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A STUDY TO ASSESS THE EVIDENCE BASE AND METHODOLOGIES FOR POVERTY REDUCTION IMPACT ASSESSMENT IN EIIP/ASIST-AFRICA PROGRAMME

CHAPTER 1

1.0 Executive summary
The following are some of the key observations noted from the review of baseline and impact studies relating to the EIIP ASIST interventions in Africa.

Although generally regarded as useful with respect to the purposes for which the studies were done, a review of the baseline and impact studies demonstrates a failure to provide a logical link between performance indicators from baseline studies and those designed for impact studies. Certain methodological gaps are cited in this review.

The baseline and impact studies reviewed are deemed in this study to be deficient in failing to classify the potential beneficiaries of EIIIs by their poverty categories. This limitation makes it difficult to assess changes that have occurred from the period the baseline studies were conducted up to the period when the impact assessment studies were conducted.

Unless substantial efforts are made to target the EIIPs to the poorer segments of society, their outreach to the poor households is demonstrated to be weak. In many cases the evidence of such targeting is not available which partly explains the perceived poor links between EIIIs and poverty dimensions.

Attempts to link EII projects to poverty dimensions is problematic in that the impact analysis must (a) look beyond the activities of specific EII interventions and capture the total impacts of projects. The interventions of other stakeholders who may be involved in relevant development activities within given areas are not taken into account in the baseline and impact analysis; (b) assess the period before the project and long after the project phase. The reality demonstrated by the review indicates that the studies have not been able to generate and analyze sufficient data regarding key performance indicators which can be monitored over time.

A simplified and effective methodology of carrying out both baseline and impact assessment studies based on the results-based monitoring (RBM) approach has been recommended in this study.

1.1 Introduction
The consultancy assignment, ‘A Study to Assess the Evidence Base and Methodologies for Poverty Reduction Impact Assessment in EIIP/ASIST- Africa Programme’ is divided into two sections. The first chapter provides an analysis of all relevant baseline and impact study reports (more than 90) which are available in the ASIST Information Service. A large number of other
documents available from various sources, including websites have also been examined. An attempt is also made to identify the documents which show a direct linkage between the EIIP and poverty reduction\(^1\). The second chapter of the study comprises two main outputs. The first output are the existing methodologies and indicators, with an analysis of appropriateness, robustness and gaps. The other output for the chapter comprises the proposed methodology and recommended approaches and indicators for possible use by the EIIP in the monitoring and assessment of outcomes.

1.2 Background to the study
The global Employment Intensive-Investment Programme (EIIP) of the ILO promotes and supports the generation of productive and decent employment through local resource-based investment policies and programmes in infrastructure to contribute to poverty reduction, economic development and social progress. ASIST Africa (Advisory Support, Information Services and Training for labour-based technology) has held the role of the delivery mechanism for EIIP in Eastern and Southern Africa. The programme has been considered fairly successful and is believed to have had significant impact, particularly when it comes to the delivery of infrastructure using the labour-based technology (LBT). Nevertheless, the approach has not generally been up-scaled and mainstreamed in the development process as a whole, as a core strategy for employment creation and poverty reduction initiatives.

The current policy environment in some African countries and the adoption of development frameworks like the poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) provide a good opportunity to promote and institutionalise the use of EIIPs for poverty reduction. Some countries like Namibia and Kenya have specifically mentioned in their PRSPs their commitment to foster the use of LBT for employment creation, particularly in the rural roads sub-sector. These countries and others need to be supported in strategic areas enabling them to mobilise enough resources for EIIPs. Among them are the tools for poverty impact monitoring and assessments which are also necessary for advocacy. Although some monitoring and assessment tools (such as RAPI, see section 2.1 below) have been developed over the years, there is a need to improve on these to consolidate the evidence base on EIIPs and to demonstrate the actual impact on poverty, being the ultimate goal in order to increase the uptake.

Part of the objective of this study is that the baseline and impact studies together provide a systematic way of assessing viability and effects of development interventions over time.

\(^1\) It is noted that whilst all the available documents, baseline and impact assessment and associated reports have been examined, not all the documents have been commended upon individually because of the need to focus the presentation in this study.
1.3 The objectives of the study

The objectives of the study can be summed up as follows:

1. Synthesizing and make available the already existing baseline and impact information, verifying the quality and appropriateness of the information to strengthen the evidence base of EII on poverty reduction.
2. Developing an evaluation and impact assessment methodology that can systematically be used in the programme to monitor the impact of EII interventions on poverty levels. Cost effective ways of capturing this type of information are recommended.
3. Establishing proxy indicators and the link between employment, income and poverty reduction as well as the opportunity costs for people working on labour-based projects.
4. Developing a convincing argument to EII practicing countries and partners on the need for socio-economic baseline and impact studies to demonstrate impact of EII on poverty reduction, in particular where ASIST is directly involved.

The analysis on tables A1 and A2, (see appendix), in particular the impact rating of evidence drawn from the more than 90 documents provided by the ILO ASIST Information Service and additional reports found from various sources including websites. The analysis is based on the evidence provided in the documents, qualitative judgement and perception criteria of the documents and the evidence presented. An attempt has been made in all relevant cases to as far as possible examine critically whatever links exist, direct or indirect (where they can be demonstrated) between EII and poverty dimensions, as spelt out in the terms of reference of the study. The studies which have not been referred to or quoted individually have either been found to have no links whatsoever or too weakly associated to the EII to warrant any reference in the analysis. The quality of many of the studies is also poor and any attempt to make much reference to such material has been found by the consultant to be undesirable and without much value addition to the study.

A substantial number of impact studies have been done without reference to proper baseline information, a situation which limited the use of the impact studies. In many cases the quality of both the baseline and impact studies is questionable and presents a variety of unanswered questions. Another limitation to the study with reference to baseline and impact studies is that a large number of reports referred to as impact studies are not impact studies at all but mere baseline studies. Real impact studies have been found to be few. Largely due to the widespread poor quality and unfocussed nature of the baseline studies, in a large number cases, variables cannot be traced through the use of specific indicators to assess change over time. It is also problematic to provide a direct link between EII to poverty dimensions in almost all the studies available. This problem and what it implies have been
examined in some detail in chapter 2, which analyses the current methodologies applied and what is proposed in this study.

1.4 Case references: review of country specific experiences

1.4.1 BOTSWANA\(^2\)


Component B: Application of Labour-based Methods in Road Maintenance and Construction

Summary
The Botswana labour-based road maintenance project amply demonstrates the difficulty of sustaining the ‘feel good factor’ to communities exposed to projects during project implementation. Whilst it was revealed that during the project demonstration period, many jobs were created for both men and women, with cash earnings spreading to targeted poor households and communities, the ending of the project signified a reversal of fortunes of the beneficiary households and communities. The micro-enterprises and a few formal businesses operating in the communities were badly affected with the ceasing of work opportunities previously created\(^3\). It is clear that the short-term nature of the benefits meant that the project did not have a sustained impact on poverty reduction and employment generation – a typical dilemma faced by many such projects.

The impact assessment report (2002), however, makes the following observation:

> ‘The impact of the LBM project has been significant because households could, even in one - two month period of employment, accumulate sufficient cash to meet basic needs and make other kinds of ‘investment’.

The underlying assumption of the LBM approach that the socio-economic situation of households will be better after they have participated in a project compared with what it was before needs to be re-examined.

\(^2\) Baseline study for Botswana not available to the consultant but the inferences in the impact study reveals that some valuable information is available from baseline studies. However, the baseline study indicators seemed limited in that only short term benefits were captured through the indicators and variables analysed.

\(^3\) An undisclosed number of enterprises operated prior to the project whilst others emerged following the implementation of the project.
Indeed poor households may be able to acquire some assets to improve their housing and obtain other inputs whilst others are engaged in some micro-enterprise activities. However, given the relatively low wage rate generally offered in these projects, it is not conceivable that there may be a major turnaround in the livelihood and or socio-economic position of large numbers of participants since the evidence generated in most LBM projects is that most of the income earned is spent in basic survivalist items which quickly disappear upon the termination of projects.

In the case of Botswana, the available studies do not show that there has been an in-depth analysis of linkages with other development programmes to sustain the benefits. The Botswana labour-based programme seems to work in isolation of other major initiatives, e.g., enterprise development projects, other typical projects focusing on employment creation and poverty reduction.

A question might be asked is why the existing studies been silent on these other initiatives which are expected to exist in many parts of the countries covered by the LBM projects.

The answer to this question may lie in a ‘methodological gap or deficiency’ in the design of the various studies, in view of the fact that at the time the projects were designed priorities may have been different from what they are now when programmes are increasingly facing more rigorous analysis regarding their impacts. A retrospective analysis of impact based on current priority issues may then prove to be very difficult.

1.4.2 KENYA

References


*The Ministry of Public Works, Republic of Kenya. and the Baseline Survey for the Kenya Minor Roads Programme (March 1989); Socio-Economic Impact Evaluation of the Kenya Minor Roads Programme in SIDA Funded Districts (November 1989) are two important surveys carried out by a Kenya based private consulting company through to 1992.*

Kenya is a country with a long history, of more than 30 years of involvement in the constructing and maintaining of rural roads through labour based techniques. For more than 10 years, since 1988, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Government of Kenya, the ILO and other donors have been collaborating in a Minor Roads Programme. The development programme initially covered four districts but it has since extended to many other districts of the country.
Overall priority has been given to the carrying out of baseline and impact assessment studies in the areas of Minor Roads Programme establishment.

The studies cited attempt to relate some changes that have occurred in the project areas, associating them with the existence of the Minor Roads, using a methodology that compares and contrasts what are referred to as “test areas” and “control areas”. Test areas are project impact areas whilst control areas are those areas not covered by the project. Case examples of Nakuru and Kericho districts have been used in the studies.

Differences in various household incomes (wage income, agricultural income, off-farm income and incomes from self-employment) which are presented being in favour of test areas generally are demonstrated to show the impact of the programme.

Increases in value of marketed surplus for agricultural produce of as much as 23% in some test areas compared to control areas are presented as evidence of the impact of the Minor Roads Programme. Non-farm cash earnings have also shown significant rise in programme areas.


“The presence of the Rural Access Roads in the Study areas definitely has a positive and direct effect in terms of accessibility to markets …..The increase in farm and non-farm incomes testify to this”.

However, it is acknowledged that in many developing countries, it is the better-off rural households who produce surplus for marketing. Poorer households produce largely for own consumption.

Wage employment was found to be the highest non-farm monthly income earner for households in the test areas (KShs 365), whilst self-employment is the highest non-farm monthly source of income for the households in the control road area (some Kshs 461). There is no systematic analysis of all the incomes in the report, a gap in the analysis.

Issues of concern relate to the distribution of the various incomes between poor and non-poor households which is not highlighted in the available reports. An added dimension relates to the linking of the results solely to the establishment of minor roads which is problematic methodologically in view of other factors at play in the development process. Also added to this, the quality aspects of the roads constructed through labour based methods and how this is associated with the desired outcome of poverty reduction needs to be examined carefully.
The Ministry of Public Works, Republic of Kenya, June, 1992, Socio-Economic Impact Evaluation of the Kenya Minor Roads Programme in CIDA Funded Districts report shows an increase in the number of people entering self-employment around the test road areas which follows the mushrooming of commercial establishments along improved roads witnessed after completion of gravelled process. However, whether this increase is solely a direct result of the project is a question that cannot be fully answered from the available information. This presents a gap in the methodology used to analyse change and impact over time.

