

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

PD-AAU-553
49843

(BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS)

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT (Mission or AID/W Office) _____
 B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN? yes slipped ad hoc
 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 #	Project/Program Title (or title & date of evaluation report)	First PROGRAM or equivalent (FY)	Most recent PACD (m/y/r)	Planned LOP Cost ('000)	Amount Obligated to Date ('000)
386-0405	Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry Project	1981 9/30/1981	3/87	24,000(L) 1,000(G)	17,900 200

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. Distribute evaluation report to GCI, GOMP, AID/W	Amato	Jan 87
2. Prepare Project Assistance Report and process all project claims for reimbursement.	Fisher	Before Nov 87
3. Inventory the construction done with project funds for completion of project report; issue status report.	contract (PD)	Apr-Nov 87
4. Inventory the community and private plantations to determine stocking and collaborate with the GOMP to prepare an outline for suggested management of the community plantations after the PACD.	Fisher	Jan-Dec 87
5. Collaborate with the GOMP in preparing guidelines for extension activity to be provided communities and private landowners in management of their plantations after the PACD.	Fisher	Jan-Dec 87
6. Collaborate with the GOMP in determining any follow-up activities to be bi-laterally conducted by the GOMP, and AID.	Fisher	Jan-Mar 87
7. Survey the villagers to determine the extent of local participation in plantation management.	contract	Jan-Dec 87
8. Conduct a socio-economic survey to determine the impact of the project on the natural forest and on the population, including the local market for wood products.	contract (PD)	July 86-May 87
(Attachments, if necessary)		

F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION mo 02 day 19 year 86

G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:

Signature: 19 Dec 86 Project/Program Officer: Harold E. Fisher Representative of Borrower/Grantee: _____ Evaluation Officer: _____ Mission or AID/W Office Director: _____
 Date: _____

The evaluation of Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry Program (MPSF) operates at two levels. At one level it addresses broad programmatic questions such as the soundness of the social forestry concept and at another, the details of the Social Forestry Directorate's (SFD) implementation of the MPSF. The evaluation is divided into five sections covering the following topics: land availability, economic and financial analysis, community participation, institutional structure and SFD management.

The basic programmatic conclusion was that social forestry as it has been implemented in Madhya Pradesh is fundamentally flawed. The principal purpose of the MPSF -- building institutional capacity to motivate participation of villagers in the establishment of community plantations -- has fallen by the wayside.

In light of this finding, the evaluation team strongly recommended that SFD undergo a period of program reconceptualization, restructuring and consolidation. The following were recommended as high priority areas for program exploration and reformulation:

Land Availability

--development of estimates of amount of land potentially available for social forestry and its quality. Enough evidence was turned up during the evaluation to suggest that the availability of revenue land and its quality is a serious constraint on MPSF.

Economic and Financial Analysis

--exploration of the feasibility of establishing community plantations as financially viable self-sustaining enterprises: The team found that none of the plantations visited, as they are presently managed, will be financially self sustaining.

Community Participation

--formulation of an approach to engage Panchayats in the management of community plantations from the outset. The team found that much work remains to be done in engaging village level authorities in the management of community woodlots.

Institutional Arrangements

--examination of arrangements with other institutions and various non governmental organizations to determine effectiveness of existing arrangements and alternative structural arrangements that would improve program content and implementation. The team found that the present institutional arrangements are an important constraint on the development of MPSF.

Social Forestry Directorate Management

--determine means to improve continuity and strength of the top SFD leadership and hire personnel with background and interest in extension. The top position in SFD has been both a revolving door and "port of last call" for senior Forest Department officials on the verge of retirement. At lower levels in SFD many personnel have been transferred from the Forest Department to SFD with limited qualifications for their jobs and interest in them:

--examine SFD program content and procedures with a view to emphasizing SFD extension services and private farm and agroforestry. At present the areas in which extension services are being provided are for private nurseries and in a few cases, private farm and agroforestry.