In the Government of Kenya (programme supported by ILO) impact evaluation of the MRP, 1992, it is argued:

“The improvement in incomes of small scale farmers, or of poor families living near the road as a consequence of road improvement is probably the most difficult of MRP objectives to verify or refute”.

However, a cautionary observation emanating from more critical analysis is that road projects can actually re-enforce economic and social inequalities unless a concerted effort is made to direct project benefits to poorer groups in the area (McCord and Seventer, 2004).

**Kericho district road - Kenya**

With reference to specific areas in Kenya, in the Kericho District, households at the test roads recorded higher percentage increases in numbers deriving incomes from a variety of farming enterprises than households at control roads, but reportedly not to a significant extent. The link between EII and increases in numbers of people obtaining farming incomes is however, speculative since there may be many factors accounting for this observation.

Better wage employment opportunities were reported with respect to the test road, a perceived indicator of the ability of minor roads to open up income-earning opportunities and increase off-farm employment for poor members of the communities within the project areas.

The general levels of income from wage and self-employment remained higher for the project beneficiaries than for without project beneficiaries.

Large increases of commercial establishments (125%, from 24 to 55), largely in the form of micro-enterprises for the period between the baseline and final impact surveys indicate some interesting changes that may be directly associated with the MRP - although other factors need to be considered. The expansion of business within the CIDA funded MRP areas resulted in the increase of employment opportunities from 25 to 76, a three-fold rise. Although there is no evidence that these jobs were sustained, it is presumed that some poor members of the community would have benefited from such a development.
Nakuru district road - Kenya
Similar trends were noted with respect to Nakuru District, another project area, where generally test road households had higher levels of farm incomes than without minor road construction.

The average annual household incomes were also significantly higher than the without situation. Non-farm incomes (self employment and remittances or income transfers increased in the test areas. There was also a marked expansion of micro-enterprises in terms of number of establishments signifying more employment opportunities created as a result of MRP.

In the case of Kenya, impact documents (Ministry of Public Works, June 1992) there is some evidence that in some districts where cultural barriers failed to block women from offering their labour, significant numbers of women were engaged as casuals on road improvement activities. The opportunities for income-starved local communities gradually removed the gender divide in labour mobilization. As a result of the participation of women in labour based road improvement projects, it is understood from existing documents that there was an increase in the number of women involved in wage employment between the baseline and final surveys – one of the main impacts cited for the programme. It is presumed that a large number of these women came from poor communities.

In the study ‘Socio-Economic Impact Evaluation of the Kenya Minor Roads Programme: A Review of Recommendations’, August, 1991 Martin Walsh makes a number of important observations.

A major point made by Walsh is that the impact evaluation of the MRP was not as well conceptualised as it might have been, a problem shared with many other road impact studies analysed in this study\(^4\). There was generally large quantities of data gathered but quite thin on poverty issues as it is clear that the design of the impact assessment in its original form did not prioritise such issues. An examination of the terms of reference for the various studies shows that issues of priority have changed over time. Whereas previously in the past emphasis seemed to have been on generating large quantities of data on a large number of variables, things have changed in recent years with a new emphasis and focus on quality and key issues of employment and poverty dimensions.

In another study: ‘Socio-Economic Impact Assessment of Minor Roads Programme in Nyamira District, Kisii Training School, April 1993’, a number of points are made. The report which relies on qualitative information (which contains sketchy information) to a large extent, argues that the Minor Roads Programme has created employment to Kenyans in impact areas and this has\(^4\) This is related to the absence of baseline data and lack of measurable indicators from the studies which are supposed to provide benchmark to trace for change over time.
helped to bridge the financial gap between the middle and low level income earners.

The construction of roads has enhanced inter-district commercial activities and the development of micro-enterprises or what are commonly referred to as the “Jua Kali” in particular. The mushrooming of permanent shelter along the constructed roads is seen as an indicator of the success of the minor road programme in developing enterprises with possibilities of impacting positively on poverty, reducing poverty among communities who hitherto languished in poverty with very limited employment opportunities, both for earning wage income and income generated from self-employment. More marketing opportunities have been created for those entrepreneurs willing and able to engage in viable business activities.

In the case of Kenya, both the baseline and impact studies (whilst they do have a strong gender consciousness) are somewhat deficient in missing the classification and analysis of potential MRP beneficiaries by poverty groups, i.e., poor and non-poor which could be used to assess changes over time. Judging from the available documents, the analysis of poverty issues as far as they relate to the MRP seems to be somewhat an after-thought, possibly a response to a presumed criticism that the programmes have had no major impact on poverty. Carrying out a retrospective analysis and digging out information which may not be packaged well is a big challenge for this study.
1.4.3 SOUTH AFRICA

References
DFID: Limpopo Province Labour Intensive Rural Roads Maintenance Programme (Gundo Lashu) Output to Purpose Review May 2003


Summary of impacts
In their paper ‘The Economy-Wide Impacts of the Labour Intensification of Infrastructure Expenditure in South Africa’, 2004, McCord and van Seventer offer one of the most detailed analysis of the impacts of public works programmes on poverty and a wide range of dimensions including employment.

Drawing on recent survey data from two public works programmes in South Africa, the microeconomic impacts of public works programme participation in terms of income poverty, non income poverty and labour market performance are reviewed. The microeconomic findings are linked to recent research examining the macroeconomic impacts of public works programmes with the two considered together in assessing the micro-macro linkage of public works programmes and their contribution to development and poverty reduction.

The microeconomic analysis suggests that while participation in a public works programme may not contribute to a reduction in the depth of poverty, with improvements in participation in education and nutrition, and have positive psychological benefits, the impact of a short-term programme may not be significant in terms of reduction in headcount poverty or improvements in asset ownership (material or financial). In such a case the public works programme income may function essentially as a temporary wage shock especially so because the insurance function of the transfer is limited by the short duration of the employment period. However, if targeted to poorer groups, with lower levels of school participation and poorer nutrition, impact may be greater per unit of wage transferred, in terms of contribution to human capital, but is still unlikely to move participants out of poverty, but rather reduce the depth of their poverty.
Survey data from the Gundo Lashu Programme\(^5\) has been used to assess the micro-economic impact of public works programme participation in terms of selected indicators of poverty, which considers both income and non income dimensions of poverty, and labour market performance.

The analysis of survey data with respect to impact on poverty reduction shows that even with public works income, 87 percent of participating households still fell below the poverty line by a significant margin. The survey data suggests that the income poverty reduction impact of a short-term Public Works Programme employment is limited, although the poverty gap (depth of poverty) experienced by participating households is temporarily reduced. The implication is that a short-term employment opportunity is not likely to have significant insurance benefit in the face of chronic poverty, and also unlikely to facilitate a sustained movement out of poverty.

Although some improvement in the material and financial asset base of participating households is demonstrated by the survey findings, there was only limited investment in formal or informal income generating activities with a limited stimulus to the local economy. Quite likely, the benefits are limited to the duration of PWP implementation. Survey data also implies that the labour market effect of programme participation which is mediated through improved labour skills and experience is limited in the context of widespread unemployment, in view of the fact that the major challenge is the structural and mass nature of unemployment. Targeting poorer groups for PWP employment and extending the programme period would more likely result in maximising the impact of the intervention.

McCord and van Seventer further contend that macroeconomic analysis indicates that an annual shift in the factor intensity of R3 billion of existing infrastructure budget allocations is not likely to have a significant impact at macro level on employment or GDP growth because of the limited scale of the intervention. The impact on poverty is dependent upon targeting PWP employment to the poorest categories of beneficiary communities, in which case aggregate income would increase by 2 percent, but in the event that employment is spread more generally across unskilled labour, as survey findings indicate, the impact on the poor ceases to be significant.

Howe et al (2005) examine the Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP being supported by the Department of Public Works and its development partners in the Republic of South Africa. The analysis differs considerably from the position taken by McCord and other critics of the Public Works Programme in South Africa.

While McCord and van Seventer argue that the economy-wide impacts of labour based methods of infrastructural development are overall insignificant,

\(^5\) This is the Limpopo Province Labour Based Rural Roads Maintenance Programme.
Howe et al argue that this conclusion is based on an inadequate understanding of the Public Works Programmes and the context within which they operate. (McCord, 2005; McCord and van Seventer, Howe et al, 2005). Clearly public works programmes in any country, including the Republic of South Africa are not and should not be designed as a panacea to the unemployment or poverty crises which characterise a large number of African countries.

The EPWP, for example, was designed as a modest contribution to one of many measures aimed at reducing unemployment and poverty in South Africa. In addition, the existence and importance of other programmes and projects that specifically focus on the quality and productivity achieved by labour must be acknowledged. These initiatives have been part of a deliberate strategy by the ILO and its partners to make labour-based works competitive with capital-intensive methods of producing the same infrastructure (Howe et al, 2005, Allal and Edmonds 1977, World Bank 1983).

Furthermore, the EPWP reflects a choice for the South African Government to deliver on the provision of basic services using conventional construction methods, or using labour-based methods, in the process creating five to six times as many jobs for the lower skilled unemployed.

Howe et al show how the links of the EPWP with the National Skills and Development Strategy (NSDS) with a particular focus to train and impart skills to the unemployed is important to the development process. As far as possible the EPWP involves, for example, the Sector Training and Education Authorities to ensure that relevant training is provided to public works participants. In the infrastructure sector, contractor and site supervisor learnerships are planned to provide skills to more than 3 000 persons so that they can find employment managing labour-intensive works within the construction industry beyond the public works programme.

In their conclusions regarding the misgivings about the SA Public Works Programme, Howe et al (2005) state another important point:

“….the key to success lies in the design of the public works programme and in securing sufficient political commitment to overcome the inevitable teething problems they all go through”.

One of these teething problems is the issue of appropriate targeting. It is necessary to know where the poor are, but also in what way they experience poverty. In some cases public works programmes may well be inappropriate.

The SA EPWP demonstrates that public works programmes can be linked to other government priorities such as focus on the delivery of basic services
and other skills and training initiatives. Ultimately the success of the EPWP will depend on how well all the activities can be integrated so that the EPWP not only contributes to the creation of additional works opportunities, but also to other national objectives such as providing quality infrastructure and social services to the poor, and skills to the unemployed (Howe, et al, 2005).

How well public works programmes are linked to other sectors and government priorities in other African countries is not altogether clear and an issue of concern. This is largely so because of the apparent isolation of the programmes or at least the failure by existing studies (baseline and impact) in most African countries to place into correct context PWP. The studies are on the whole silent on the issue of networking and linkages with complementary initiatives (e.g., government policies and priorities, etc.) seeking to address similar problems within the various development contexts, an important gap which needs to be filled.