I. EVALUATION COSTS

1. Evaluation Team

Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (US\$)	Source of Funds
Dr. B.R.Mehta	Indian Inst. of Ferest Mgmt.		\$1,250.	PD&S

2. Mission/Office Professional
Staff Person Days (estimate) 20 weeks

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional
Staff Person-Days (estimate) 20 person days

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:

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

Mission: USAID/India

Purpose of Activity: The principal purpose of MPSF was to build institutional capacity to motivate participation of villagers in the establishment of community plantations.

Purpose of the Evaluation: MPSF Project Agreement required a second evaluation in 1985 to assess project accomplishments and to determine desirability and timing for a follow on project of AID assistance.

Methodology used: Intensive program of meetings and site visits by five person team over period of three weeks to collect information and data. Representative sample of sites selected by SFD visited.

Findings, Conclusions and Major Recommendations: The basic programmatic conclusion is that social forestry as it has been implemented in Madhya Pradesh is fundamentally flawed. The principal purpose of the MPSF -- building institutional capacity to motivate participation of villagers in the establishment of community plantations -- has fallen by the wayside. Fodder, fuelwood and small timber plantations cannot be managed on a long term, self sustaining basis by Panchayats because the existing political economy of the Panchayats militates against it. The combination of short term political motivation of Panchayat leaders and the tremendous pressures for grazing land for cattle owned by villagers are far too great to allow community managed plantations to exist for very long under Panchayat management.

In light of the above, the evaluation team strongly recommends that SFD undergo a period of program reconceptualization, restructuring and consolidation.

The following are high priority areas for program exploration and reformulation:

Land Availability

--development of estimates of amount of land potentially available for social forestry and its quality. These estimates would take into account encroachment, the likelihood of the Panchayats allocating land for social forestry and competing claims of other government programs on revenue lands. Enough evidence turned up during the evaluation to suggest that the availability of revenue land and its quality is a serious constraint on MPSF.

Economic and Financial Analysis

--exploration of the feasibility of establishing community plantations as financially viable self-sustaining enterprises. The team found that none of the plantations visited, as they are presently managed, will be financially self sustaining. However, the team's very rough estimates indicate it is technically feasible for some plantations to be financially self sustaining. Major changes would be required in the behavior and attitudes of both SFD and the Panchayats for this to happen.

Date this summary prepared: December 10, 1986

SECRET

Community Participation

--formulation of an approach to engage Panchayats in the management of community plantations from the outset and in the case of established plantations for turning over full management responsibility to Panchayats as soon as feasible. The team found that much work remains to be done in engaging village level authorities in the management of community woodlots. To the extent villagers are engaged as managers in forestry by SFD it is through the nursery and seedling distribution programs.

Institutional Arrangements

--examination of arrangements with other institutions such as the Forestry Department, Revenue Department, Panchayat Department, Rural Development Department, Horticulture Directorate and various non governmental organizations to determine effectiveness of existing arrangements and alternative structural arrangements that would improve program content and implementation. The team found that the present institutional arrangements, including staff assignment and transfer procedures, within the parent Forest Department are an important constraint on the development of MPSF. Additionally, the traditional functioning of the Forest Department, from which all of SFD top management is drawn, may constrain development of an extension oriented program. By contrast, although their reach is decidedly smaller, the Horticulture Directorate and some non governmental organizations are extension oriented and accordingly their resources could be drawn upon to help execute MPSF. Radical alternatives such as splitting off SFD from the Forest Department or merging Horticulture Directorate and SFD and separating both organizations from their parent Departments should not be excluded from consideration.

Social Forestry Directorate Management

--determine means to improve continuity and strength of the top SFD leadership and hire personnel with background and interest in extension. The top position in SFD has been both a revolving door and "port of last call" for senior Forest Department officials on the verge of retirement. Over the past one year the virtual absence of top leadership has had a devastating affect on SFD morale and program direction. At lower levels in SFD many personnel have been transferred from the Forest Department to SFD with limited qualifications for their jobs and interest in them. Actions such as closing off transfer to SFD from the Forestry Department except by request, allowing staff interested in social forestry to remain with the SFD, and recruitment of qualified personnel from other agencies and the open market could help to rectify this situation.

--examine SFD program content and procedures with a view to emphasizing SFD extension services and private farm and agroforestry. At present the areas in which extension services are being provided are for private nurseries and in a few cases, private farm and agroforestry. SFD may want to give further emphasis to programs in these areas. Similarly targets could be reformulated to reflect program emphasis on extension as well as numbers of hectares of new community plantation established and numbers of seedlings distributed.

Note

The above summary covers only the major points in each of the sections of the paper. There are numerous other recommendations in the report and also in the first mid term evaluation of November 1983 that SFD could follow up on to the benefit of the State's social forestry and wasteland development program.

Concluding Comment

It may be that a major overhaul of SFD might help to establish community plantations that will have a life beyond SFD management. In the absence of a major overhaul, the conclusion is that the plantations will continue only so long as SFD or some other

Detailed Report (Annex)

government agency is directly involved in their management. Even then successful management of hundreds of small and scattered plantations will be no small feat and may very well not be an efficient use of scarce Government of Madhya Pradesh (GOMP) resources.

Following from the above, the main issue may be how to adopt and institute alternative approaches to forestry in Madhya Pradesh. There very well may be better investment programs than the establishment of community woodlots on Revenue wastelands.

GOMP/USAID Follow on Project

In considering any GOMP/USAID follow on activity to MPSF, the scope of work should be broad enough to permit the kinds of important changes in the MPSF approach and structure that have been discussed in the report. In addition, it would be important to consider investments that are related to, but outside the framework of the MPSF.

Finally as regards the present GOMP/USAID MPSF project, the team recommended USAID not commit to exploration of a follow on activity without prior agreement on the far reaching type of scope suggested above. In the absence of such an agreement, the team recommends an extension of the project completion date by two years to March 28, 1989 with no additional funding.

Lessons Learned: The following are lessons learned from MPSF:

Quantitative targets -- in the case of MPSF number of hectares of trees planted and seedlings distributed -- raise havoc with projects that have as their primary purpose institution building. Physical targets laid out in the Project Description overwhelmed the institution building purpose of MPSF.

Time should be allowed for at least one successful run of an experimental activity before major commitment of resources dedicated to rapidly expanding the activity. MPSF design work carried out in 1980 drew heavily on Ford Foundation experimental field work begun in M.P. in 1978. With benefit of hindsight, it is clear the design was not up to coping with the powerful political and financial motivation associated with this massive scheme to introduce community managed plantations throughout 21 Districts of M.P.

Major innovative programs with complex political economies should be built gradually from a small base. MPSF leapt from a small, experimental activity to a major program in a period of two to three years. Given the indestructible nature of large bureaucracies, gradual development may make it easier and less costly to call a halt to or redirect an experiment that in replication failed to meet the promise envisaged.

SUMMARY (continued)

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

Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry Project (386-0475)
Second Mid-Term Evaluation
December, 1985

ATTACHMENTS

COMMENTS BY MISSION, AID/W OFFICE AND BORROWER/GRANTEE

The Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry Project evaluation has been thoroughly vetted and discussed with GOI and G of MP. Follow-up discussions have been held on the advisability of either extending this project or continuing a large scale effort in Madhya Pradesh through a state level field oriented project. Mission has concluded that no further development purpose can be served by this type of activity in Madhya Pradesh. We credit this excellent evaluation as a major contribution to helping us reach this decision with the Government of Madhya Pradesh. However, we will continue to maintain a presence in Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry through other institutional capacity improvement projects now being considered or underway.

MISSION COMMENTS ON FULL REPORT