1.4.4 TANZANIA

Reference
Hanna Nassif Community Based Infrastructure Upgrading Project Phase II, Baseline Study (1994; 1998) and Mid-Term Impact Assessment (1999)

This project is a typical one with an obvious link to reducing poverty among poor households. Although the case is not well demonstrated in the available documents, it is evident from the baseline and evaluation reports that the project has a strong bearing on alleviating poverty and in creating employment, both wage labour and self-employment. The project sought to tackle key issues of infrastructure development of an unplanned settlement. The settlement is the home of some of the poorest members of the Dar es Salaam City community, one among 44 unplanned settlements in Dar es Salaam, a category of poverty stricken communities which lacked basic infrastructure including water supply, roads, drainage systems and liquid and solid waste collection.

The 1998 baseline study and mid-term impact assessment cites methodological concerns about the 1994 baseline study making an important qualifier about the difficulty of relating the impact assessment study to the earlier baseline study. In this case there seems to exist an information gap which one can only attempt to fill through inferences from the available studies. The 1998 study provides tables which quantify the structure of employment, direct employment created by the project in the impact or project area. It states that whilst the employment structure has not changed significantly, some 4 430 workdays additional to an estimated figure of 20 000 were created by the project, an increase of 22 percent. There is also an analysis of the state of enterprise development in the project area at inception and well after project implementation. The general trend is that there has been an increase in the number of enterprises, in particular micro-
scale over the period of project implementation, with an overall increase of 16 percent.

The main concerns and gaps highlighted with respect to the Tanzanian case references and indeed many others are summed up in the concluding section of this chapter which summarises key questions and issues emerging from the reports and documents reviewed.
Drawing on the lessons learnt from the Hanna Nassif community initiative of Tanzania, it can be demonstrated that one way of reducing urban poverty is through improvement of basic infrastructure by using community contracts, labour based construction, operation and maintenance. The micro-credit financial arrangement attached to the initiative created opportunities for improved household incomes.

**Figure 1. The poverty reduction strategy in Hanna Nassif**

Source: Kyessi 2002:281, Fig. 9.6
1.4.5 MOZAMBIQUE

Reference
UNDP (2002) Mozambique: Re-opening Mozambique, Lessons learned from the Feeder Road Programme

An impact study of the Feeder Road Programme (FRP) of Mozambique presents one of the greatest success stories of the application of the LBM approach in Africa (UNDP, 2002). The programme which has been engaged in the construction and maintenance of rural feeder roads has contributed immensely to social reconstruction through the provision of employment and the training of Mozambican nationals both for site jobs and for supervisory and managerial posts. The programme centred on work in Gaza, Inhambane and Manica provinces but later spread to other provinces and districts of the country. The programme is implemented by the Government of Mozambique through the National Road Administration, with the support from a variety of international donors, which include NORAD, SIDA, etc., and technical assistance from ILO.

Labour-based methods for road construction were first established in Mozambique through pilot projects in the early 1980s. Following the Peace Accord in 1992, these methods were applied to a national programme, the Feeder Roads Programme (FRP), designed to rehabilitate roads in virtually every part of the country. In the process, the FRP has been transformed from a stand-alone programme to an integral part of the Directorate of Regional Roads in the Mozambique National Road Administration.

According to the impact study, the FRP is well integrated within the overall development and strategic framework of Mozambique. The Mozambique Road Policy, 1999 has the following statement:

“Feeder Roads provide the links between the population centres at district level and between these centres and the Primary and Secondary Road network......... The Government will, in a decentralised manner, promote the permanent rehabilitation of feeder roads, focussing mainly on those that have heavier traffic. Labour-intensive construction methods will be employed in the construction”.

Since 1989, the programme has rehabilitated 2 396 km of feeder roads using labour-based methods, creating additional employment for maintenance operations. The work is carried out through 29 labour-based “brigades” established in all provinces of the country. Each brigade employs 150 to 250

---

6 The baseline study, which is presumed to be in the Portuguese language is not available. However, the impact study which is strong in analysis has been able to highlight some of the major impacts of the FRP to a large extent, despite the unavailability of the baseline study.
EIIP/ASIST Africa Programme Poverty Reduction Impact Assessment Study

workers, is managed at the local level, and works with a set of essential light equipment to safeguard quality. In 1997, the FRP employed some 6,500 workers, of which 20 per cent were women.

The impact study also shows that the FRP has contributed significantly to the economic and social recovery of a nation torn apart by civil war. The payment of wages to local communities was an important means of helping poor people to rebuild their livelihoods following the disruption of the war. The reopening of roads has enabled the Government to re-establish social services in remote areas, whilst rural farmers are now able to access markets to sell their surplus agricultural produce. Vital skills have been transferred to thousands of Mozambicans, including those involved in the overall management of the programme, and those tasked with implementing the works on site. In addition, the FRP has created valuable employment opportunities for poor rural communities and provide a direct injection of cash to needy households struggling to recover from the effects of war. Added to this, the skills training done through the FRP enabled trained persons to enhance their employment prospects in both the public and private sectors.

Focus has shifted to increase the involvement of the private sector in the execution of public works. This is done in line with recent development trends in Mozambique where the state is embracing a more market oriented approach as is happening elsewhere in the world.

Thus, the FRP presents a great success story of the application of the LBM approach in Africa.

The participation of women in the FRP is considered to have important implications on equity issues in the distribution of employment created and also on poverty.
Box 2: Increasing women’s participation in road building in Mozambique

The FRP in Mozambique set a target for the participation of women in road construction and maintenance of 25 percent but consistently failed to achieve this. A review was commissioned to examine barriers to female participation and suggest measures to counter these. Among the barriers identified were:

- recruitment processes controlled by men
- lack of women in supervisory positions
- information about employment opportunities not channelled through media accessible to women (and indeed most poorer people without access to radios and television and also with higher levels of illiteracy)
- work involved staying on camps with few facilities, no health care, far markets to buy or sell food

Measures suggested to improve the participation of women were:

- improved outreach and consultation with women’s groups in recruitment process
- hiring more women in supervisory positions
- provision of health and childcare facilities near worksites.

As a result of the study, a gender advisor was recruited to the National Directorate of Roads and Bridges in the Ministry of Public Works and Housing, with the responsibility for monitoring the study’s recommendations as well as for examining ways in which the Directorate can institutionalise its capacity to support gender sensitive programmes.

Thus the meso and macro links of the FRP (as far as gender is concerned) can be considered as strong and worth learning from with respect to other EIIP in the Southern African region and elsewhere.


1.4.6 MADAGASCAR

Reference

Using a macro-economic model to measure the impact of labour-intensive investment projects on the economy of Madagascar, the impact study estimated the differential effects of employment versus equipment-intensive approaches on the principal economic variables which among others included, production, consumption and employment.
The analysis demonstrates the superiority of the employment-intensive approach, which is 30 to 80 percent less costly, creates 2.5 times more jobs, increases national income and household consumption 2.5 times.

In 1995, the employment-intensive sector created 12,000 direct and 23,000 indirect (equivalent full-time) jobs. These jobs compare favourably with the 17,000 jobs that existed in the free trade and the total of 77,000 jobs in the formal sector.

The experience of Madagascar shows that labour-based infrastructure provision at national scale requires a supportive policy framework at appropriate institutional level. A supportive policy environment should be two-pronged, aiming firstly at the creation of an **enabling environment**, which ensure the removal of barriers to the use of labour-based technologies and the use of public investments in contracting small-scale contractors and poor local communities. Secondly, such a supportive policy framework should include a **promotional policy framework**, which promotes in an active manner, the use of labour-based technologies ad local level planning as a general aspect of infrastructure provision in the country.

The Madagascar case also demonstrates the difficulty of linking EII interventions to poverty dimensions. Like in the other country specific cases, the robustness, quality and impact of the EII's are limited. Details on these limitations are highlighted in the concluding remarks of this chapter.

**1.4.7  GHANA**

A small contractor development project in Ghana (Ghanexim/1989 - 90) has provided comprehensive business and management training to the staff of 93 companies working on labour-based road rehabilitation projects. In addition, over 100 Government engineers ad foremen were trained in labour-based works and contract management. A nationwide expansion of the project resulted in the rehabilitation of over 1,500 km of roads and 3,500 culverts in the period August 1989 to December 1996. The cost of rehabilitation ranged from US$10 – 11,000 per km, with 2,500 workdays of employment created per km. During the first 8.5 years of its implementation, the programme created some 4.4 million workdays (or 20,000 work years) of temporary employment, implying also, at an average wage rate of approximately $1 per day, some $4.4 million was injected into the poor rural communities as direct cash wages. Substantial indirect spin-offs in terms of employment creation and poverty reduction were obtained through investments in housing improvements, local production of hand tools, farm rehabilitation and social expenditure. In recent years an interesting development has occurred in the form of the establishment of associations of labour-based contractors which have benefited from training in ILO-ASIST programmes.
According to the Ghanexim report, the employment-intensive infrastructure programmes are generally acknowledged to have generated large numbers of jobs for the poor in many countries in Africa and elsewhere. However, it is observed in much of the published literature that because of the short-term nature of the jobs created, it is desirable to combine employment-intensive programmes with other initiatives that have a longer term and more sustainable impact such as micro-finance for self employment and micro-enterprise development and skills development. The linkages with these key sectors that are central to poverty alleviation though they have begun to emerge need to be strengthened considerably. This should occur within a context of networked development approach – which allows the identification and a well defined collaborative strategy with a great variety of actors and organisations, (practitioners and policy makers).

Like in the previous cases analysed, the robustness, quality and impacts of the documents examined have limitations that are elaborated upon in the section dealing with conclusions and key observations in this chapter.

1.4.8 NAMIBIA

References

Andrew Botelle, Namibian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER) on behalf of the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA), November 1991: A Socio-Economic Survey of the Onaanda Road Construction Project, Western Owambo

Andrew Botelle, Namibian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER) on behalf of the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA), February 1992: A Socio-Economic Survey of the Onaanda Community-Based Road Construction Project, Western Owambo Region


Summary

The 1991 baseline reports give an elaborate picture of the socio-economic setting of Namibia, with high unemployment of 43.5 percent of the adult population. Other socio-economic indicators (available income sources, state of enterprise development and opportunities for self-employment, etc.) show that large numbers of people in the country are marginalized and poor, even more acutely on the basis of gender.
The Republic of Namibia, Ministry of Works and Transport and Communication report, August 2000, impact assessment report demonstrates that the EIIP approach is strongly linked to the reduction of poverty. However, like in many of the project areas, the poor were not targeted as well as they might have been. The selection process for prospective trainees and recruitment process for workers did not target the poorer households adequately in the communities. The weaknesses associated with generalising incidences of poverty and “targeting failure” in the project area creates a situation whereby the better-off and stronger and more assertive members of communities tend to take advantage of such development projects whilst the poor and less powerful and less assertive may be left out.

However, the study makes concrete proposals and recommendations laying out criterion that ensures that the next phase of labour based projects reach out to the really poor and marginalized households. The criterion is well discussed in the report and there are important lessons to draw for other EIIP projects in other countries if they are to have a greater impact on poverty alleviation.

The August 2000 impact assessment report argues that specific data were not collected in a systematic way to enable a convincing link between EIIP and poverty reduction. While a great deal of baseline information was generated, the data is of limited use in explaining the link between EIIP and poverty in communities within project areas. Full records are not available regarding the number of people employed disaggregated by gender. The study further argues that recruitment within the labour based projects did not follow formal criteria regarding targeting.

However, the report notes that the projects employed more people than in conventional construction. Although an improvement is noted in terms of employment creation, the technical and economic analysis reveal that there was considerable room for significant improvement in employment generation and potential for more socio-economic impact.

As in the previous cases, the strength of the baseline and impact analysis, as shown in the documents reviewed, are limited and have some gaps which form the basis of the section highlighting key observations and conclusions of chapter one.

1.4.9 ZIMBABWE

Reference
Summary
Rural Feeder Roads Programme was introduced in Zimbabwe between July 1991 to July 1994, jointly funded by the Government of Zimbabwe and DANIDA. Other donors, for example, SIDA also joined in later.

The Jimat Consultant report reveal that “the Labour Based Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Rural Feeder Roads Project has been “a resounding success” in terms of jobs created for both men and women, the poor, the needy, youths and the uneducated, whose employment prospects were very limited in view of high levels of unemployment in the country.

By the end of 1997, six roads rehabilitated in two project areas created between 45 500 - 115 200 worker-days of work per road reaching a total of 490 000 worker-days. The figure is assessed to translate into over 6 000 jobs generated between 1994 - 1997 along six rehabilitated roads surveyed.

The impact study shows that a large proportion of the income earned from cash earned during road rehabilitation and maintenance was used to meet basic needs of rural households who comprise some of the poorest people in the country. The study did not, however, provide a break-down of earnings by poverty status.

Also to note, is that participating members of rural households in the project areas acquired skills which strengthened them in their capacity to perform other income and domestic activities.

The outputs of the projects are reported to have enhanced, in a significant manner, household food security, especially during drought periods, including among some of the most vulnerable population groups. Other outputs such as investments in productive assets, income generating projects and education are perceived to have raised the profile of participants, irrespective of their previous status, and the benefits are perceived to continue to accrue long after the project expired.

The study is limited for purposes of impact assessment largely because of the inability to follow through adequately measurable indicators which form the basis of impact analysis. Although the quality of the report is fair, in relation to a large number of documents made available from other countries, there are certain gaps which were not filled in the analysis. For example, it is not possible from the report to articulate qualitatively and clearly how communities in the intervention areas have benefited from the road development project. Like many other reports, the document was not able to link EII to poverty dimensions in a manner that cannot be challenged.
1.5 An analysis of labour-based methods based on empirical evidence

Much debate has occurred about whether current infrastructure service provision benefits the poor. Some evidence suggests that certain types of infrastructure service provision, for example roads and transport, have a potential to contribute to agricultural output, and that infrastructure improvement (in electricity supply, transport and telecommunications in small towns contribute significantly to industrial growth and employment) (World Bank, 1994). At a community or individual level benefits can accrue to the poor if labour-based methods of construction are used rather than capital intensive methods (SIDA, 1996).

However, the approach has its own critics and sceptics who are of the view that the programme has not been so successful in creating employment and reducing poverty to the extent that its advocates and promoters claim. The analysis of various baseline, impact studies and a variety of other documents provides an opportunity to respond to such criticism.

Box 1: Infrastructure and poverty linkages (see R. Masika and S. Baden, 1997)

- Public infrastructure of acceptable quality stimulates economic growth and is a prerequisite for economic and social development. The quality of infrastructure and service provision is important in attracting foreign direct investment (FDI), with the potential to generate new employment opportunities. Research generally finds that infrastructure capital has a positive effect on economic growth and output in developing countries (Kessides 1993, Fox 1994).

- Access to a range of basic infrastructure services (e.g., clean water, sanitation) is often regarded as an indicator of well-being (Sida, 1996).

- Infrastructure services can reduce poverty through health improvements, for example, by improving water and sanitation, which decreases incidences of illness, and associated lack of productivity.

- The way in which infrastructure is financed influences the distribution of income in society (Sida, 1996). Infrastructure provision such as better transportation and water services can be very effective in raising incomes of some people (depending on region, income group) (Fox, 1994).

- Construction of infrastructure facilities may lead to employment opportunities for the poor, or, alternatively, to loss of jobs. Labour-based methods in the construction and maintenance of infrastructure provide employment and incomes for poor people (Howe and Richards, 1984), but in some cases workers may lose their jobs, e.g., where a new source of electricity leads to the introduction of labour-saving technology (Fox, 1994).
Box 1 illustrates the potential contributions of infrastructure services to poverty reduction. Whilst there is considerable evidence that infrastructure development is correlated with economic growth, there is less evidence to support a positive impact on poverty. In general, non-poor households rather than poor households seem to benefit more from public infrastructure investments (Howe and Richards, 1984; World Bank, 1994; UNCHS, 1996).

Turning to the lessons and experiences derived from the ILO, EIIP/ASIST programme, the immediate purpose of EIIPs is to maximise short-term employment opportunities and alleviate transient poverty (Kiddeman, 1998). Targeting has been applied to influence distributional effects and effectiveness of EIIPs and is measured in terms of reaching the poorer groups. To the extent that poverty is associated with lack of employment opportunities, employment creation is deemed to be one of the most effective ways of alleviating transient poverty (Kiddeman, 1998).

Evidence of the operation of ‘self-targeting’ mechanisms associated with appropriate wage levels was found in several of the EIIPs implemented over the last 10-15 years.

Evaluation studies, using qualitative analysis, and household surveys designed to determine differences between participants and non-participants have been used on a number of occasions to determine income and poverty effects. In Nepal, for instance, an evaluation study of the ILO-supported public works programme noted that “most of the unskilled labour was carried out by the poorer groups since the market related wage rates offered by the contractors did not attract the better-off…. In this way, the Special Public Works Programme included a substantial income distribution effect in favour of the poor (UNDP/ILO, 1986).”

Comparison of household incomes of participants and non-participants was undertaken in Lesotho, Rwanda, Burundi and Thailand. In the case of Lesotho non-participant households had, on average, 50 percent higher incomes and this was explained by the fact that employment on the road project was seen “as a last resort, when more lucrative opportunities are hard to come by” (Kiddeman, 1998). The study concluded that incomes from the labour-based road construction project “probably represent more appropriate programmes for poverty alleviation because of their distributive nature” (Mhlanga, et al., 1995., p 50). In the Burundi survey, focusing on female workers, who constituted a significant proportion of the poor, participating households were found to have 20 percent higher incomes, associated to a large extent with income from the project (D’Haese, et al., 1988).

Analyses of information about the long-term effects of EIIPs, which are broadly defined as impacts has been found to be scarce (even to date), diverse and questions have been raised and continue to be raised about the reliability of the information presented. A major ‘methodological gap’ is that the information which often refers to post project completion events is less
frequently collected than that relating to on-going projects and because the number of projects producing sustainable outputs is considerably smaller than what is implemented. Much of the information is also not so reliable because of methodological and statistical limitations.

Whilst there is general agreement that poverty alleviation is the overarching final objective there is less agreement about the exact way and sequence in which EIIPs contribute to poverty alleviation. The practice has been that information generated has concentrated on primary initial impacts and only sketchy attempts have been made to translate these into longer-term impacts. This is the case even with respect to fairly recent projects which form the basis of much of the discussion in this chapter.

The overall conclusion is that long-term effects of EIIPs are diverse and complex and do not necessarily have a strong poverty alleviation effect (Kiddeman, ILO, 1998, Hopkins, 1998). Many EIIPs have historically experienced problems relating to sustainability of outputs and may not (yet) be producing tangible benefits and impacts. Furthermore, such long-term effects have generally been expressed in terms of primary benefits, e.g., increased production and services, institutional changes, etc. A case in point is that assets and benefits produced with LB methods may indeed be more easily sustainable than those produced with more traditional methods but the long-term impact on poverty alleviation needs to be more carefully documented (Kiddeman, 1998).

1.6 Summary of key observations and conclusions from the baseline/impact studies

1. There are some methodological weaknesses in the existing baseline and impact studies which are rooted to the poor design of the studies. The indicators and variables used in both the baseline studies and subsequent impact studies have not been well thought out. It also seems that the analysis of poverty impacts as this relates to EIIs has been prompted more by external criticisms of the programme regarding its impact rather through an objectively identified need. It becomes a difficult exercise to assess impacts retrospectively from baseline and impact studies which did not conceptualise poverty dimensions in their designs in the first instance.

2. The existing studies overall fail to demonstrate important linkages with other major development programmes which are capable of sustaining the benefits. The meso level links of the projects, as demonstrated in the studies are weak.

3. Both the baseline and impact studies are deficient in failing to classify the potential beneficiaries of EIIs by poverty status. Measurable
indicators can then be used to assess changes in status of households falling in defined poverty categories over specific time-frames.

4. The sustainability of employment created in intervention areas cannot be demonstrated. Employment created through EII is short-term and the available evidence show that the benefits often fall away upon the termination of projects.

5. The increases in the number of micro-enterprises and other non-farm employment and possible changes in the socio-economic status of members of households in intervention areas may not necessarily be the result of the project. Other key factors, for example the existence of some development interventions need to captured in the analysis. The inputs of other stakeholders who may be central for example in employment generation and sustaining the establishment of enterprises in the area could be critical.

6. There is an acknowledgement that the participation and commitment of various other stakeholders and or actors (grassroots and external) can bring in the necessary human, technical, financial and material resources for EIIPs. However, the current studies have not factored this very well in the impact assessment. There is thus a danger of understating or over-stating the link between EII and poverty reduction, a major problem in the analysis.

7. “True impact” is long term and must necessarily look at beyond the project phase (the after effects which may need to be examined in a somewhat different manner than what most of the impact assessment studies on the EII project have done to date). There seems to be no evidence of impact assessments do “long after” project phase, besides those studies carried out during the project phases. There is a possibility that some of the impacts may have actually been understated or overstated because of the timing of the impact studies.

This chapter has noted the various gaps in the existing baseline and impact studies which contribute to their limited use in fulfilling the purpose and objectives of the present study. Chapter 2 which follows discusses the methodologies applied and proposed in some detail.
CHAPTER 2

2.1 Analysis of existing methodologies and indicators used for baseline/impact assessments

The reasoning behind RAPI is that the methodologies that have been applied in both the baseline and impact studies within the EIIP intervention areas have had shortcomings in terms of their relevance to the assessment of change over time. Overall the analysis of the studies carried out to date leads to the conclusion that whilst in some cases, there are possibilities to link EIIs to poverty, in the majority of cases any such links can only be speculative (see tables A1 - A2, in the appendix). The appropriateness and robustness of the methodologies used to date shows a number of weaknesses which are highlighted in many parts of both chapters of this report.

At this stage it is appropriate to analyse the RAPI methodology which has attracted a great deal of interest in EIIP Africa Programme and internationally.

Though it may be useful in generating some valuable information which could be used as a basis for poverty and rural development studies, overall the RAPI methodology and other methods used by the EIIP in the past have been inadequate in linking employment intensive investment to poverty impact. The following some observations to note:

- The RAPI methodology defines poverty in terms of deprivation of basic capabilities such as basic needs, assets, means of livelihood and social services and subjective perception by the household.
- This is an attempt to move away from measuring and solving poverty using the income approach.
- The core essence of RAPI as this concerns capability deprivation is commendable.
- The use of control groups, that is, finding communities with similar characteristics in a different area and then compare and contrast with the area of EIIP project work area.

A problem area with the RAPI method relates to finding a control area with the same characteristics and not affected by the EIIP work. Because of the nature of development in the road sector, the effects may spill over into control areas, a real possibility within the road/transport sector. The possibilities of spill-over benefits may actually distort the results of the RAPI with control areas being external silent beneficiaries of road development. This is a disadvantage to the methodology but a strength to EIIP and public works in the road sector. A critical point to note is that there are actually possibilities of wider impacts of EIIP which are beyond what can be measured by the methodologies which have been applied to date, including RAPI.
In the RAPI, there is a mismatch between the indicators/variables being used to measure poverty and the impact of the intervention through EII. The RAPI questionnaire is a standard rural development questionnaire which helps assess rural development and welfare for households and communities in general. The mismatch comes about in that introduction of an EII in an area will not necessarily affect the dimensions being measured by the RAPI because other factors come into play.

The dimensions being measured or used as indicators in RAPI can change substantially due to other factors which are not the EII interventions. The dimensions are general rural development issues affected by other programmes and initiatives that are not EII.

RAPI has one major assumption that welfare will improve more or faster where there is intervention than in the control area such that all the other rural development projects impact are reflected in the magnitude of welfare improvement in the control area and the difference between welfare in the intervention area and control area would then capture the impact of the EII intervention.

The RAPI assumption regarding the relationship between the control area and intervention area has a problem in reality. If for some reason, welfare (based on the various characteristics and variables used) happens to improve faster in a control area, the conclusion is that the EII has been ineffective and yet in reality you are not in control of development in the control area. It could be that some development not known to EII happened in the control area which did not happen in the intervention area. Another point is that at the same time of EII intervention, major interventions may also accompany EII intervention in a particular area; a control area may at the same time have little intervention and during the period. A development like this, which is not far-fetched can actually cause distortion in measurement. It must be noted that development work does not occur at the same pace in both the control area and the intervention area.

As demonstrated in the RAPI “Output Tables” and the variables designed to capture poverty associated information provided from tables 1 – 9, pp 36 – 39, these cannot be directly linked to the poverty impact of EII.

RAPI method is a useful but time-consuming basis for assessing poverty which cannot be linked to EII. There is no rapidity in RAPI method.
Table 2.1: The thresholds for indicators used in the RAPI methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold for Poverty</th>
<th>Comment with respect to usefulness to poverty link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1: Thresholds for Food Poverty</td>
<td>The “thresholds” for each of the measures/indicators of poverty shown from table 1 - 9, pp 34 - 39(as discussed) are not quite relevant within the context of EIIPs because information generation and processing is time-consuming yet very difficult if not impossible to link with EII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2: Thresholds for Poverty in Accessibility to Water Supply</td>
<td>A more cost-effective and rapid assessment method which is more relevant within the framework of the limited objectives of the EI context and ILO is proposed in this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3: Thresholds for Poverty Relating to Shelter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4: Thresholds for Poverty in Energy Supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5: Thresholds Relating to Non-food Essentials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6: Thresholds Relating to Health Status (illness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7: Thresholds Relating to Assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8: Thresholds Relating to Means of Livelihood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9: Thresholds Relating to Social Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 The alternative methodology proposed

The essence of a true rapid assessment is to get indicators which are as directly related to the project as possible, not broad rural development indicators like those used in the RAPI.

To be appropriate, RAPI must be a methodology which is situation specific, refer to a particular road construction or public works or EI project.
Example 1: water supply project
If the EIIP ASIST gets into an area community requiring a dam designed to ease water supply constraints, for example, what is needed is to carry out a rapid assessment investigating what the community in the intervention area does not have which it would benefit with a dam. For example, you can then proceed to measure the following:

(a) distances walked to go to collect water currently
(b) distances for livestock to obtain water
(c) Watering distances for household nutrition gardens
(d) Levels of nutrition of children under 5 years (can be obtained from local clinics, useful baseline information.

The data can be obtained very rapidly and in a cost-effective manner. The merit of doing this is that one is not measuring things or seeking to investigate on variables which have nothing to do with the project intervention. If the project is implemented, for example over 2 to 3 years, project monitoring can trace and check the specific simple indicators in the project area, what is happening to the specified variables and find out what members of communities and households are now able to do which they could not do previously. For example, reduced distances in fetching water, improved access to water by livestock, nutrition gardens with improved access to water and improved nutritional status of children under 5 years

There is reference here to perception of well-being which is a direct result of a specific public works or EIIP project intervention.

Example 2: feeder road construction

Before the project
Record distances walked to get transport to specific service centres (e.g., key areas, clinics, hospitals, schools, access to nearest town centre; frequency to towns before feeder road construction, and after feeder the road; time taken to get to specific major locations, costs of transport for people and goods or agricultural inputs, access to suppliers of major inputs or services

After project
Capture the same variables, what the community or householders in the intervention area say, transport to service centres, perception of community with respect to what they are benefiting from the feeder road. A rapid assessment of the variables based on the indicators used before the intervention will actually make sense.

It is then possible to assess what the project brings to the community.
Example 3: construction of a bridge

Before the project
A rapid assessment can be carried out on the following indicators and variables:

(a) Time taken by members of the community to reach major service centres (clinics, hospitals, service centres including towns).
(b) Access to suppliers of inputs or other essential support services.
(c) Cost of travelling to specific locations or centres.
(d) Number of vehicles by type (light and heavy vehicles, incoming and outgoing traffic).
(e) How much time children take to reach schools, daily trips to and from schools.

After the project
Using the same indicators, make both qualitative and quantitative rapid assessment of changes on the specific variables over 2 to 3 years or any specific suitable timeframe. An objective judgement on the medium term outcomes can be drawn, linking EI to such outcomes, but not poverty per se.

2.2.1 Concluding remarks on the RAPI methodology and the proposed approach
RAPI is a too broad based and costly methodology for widespread application on the EI projects; it has a perception of a whole livelihood circle, which is not relevant to EI and has no reference to a specific intervention.

The major point is that EIIPs are specific interventions, where promoters must go out and carry out small rapid assessments with simple and direct indicators of what EI projects can provide but not necessarily examining the broad rural development picture as advocated in the RAPI. The RAPI methodology is too complicated to link to EI to poverty.

The prototype household questionnaire (annex V, pp 125 - 148) attached to the RAPI methodology is a typical rural development questionnaire which has little or no direct relevance to EI. Whilst the questionnaire captures useful rural development indicators, which may be relevant for rural development planning, its usefulness in terms of linking EI to poverty assessment is questionable.

RAPI assesses the wrong variables in the EIIPs. To be emphatic, what is needed are small concise and direct rapid assessments.

Over time small rapid questionnaires can be developed and be refined over time for EIIPs such as road construction or other infrastructure projects. Over
time the research tools can be sharpened for widespread application, but with some flexibility which depends on development context.

What emerges from the available evidence is that the EIIP/ASIST Programme baseline and impact studies though useful to date, need to be more focused on performance indicators for every defined outcome. The alternative methodology of formulating performance indicators, together with what needs to be avoided, is explained in this chapter.

For any EII project there is need to identify medium term outcomes as opposed to the RAPI method which uses the highest level long term impact in an attempt to link EII to poverty dimensions. The other methodologies that have been used in the past have in general (the baseline and impact studies) not been focused enough which explains why it has been very difficult in EIIPs to assess impact to date, not only with respect to poverty dimensions but on a whole range of other variables.

The EII projects should be measured for their medium term impact, assessing what is measurable over a specific period of project intervention, for example, two to five years down project implementation. Based on the analysis in this study, attempts to link EII and poverty reduction should be discouraged. There are much simpler ways the efficacy of EIIs can be demonstrated and justified for further investment in the EIIP.

### 2.3 A further elaboration on the methodological framework For employment intensive poverty impact assessment and justification for the proposed methodology

For the purpose of the present study impact can be defined in relation to the objectives of the individual programmes or projects. In reality however impact has included short-term, immediate, effects together with indirect and long-term effects, whether anticipated or unanticipated, among a wide range of variables and factors too numerous to mention.

Two basic objectives can be distinguished; short-term poverty alleviation through employment creation and long-term poverty alleviation, largely through the use of assets. Whilst direct and indirect effects can be distinguished for each programme and moreso for an overview of several programmes, the determination of total impact is also important. Total impact in this context comprises direct, multiplier and capital effects together with opportunity costs. This study is a modest attempt whose aim is to contribute to the development of a methodology that measures total impact.

Two broad categories of methods for the assessment of socio-economic impact can be distinguished. Before-after and with-without comparisons have previously been the most common methods whilst modelling has been applied in a few cases. The before-after comparisons method is frequently used in connection with the Logical Framework Analysis, the most preferred
method for the design and evaluation of project interventions world-wide. Many ILO-supported EIIPs impact studies on irrigation are of this type (Keddeman, 1998). A major limitation of this method is that changes occurring over time cannot be attributed to specific causes with a tendency to attribute changes to the interventions being analysed.

A combination of methods have been attempted in the impact studies reviewed, for example, the Kenya Rural Access Roads Impact Evaluation Study and in impact evaluations of the Minor Roads Programme (Kenya) and the Feeder Roads Improvements Programme in Ghana. These studies are known to have frequently encountered practical problems which relate to external, uncontrolled changes and lack of funding for follow-up surveys. In some cases (e.g., the Kenya Minor Road Programme) the poor design of initial baseline studies have made it difficult to follow through impact issues to assess changes over time.

A major problem with respect to impact analysis relate to quality of data and methods employed in data collection. Another problem is that baseline and impact studies have tended to gather large quantities of data a great deal of it not being analysed at all for use by the programme and other stakeholders. In many other cases, for reasons that are not obvious the generation of statistically reliable and significant data has been problematic. Very few impact studies have included econometric methods to determine statistical significance.

Various data collection methods have been used, which range form compiling project records, to stratified sample surveys, aerial surveys, participatory rural appraisal (PRA) methods. Other proxy or composite indicators which may well be useful for impact analysis have not been developed and used, in particular as these relate to poverty issues. In fact issues related to poverty have only been studied indirectly and without the depth required for such studies.

**2.3.1 Development of indicators**

The OECD, the United Nations and the World Bank have agreed to focus on a series of key goals in partnership with development countries. These goals have been endorsed by major international conferences. A system for tracking progress has also been agreed. A core set of indicators are used at global level to monitor performance and adjust development strategies as required. In terms of development policy, the following terminology is applied for indicators:

- **Input** indicators measure the financial, administrative and regulatory resources provided by Government and donors. It is necessary to establish a link between the resources used and the results achieved in order to assess the efficiency of the actions carried out.
- **Output** indicators measure the immediate and concrete consequences of the measures taken and resources used, e.g.: Number of training
centres built, number of persons trained as trainers, number of micro-enterprises established. In the logframe structure the ‘outputs’ are referred to as ‘results’.

- **Outcome** indicators measure the results in terms of target group benefits. E.g., changes in income levels, percentage of women among the participants of LBRM projects, percentage of poor, non-poor in terms of targeted beneficiaries.

- **Impact** indicators measure the long-term consequences of the outcomes. They measure the general objectives in terms of national development and poverty reduction. E.g., poverty levels, employment creation.

Suggestions with respect to methodologies have been made over many years by various consultants and experts hired by the ILO. These suggestions have continued to be deficient in their failure to contribute towards a widely accepted method designed to assess EIIP induced change over time.

Drawing from the lessons and experiences of the ILO ASIST and associated programmes, one ‘expert’ made a suggestion which at one time appeared to have gained considerable acceptance within the ILO (Hopkins, 1998). He made the suggestion: *The key to indicator choice is three-fold: simplicity, measurability and manageability. Indicators should be simple to understand; they should be readily measurable; not too many indicators should be chosen to be collected on a regular basis*. A fairly simple methodology which is easy to apply has been proposed in this study for possible adoption by the EIIP.

### 2.3.2 Defining a methodological framework that might work for the EIIP - ASIST programme

With the advent of globalization, there are growing pressures on governments and organisations around the world to be more responsive to the demands of internal and external stakeholders for among other things, greater development effectiveness and delivery of tangible results. As demands for greater accountability and real results have increased, there is need for enhancing results-based monitoring and evaluation of policies, programmes and projects.

Results-based monitoring and evaluation is a powerful public management tool which can be used to track progress and demonstrate the impact of a project, programme or policy. Results based M & E moves beyond an emphasis on inputs and outputs (as is the case with traditional implementation-focus M & E) to a greater focus on outcomes and impacts.

The essential actions involved in building a Results-Based M & E system are to:

1. Formulate outcomes and goals
2. Select outcome indicators to monitor
3. Gather baseline information on the current condition
4. Set specific targets to reach and dates for reaching them
5. Regularly collect data to assess whether the targets are being met, and
6. Analyze the report and the results.
TEN STEPS TO DESIGNING, BUILDING AND SUSTAINING A RESULTS-BASED MONITORING (RBM) AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

The following RBM methodology, aspects of which are being adopted or considered for adoption by other major international development organisations like the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the European Union and the World Bank is worthwhile to consider for adoption by the EIIP Africa Programme.

Conducting
A readiness
Assessment

Selecting key
Indicators to
Monitor
Outcome

Planning for
Improvement-
Selecting Results
Targets

The Role of
Evaluations

Using
Findings

Step 1 – a readiness assessment is conducted before the actual establishment of a system. The readiness assessment is the foundation of the system, if not well understood, going ahead may be fraught with difficulties and, ultimately failure.

Step 2 – involves choosing outcomes to monitor.

Step 3 - involves setting key performance indicators to monitor progress with respect to inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts.

Step 4 - relates to establishing performance baselines – qualitative or quantitative to be used at the start of the monitoring period.

Step 5 - builds on previous steps and involves selection of results targets.

Step 6 - includes both implementation and results monitoring.

Step 7 - deals with the uses, types, and timing of evaluation.

Step 8 - looks at ways of analysing and reporting data to help decision makers to make improvements to projects, policies and programmes.

Step 9 – using findings to share knowledge and learning within organisations.

Step 10: sustaining results-based M & E systems including demand, clarity of roles and responsibilities, credibility of information, etc.
In the case of the EIIP, a readiness assessment requires an understanding of the participatory and partnership processes needed to develop the RBM system. These are context specific and should be sensitive to the political and socio-economic and cultural environment within which interventions take place. As far as possible the inputs of the beneficiaries of the proposed interventions need to be factored into the process. External professionals and experts should come in to direct and facilitate a process that is largely driven by stakeholders and beneficiaries.

2.3.3 Selecting key performance indicators to monitor outcomes

Indicators should be developed for all levels of the results-based M&E system, which means that indicators are needed to monitor progress with respect to inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and goals. There is need to monitor progress at all levels of the system to provide feedback on areas of success and areas where improvement may be required.

Outcome indicators in the case of the EIIP/ASIST programme would help answer two key questions: “How will we know success or achievement when we see it?” Is the programme moving toward achieving its desired outcomes?” These are questions that are increasingly being asked of development organisations/programmes across the globe. Consequently, setting appropriate indicators to answer these questions is a critical part of the 10-step model.

The development of key indicators to monitor outcomes enables the managers of the EIIP/ASIST to assess the degree to which intended or promised outcomes are being achieved over time. *Indicator development is a core activity in building a results-based M&E system.* It drives all subsequent data collection, analysis and reporting. There are also important political and methodological considerations involved in creating good and effective indicators.

In selecting indicators, the interests of multiple stakeholders should be taken into account. The selection process should be guided by the knowledge that the concerns of interested stakeholders are considered and included. It is not advisable to formulate indicators and conclude the process without the participation of stakeholders. An approach that excludes major players, i.e., ‘network partners’ in the development process is bound to be fraught with problems and difficulties and ultimately will not produce desirable results – hence the case for results-based monitoring and evaluation. This is especially the case for community based initiatives.

The strategy for formulating any workable methodology should not be left to a select group of individuals or experts within the ILO or any external consultant(s). Indicator selection is a complicated process in which the interests of several relevant stakeholders need to be considered and reconciled. At best what can be achieved with respect to the EIIP/ASIST Programme is to draft a methodological framework for poverty and impact
assessment which must necessarily be further tested and refined through a participatory process involving all key stakeholders.

Example:

Building the Results-Based Framework: Developing a Set of Outcome Indicators for the EIIP/ASIST - Africa Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor households have improved/diversified productive enterprises (dpe)</td>
<td>1. Percent of poor rural households with improved/diversified productive enterprises</td>
<td>In 2003, 30 percent rural households have improved/diversified productive enterprises</td>
<td>By 2006, 45 percent of poor rural households have improved/diversified productive enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Percent of poor peri-urban hhlds with improved/diversified productive enterprises</td>
<td>In 2004, 40 percent of peri-urban hhlds have improved/diversified productive enterprises</td>
<td>By 2006, 50 percent of peri-urban hhlds have improved/diversified productive enterprises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance indicators should be as clear, direct and unambiguous as possible. They may be quantitative or qualitative. Quantitative indicators should be reported in terms of a specific number (number, mean, or median) or percentage. Qualitative indicators/targets imply qualitative assessments.....{that is}, compliance with, quality of, extent of and level of.

2.3.4 Setting baselines and gathering data on indicators

A proper baseline must be established in order to establish a benchmark for the assessment of performance or change over time. The baseline is the first measurement of an indicator. Good baseline studies are derived from well defined outcomes and indicators. A big challenge in any development programme, in particular the EIIP, is to have a sound performance baseline, i.e., information, qualitative or quantitative - that provides adequate data at the beginning of, or just prior to, the monitoring period. Obtaining adequate baseline information on each of the performance indicators for each outcome is what every EII project must strive to achieve.
2.3.5 Building baseline information
There are eight important questions that need to be asked in building baseline information for every indicator.

1. What are the sources of data?
2. What are the data collection methods?
3. Who will collect the data?
4. How often will the data be collected?
5. What are the costs and difficulties in collecting the data?
6. Who will analyse the data?
7. Who will report the data?
8. Who will use the data?

2.3.6 Identifying data sources for indicators
A number of issues are considered when identifying data sources. Can the data source be accessed in a practical fashion? Can the data source provide quality data? Can the data source be accessed on a regular and timely basis? Is primary data collection from the information source feasible and cost-effective?

It is important to collect only the data that is intended for use. “As a rule of thumb, only collect baseline information that relates directly to the performance questions and indicators that you have identified...........” (IFAD, 2002, Section 5, p.32). Available evidence shows that in many programmes and countries, the amount of time which has been spent collecting “other information” which is not of any relevance is considerable for both baseline and impact studies. This must be an issue of concern.

Data sources for indicators can be primary or secondary. Primary data are collected directly by the organisation concerned, or may include administrative, budget, or personnel data; surveys, interviews; and direct observation. Secondary data have been collected by other outside organisations, and are gathered for purposes other than those of the organisation concerned. However, questions of validity and reliability can be raised with regard to secondary data. Furthermore, using secondary data means using someone else’s data to report progress and success in moving toward your own desired outcomes.

Over time, internal organisational capacity for data collection and analysis can and should be built, as it is a key component in establishing a sustainable monitoring and evaluation system.
2.3.7 Planning for improvement - selecting results targets
After gathering data on indicators, the next step is to establish results targets - what is achievable in a specific time toward reaching the outcome? Identifying the expected and desired level of project (micro), programme (meso), or policy (macro) results requires the selection of specific performance targets.

Target setting is the final step in building the performance framework. It in turn, is based on outcomes, indicators and baselines. The process of reasoning is a deductive one, and flows back from the desired outcomes.

2.3.8 Definition of targets
A target is “a specified objective that indicates the number, timing and location of that which is to be realised (IFAD, 2002, p. A-11). Essentially targets are the quantifiable levels of the indicators that a any organisation, country or society wants to achieve by a given time. For example, one target might be “all families within an EIIP/ASIST impact area should be able to eat two meals a day, every day, by 2007”.

One method to establish targets is to start with the baseline indicator level, and include the desired level of improvement (considering available resources over a specific time period, for example, 18 – 36 months), to arrive at the performance target. In doing this, the starting point will be known, as well as the available resources to make progress toward the specified target over a particular period of time, for example 5 years.

2.3.9 Factors to consider when selecting performance indicator targets
A number of important factors need to be considered when selecting performance indicator targets. One factor is to consider previous performance in projecting new performance targets. One might observe how an organisation has performed over previous periods before projecting future performance targets.

“The baseline is the situation before a program or activity begins; it is the starting point for results monitoring. The target is what the situation is expected to be at the end of a program or activity....A thorough analysis of the key factors influencing a development problem complements the development of baseline data and target setting.” (UNDP, 2002, pp. 66- 67

Most targets are set annually, but some could be set quarterly. Others could be set for longer periods. However, setting targets more than three to four years forward is not advisable. “Between the baseline and the ....{outcome}there may be several milestones {interim targets} that correspond to expected performance at periodic intervals” (UNDP, 2002, p.66).
Flexibility is important in setting targets because internal or external resources may be cut or else diminished during budgetary cycles. If the indicator is new, care needs to be exercised in setting firm targets. It is suggested to use a range instead. For example, in 2005, one might set a poverty target that states “by 2007, 30 to 40 percent of all rural households will be engaged in new viable non-farm micro-enterprises”.

2.3.10 The overall performance-based framework
The completed matrix of outcomes, indicators, baselines, and targets becomes the performance framework. It defines outcomes and plans for the design of a results-based M & E system that will, in turn, start to provide information on whether interim targets are being achieved on the way to longer-term outcome.

Performance targeting is critical to the process of reaching outcomes. The formula for arriving at the target performance is a simple one involving baseline indicator levels and desired levels of improvement over a specified period of time. As already stated earlier, a participatory, collaborative process with relevant stakeholders and partners is central. The extent to which such an process has occurred within the ILO/EIIP ASIST programme is debatable.

2.4 A word of caution for the EIIP/ASIST
A word of caution regarding EII and public works relates to an unintended negative impact, a real possibility in the present era. Studies have shown that EII public works in Southern Africa, for instance have had a high HIV prevalence. EII projects need to mainstream HIV/AIDS education. There is be need for the EII to capture and measure the magnitude of this problem and find ways of handling it in EII ASIST Africa Programme. If this is not done, it may be that after many years of interventions within specific geographical regions or areas, the anticipated benefits may be outweighed by the costs to the beneficiary communities brought about by the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

2.5 Conclusion
The analysis of existing methodologies employed in the EIIP studies highlight one major weakness. The weakness relates to the failure to provide a logical link between performance indicators determined in the baseline studies and those determined in the impact studies. The generally poor quality of baseline and impact studies which is linked to deficiencies in the design of the studies is noted. This study offers a simplified and effective methodology of carrying out baseline and impact assessment studies based on the results-based monitoring (RBM) approach.
## APPENDIX A1

### Table A1: Summary Table of Selected Countries with Some Basic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Nature/ type of intervention or Project</th>
<th>Period of Intervention</th>
<th>Key development partners involved</th>
<th>Level of impact:</th>
<th>micro</th>
<th>meso</th>
<th>macro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Road Maintenance</td>
<td>+20 yrs</td>
<td>Republic of Botswana, NPRA, ILO/ASIST</td>
<td>Micro high, meso low, macro low</td>
<td>Micro high, meso low, macro low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>At least 23 districts of Kenya</td>
<td>Minor Roads +15 years</td>
<td>Government of Kenya, CIDA, ILO, SIDA</td>
<td>Micro high, meso low, macro low</td>
<td>Micro high, meso low, macro low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Hanna Nassif Community Infrastructure Upgrading +10 yrs</td>
<td>UCLAS, Government of Tanzania, ILO, Dar es Salaam City Council, UNCHS</td>
<td>Micro high, meso medium, macro low</td>
<td>Micro high, meso medium, macro low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Mutoko/Mudzi Tsholotsho Lupane Nkayi Feeder roads +10 yrs</td>
<td>Government of Zimbabwe, DANIDA, SIDA, ILO</td>
<td>Micro high, meso low, macro low</td>
<td>Micro high, meso low, macro low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Feeder roads</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>Government of Mozambique, NORAD</td>
<td>Micro high, meso high, macro high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Lead Institutions</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Road construction</td>
<td>+12 years</td>
<td>Republic of Namibia ILO</td>
<td>Macro - high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Public works/Infrastructure development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of South Africa DFID ILO</td>
<td>Micro - limited Meso - high Macro - high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Road construction</td>
<td>+10 years</td>
<td>ILO UNDP</td>
<td>Micro - medium Meso - medium Macro - low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The linkages between the EIIP/ASIST programme with the other key sectors is variable in countries and in many cases not acknowledged well in the baseline and impact assessment studies carried out to date. Yet it is clear that the EIIP/ASIST programme cannot make a great deal of mileage in reducing poverty (as an isolated programme) without forging strong linkages with these sectors and others depending on country specific circumstances. The Mozambican and South African examples, among others demonstrate the importance of employment intensive investments and the LBM being mainstreamed within national programmes with enabling policy support instruments.
### Table A2: Impact Assessment in EIIP/ASIST: Selected Case References Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>Type of works (1)/ Examined sectors (2)</th>
<th>Title of study</th>
<th>Author/ Date of publication ILO and reference</th>
<th>Impact rating of evidence vis a vis poverty and employment - the gaps identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Public works and road development</td>
<td>Socio-economic Impact Study Labour-based Road Maintenance Demonstration Project</td>
<td>Republic of Botswana and Public Roads Administration Directorate of Public Roads, Report No. IC 007: October 2002; Ref. BWA 110332</td>
<td>Useful but long term socio-economic impacts not demonstrated with the data analysed. Methodology applied in study not focused enough to link adequately EII to poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Public works and road development</td>
<td>Study of the social and economic impact of feeder roads improvement – Technical Proposal</td>
<td>Department of Planning, University of Science and Technology, Kumasi – Ghana/1987</td>
<td>Insufficient analysis and material available overall, without sufficient depth of analysis of poverty and the relationship between EII and poverty impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-economic impact study – Baseline Report</td>
<td>Ghanexim/1989</td>
<td>The reports are valuable for the purposes for which they were commissioned but their usefulness in terms of providing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-economic impact study – Progress Report</td>
<td>Ghanexim/1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Socio-economic impact study – Immediate Impact Report</td>
<td>Ghanexim/1989</td>
<td>Evidence of relationship between EII and poverty is not demonstrated adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Socio-economic impact study of feeder roads improvements using labour based techniques – Final Report</td>
<td>Ghanexim/1990</td>
<td>Fair but limited focus on poverty issues and long term socio-economic effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Assessment of the socio-economic impacts of the Kenya Rural Access Roads Programme</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport and Communications, Nairobi/1984</td>
<td>Fair but limited focus on poverty issues and long term socio-economic effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Baseline Survey for the Kenya Minor Roads Programme – phase 1: Survey design and methodology</td>
<td>The Management Centre and Economic Consultants, Nairobi, 1988</td>
<td>Fair but not sufficient basis for carrying out impact studies on poverty and long-term socio-economic impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Baseline survey – Phase II: Survey results, Volume 1 and II</td>
<td>The Management Centre, 1988</td>
<td>Fair but no adequate analysis of long term socio-economic impacts and links between EII and poverty unclear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Socio-Economic Impact Evaluation of Kenya Minor Roads Programme CIDA funded districts</td>
<td>The Management Centre, 1991</td>
<td>Fair but not linked well to previous baseline studies because of deficient baseline methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Socio-Economic Impact Evaluation of Kenya Minor Roads Programme SIDA funded districts</td>
<td>The Management Centre, 1989, 1990/91</td>
<td>Fair but not linked well to previous baseline studies because of deficient baseline methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Impact Study of the Minor</td>
<td>COWI consult/DANIDA,</td>
<td>Comprehensive but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Study Title</th>
<th>Author/Agency</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Forestry development</td>
<td>A Socio-Economic Study on Forestry Management</td>
<td>ILO/1996</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Public works and road development</td>
<td>Lessons learned from Feeder Road Programme</td>
<td>UNDP in association with SIDA, ILO and ANE</td>
<td></td>
<td>A good account of the impacts of Feeder Roads Programmes and its macro links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Public works and road development</td>
<td>A Baseline Socio-Economic Survey, Onaanda Community-Based Road construction Project Western Owambo Region</td>
<td>Andrew Botelle, Namibian Institute for Social and Economic Research (NISER), 1991, 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>No systematic data collection to enable impact studies to link EII to poverty – information and analysis gap exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also a failure to link initial baseline studies to subsequent impact assessment due to methodological deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Main sectors</td>
<td>Key studies</td>
<td>Authors/Consultants</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline Study and Mid-term Impact Assessment, Hanna Nassif Community Based Infrastructure Upgrading Phase II</td>
<td>University College of Lands and Architectural Studies (UCLAS), ILO, 1999</td>
<td>Comprehensive but analysis of poverty and socio-economic impacts in marginalized groups not demonstrated well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Evaluation Hanna Nassif Community based Settlement Upgrading Phase II Kinondoni District, Dar-es Salaam</td>
<td>IT Transport/UCLAS/ILO, 2001</td>
<td>Comprehensive but analysis of poverty and socio-economic impacts in marginalized groups not demonstrated well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Public works and road development</td>
<td>Output to Purpose Review, Gundo Lashu</td>
<td>Gary Taylor, Angela Bester and Peter Delius, 2003</td>
<td>Comprehensive but links between EIIP and poverty not clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Economy-wide Impacts of the Labour Intensification of Infrastructure in South Africa</td>
<td>Anna McCord and Dirk Ernst van Seventer, 2004</td>
<td>Very well argued case which shows that link between EIIP and poverty is weak unless well targeted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Expanded Public Works Programme and Chronic Poverty in South Africa: Inadequate Response or Unique Opportunity</td>
<td>John Howe, Maikel Lieuw-Kie-Song, Dr Sean Phillips and Gary Taylor, 2005</td>
<td>Good critique of McCord, putting EIIP in context being one among many strategies for employment creation and poverty reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Public works and road development</td>
<td>An impact study of the rehabilitated Moyamba-Shengwe Road</td>
<td>T.R. Islam, ILO consultant/1984</td>
<td>Fair analysis but links between EIIP and poverty not demonstrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Study Name</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Public works and road development</td>
<td>Baseline Study (Mutoko/Mudzi)</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport and National Supplies/COWI consult, 1992</td>
<td>Analysis of poverty and socio-economic impacts in marginalized groups not demonstrated well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline Study (Tsholotsho)</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport and National Supplies/COWI consult, 1992</td>
<td>Analysis of poverty and socio-economic impacts in marginalized groups not demonstrated well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-Economic Baseline Study (Lupane and Nkayi)</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, GoZ, NCG, 1999 ZWC – 041636</td>
<td>Analysis of poverty and socio-economic impacts in marginalized groups not demonstrated well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline/Impact Assessment Study</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport and National Supplies/COWI consult, 1992</td>
<td>Links between EII, poverty and employment not demonstrated well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-Economic Impact Study</td>
<td>SIDA/Dept of State Roads of GoZ, Jimat, 1998</td>
<td>Focus on immediate links between EII/ASIST and employment and poverty but not so much long-term impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators of Socio-Economic Impact – Lessons Learnt (Undated Draft)</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport/DANIDA, 1992</td>
<td>Useful summary of impact but not emphatic on long-term socio-economic impacts – poverty and employment (limited use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi/Rwanda</td>
<td>Rural infrastructure</td>
<td>Les paysans et l'investissement-travail au Burundi et au Rwanda</td>
<td>J. Gaude., A. Guichaoua, B. Martins, S. Miller International Labour</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INTERNATIONAL</strong></th>
<th><strong>Public works and road development</strong></th>
<th><strong>Analysis of Impact of Infrastructure Development Programmes on Employment Creation</strong></th>
<th>Draft, Herlianto &amp; Team/ILO, March, 1996</th>
<th>Limited links between EII poverty and employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public works and road development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Labour-Intensive Investment in Infrastructure: An entry point to employment generation and poverty alleviation</strong></td>
<td>J. Majeres, ILO Geneva, Oslo Conference, 10 October, 1996</td>
<td>Limited links cited with respect to relationship between EII poverty and employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public works and road development</strong></td>
<td><strong>An Independent Thematic Evaluation: ILO’s employment Intensive Programme</strong></td>
<td>M. Hopkins, ILO 1998</td>
<td>Limited links between EII poverty and employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public works and road development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Of Nets and Assets: Effects and impacts of employment-intensive programmes - a Review of ILO experience</strong></td>
<td>W. Keddeman, ILO, 1998</td>
<td>Excellent analysis showing that emphasis of EIIP is on immediate impacts which are strong and less so on long term socio-economic impacts which have been difficult to prove because of limited data and external constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public works and road development</strong></td>
<td><strong>More jobs for the Poorest: A Question of Choice</strong></td>
<td>Erik Lyby, ILO, 1997</td>
<td>Limited links between EII poverty and employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public works and road development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementation of Employment Programmes: Key Issues and Options</strong></td>
<td>IFPRI, 1995</td>
<td>Limited links between EII poverty and employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water supply</strong></td>
<td><strong>Water as a source of</strong></td>
<td>Marc van Imschoot,</td>
<td>Links between EII, poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Public works | Employment creation and poverty alleviation through labour-intensive public works in least developed countries | J. Gaude and H. Watzlawick, *ILR*, Vol. 131, no. 1, 1992 | Limited links between EII poverty and employment |
| Public works and road development | Impact Study | J. Gaude, A. Guichaoua, B. Martens, S. Miller, *ILR* 126 (4) 1987 | Limited links highlighted between EII and poverty |
| Public works and road development | Impact Study | John Howe, IHE, International Institute for Infrastructural Hydraulic and Environmental Engineering, The Netherlands, 1997/98 | Links between EIIP and poverty not strong |
| Public works and road development | Impact Study: Poverty and gender | Rachel Masika and Sally Baden; Bridge, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex, 1997 | A well argued case on links between poverty and gender vis a vis EIIP |
| Multiple | Impact analysis | Tenth African Regional Meeting Addis Ababa, 2003, ILO, Geneva | Fair case references for Africa on links between EIIP and poverty and employment creation |
ANNEX A

Terms of Reference

A Study to Assess the Evidence Base and Methodologies for Poverty Reduction Impact Assessment in EIIP/ASIST-Africa Programme

1. Background

The global Employment Intensive-Investment Programme (EIIP) of the ILO promotes and supports the generation of productive and decent employment through local resource-based investment policies and programmes in infrastructure to contribute to poverty reduction, economic development and social progress. ASIST Africa (Advisory Support, Information Services and Training for labour-based technology) has held the role of the delivery mechanism for EIIP in Eastern and Southern Africa. The programme has been considered fairly successful and is believed to have had significant impact, particularly when it comes to the delivery of infrastructure using the labour-based technology (LBT). Nevertheless, the approach has not generally been up-scaled and mainstreamed in the development process as a whole, as a core strategy for employment creation and poverty reduction.

The current policy environment in some African countries and the adoption of development frameworks like the poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) provide a good opportunity to promote and institutionalise the use of EIIPs for poverty reduction. Some countries like Namibia and Kenya have specifically mentioned in their PRSPs their commitment to foster the use of LBT for employment creation, particularly in the rural roads sub-sector. These countries and others need to be supported in strategic areas enabling them to mobilise enough resources for EIIPs. Among them are the tools for poverty impact monitoring and assessments which are also necessary for advocacy. Although some monitoring and assessment tools (such as RAPI, see section 2.1 below) have been developed over the years, there is a need to improve on these to consolidate the evidence base on EIIPs and to demonstrate the actual impact on poverty, being the ultimate goal in order to increase the uptake.

1.1 Purpose of baseline and impact studies

The baseline and impact studies together provide a systematic way of assessing viability and effects of development interventions over time. Specifically:

- **Baseline studies** provide a point of reference by availing information on the situation before interventions are undertaken. This information is to be used for planning, and for measuring the impacts of interventions after a certain period of time based on established variables/indicators and
thresholds. The information is also helpful to explain or predict later how the situation would be without interventions.

- **Impact studies** provide a point of comparison to the baseline situation in understanding the positive and negative impacts created as a result of the interventions implemented. These include the effects to the target groups, individuals, institutions and other dimensions (e.g. policy, environment, etc.). Assessment also takes into account investments made to arrive at the outcomes - expected or unexpected during the planning of interventions.

### 1.2 The purpose of EIIPs impact assessment for ASIST

- To demonstrate effect on improved livelihoods of the target groups through the employment intensive investments (EII) programme implementation and other complementary and mutually reinforcing interventions.
- To support planning and designing of multi-sectoral interventions.
- To demonstrate EII’s contribution to poverty reduction strategies and development agendas of partner countries and effects on the growth (or decline) of the national economies.
- To provide justification for advocating increased investments in EII programmes as a way out of poverty.
- To demonstrate effects of any type of major intervention (i.e. even if not directly impacting on poverty).
- To demonstrate effectiveness and viability of the EIIP and ASIST Africa.

### 2. Available information in ILO/ASIST on baseline and impact studies

The ASIST Information Service has a good stock of documentation on baseline and impact studies conducted in various countries, but mainly on rural roads and access. The recent search results in ILO/ASIST database brought up 47 and 41 documentations on baseline studies and impact assessments respectively. However, their quality and relevance to poverty impact has to be further assessed.

#### 2.1 Rapid Assessment of Poverty Impacts (RAPI)

The methodology that has been systematically developed and documented by EMP/INVEST is the “Rapid Assessment of Poverty Impacts (RAPI)”. “The objectives of RAPI are to establish baseline data for monitoring the impacts of employment - intensive road works on poverty over time, and draw lessons for adjusting and refining the method. A broader objective is to provide for inputs for designing development policies and strategies for reducing rural
poverty and improving the well-being of the poor”. RAPI is based on “capability approach” to poverty assessment which focuses on deprivation of basic capabilities. The underlying principle of RAPI method is that solution to the problem of poverty is not just to raise the incomes of the rural poor, but to address the difficulties faced in meeting the challenge of persistent “deficiency” of basic needs, assets, means of livelihood and social services. The analysis is based primarily on five dimensions of poverty: - basic needs status, household asset holding status, livelihood status, the level of (government) service status, and subjective perception of material well-being. The RAPI tool was field tested for baseline study in Tigray Rural Road Programme area (plus a separate control area) in Ethiopia for the first time in 2004. One of the limitations of RAPI methodology as stated in the study report is that poverty assessment is viewed in the short-term. Several recommendations are given in the study report and follow-up commentaries to improve the methodology in future applications. The method will be applied again for impact assessment in the same areas in 2006 taking into account the lessons and recommendations of the baseline study. Also, a paper on “RAPI methodology: lessons from the trial field application in Ethiopia” will be presented and discussed in the 11th REGSEM, October 2005. This will take into account the findings and key recommendations of the trial application.

3. Objectives of the Study

As indicated above, there are a range of studies available. It is also believed that most of the recent major projects would have a monitoring and evaluation system, though the issue of appropriateness in not certain. Also, the quality and type of data available has not been assessed in detail with regard to the link between the interventions and the actual impact on poverty which could be strong or weak. Moreover, this information should be readily available in a comprehensive manner, but there seems to be no systematic way for the programme to collect, synthesise and utilise this information. Hence the following objectives will form the basis of this study:

3.1 To consolidate and make available the already existing baseline and impact information, including verifying the quality and appropriateness of this information to strengthen the evidence base of EII on poverty reduction.

3.2 To develop (or adapt) an evaluation and impact assessment methodology that can systematically be used in the programme to monitor the impact of EII interventions on poverty levels. This will include recommendation on cost effective ways of capturing this type of information.

3.3 To establish proxy indicators and the link between employment, income and poverty reduction as well as the opportunity costs for people working on labour-based projects or of investments going to the infrastructure sector.

3.4 To develop a convincing argument to EII practicing countries and partners on the need for socio-economic baseline and impact studies to demonstrate impact of EII on poverty reduction for all strategic (ongoing and future) programmes, in particular where ASIST is directly involved. This will also serve as an advocacy tool for resource mobilisation in support of EII initiatives in partner countries.

4. Methodology and Outputs

The whole study intended to address the above objectives is planned to be conducted in two phases. The first phase will entail two stages of deskwork study and the second phase will entail a fieldwork study, data analysis and development of framework for resource allocation for EII initiatives. The current consultancy covers only the first phase of (deskwork) study and report writing as detailed in section 4.1 below. In order to ascertain quality the second phase of the study will be designed based on the output of the first phase. The consultant will be required to present the information obtained from the deskwork study and the recommendations thereof in a well structured manner that will allow a clear comparison of facts and figures in relation to EII and poverty impact.

4.1 Phase I - Deskwork Study

Stage 1 - Analysis and synthesis of available information and evidence base

A study and analysis of all relevant baseline and impact study reports (~ 90) which are available in ASIST Information Service and identification of those ones which show a direct linkage between the EII and poverty reduction. This will include a thorough assessment of the quality of information that has been captured in those cases with credible linkage with poverty reduction, a synthesis of evidence base and the analysis of gaps thereof.

Output:
A report with two distinct parts as follows;
- A concise summary of baseline/impact studies which provide a direct link between EII and poverty (reduction or otherwise), explaining source of the study, location, funding and the nature of EII intervention. This part should also state clearly the strength of the link(s) whether at micro, meso or macro level(s), and the important gaps identified.
- A summary of concrete evidence base on employment created and other short/medium/long-term socio-economic benefits, etc.
Time input of 15 days has been allocated for this stage. **NB:** - continuation with the second stage of the assignment by the same consultant will be based on the quality of output from the previous one.

**Stage 2 - Analysis of/ and proposition of methodologies**

a) Following the output from stage 1 above, examine the methodologies used for baseline/impact assessments where there is credible linkage between EII and poverty reduction, i.e. the method, indicators, standard of application and suitability. This will also include the review of RAPI methodology which has been used for baseline study in Ethiopia.

b) Taking into account the above information on methodologies, and by combining it with other relevant information from other important sources beyond what has been provided by ASIST, propose a (cost-effective) methodology, including key indicators that will provide the most suitable framework for baseline and impact studies to address the linkage between EII and poverty reduction.

**Outputs:**
A concise report with two distinct parts as follows;
- Methodologies and indicators identified according to section a) above (i.e. in terms of the existing information), suitability, robustness and gaps.
- Proposed methodology and indicators to be used for EII poverty impact assessments. This will include recommendation on approaches, key information requirements and other relevant issues to carry out a credible study in the field. It will also include recommendations on improving the effectiveness of RAPI methodology, e.g. by incorporating features from other successful methodologies.

Time input of 10 days has been allocated for this stage.

**4.2 Phase 2 - Fieldwork Study and Data analysis**

This phase will be designed after completion of phase I of the study. One of the main expected outputs will be a framework for allocating national resources to employment intensive infrastructure projects in a manner that will optimise impact on poverty alleviation.

**5. Timing for Phase I**

In view of section 4 above, a total of 25 man-days are required to complete the assignment. The assignment will be carried out between September and mid-October 2005. This will allow for the results to be discussed in the ILO supported Regional Seminar for labour-based practitioners in October 2005.
along with the planned presentation of RAPI methodology and practice. Each report will be submitted in a hard copy (MS Word) and electronic version as follows:

Deadline for the first stage – 20 days after the signing of the contract
Deadline for the second stage – 30 days after the signing of the contract

6. Human Resource Requirement

The study will be undertaken by a local consultant. The preferred professional background is an Economist with advanced degree and proven experience in undertaking poverty impact assessments or similar nature of work as it is required for this study.
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