

SPRING 1995 PORTFOLIO REVIEW
COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

I. General Information

- A. **Name of Grants Program**
Cooperative Development
- B. **Number of Active Grants**
17
- C. **Number of Grantees**
10
- D. **Total Value of Program Portfolio**
\$17,647,110 (LOP for all active grants)
- E. **FY 95 Budget**
\$5,510,000
- F. **Number of FY 95 Grantees (new)**
None
- G. **Number of USDH and contractor staff working on the program.**
1 USDH
 $\frac{1}{2}$ contractor staff

II. Grant Program Objectives and Relationship to Bureau Objectives

- A. **Briefly state the Objectives/Purposes of the Grants Program**

Provide support to U.S. cooperative development organizations (CDO) to enable them to develop and strengthen Co-ops in LDCs and new developing countries.
- B. **Describe how the purposes of the grants program relate to Bureau strategic objectives and program outcomes.**

All grants of the program are directly supporting BHR strategic objective No. 3 to strengthen the capability of PVO and NGO community and international organizations to deliver development and emergency services. The CDOs/PVOs grants are directed to economic growth, especially micro enterprise, shelters,

electrification, telecommunication, agriculture, finance and insurance, democracy development, and the environment. Specific program outcomes are: (1) improved technical capacity, planning and management systems in U.S. CDOs; (2) a strengthened USAID and U.S. CDO partnership and (3) increased financial and human resources mobilized for international development activities.

- C. Are there any current plans to modify the grants program to make it more supportive of the Bureau's strategic objectives? If so, please describe.

No.

III. Program Results

- A. To what extent are grant program goals being met? (Please rate success level as high, moderate or low, and explain rating)

All projects of the CDO program are reporting on a quarterly basis measurable results that relate to the areas of economic development, democracy and environment. These measurable indicators are compared to the planned ones as reported in the annual work plan. As of now they are on track, exceeding their goals on some areas and not quiet reaching them in other areas, success being in the moderate range.

- B. Are there any grant activities you can describe as particular success stories demonstrating the results your program is achieving in relation to Office/Bureau objectives?

The ten cooperative development organizations under the guidance of the office for Private and Voluntary Cooperation were responsible last year for the implementation of ninety-six projects/programs in a total of eighty-four countries. Of the projects/programs completed, many targeted strengthening of existing cooperatives and training of new members while others concentrated on creation of new cooperatives. Co-op activity covered a whole host of objectives including: private economic growth; agriculture; livestock management; manufacturing; marketing; food aid; housing; communications networking; health/nutrition; credit union and bank establishment; and electrical system networking. CDO projects also emphasize

education of cooperative members through newsletter and video production. Beneficiaries of the CDO projects ~~is~~ number in the millions, as many of the projects work with national unions of individual cooperatives.

An example of formation of a new cooperative concerns work in Poland. Working hand in hand with a local foundation and citizens committees, the National Telephone Cooperative Association (NTCA) helped establish the first two privately-owned and operated telephone cooperatives in Poland and, as far as is known, in Eastern Europe. This occurred under a small cooperative agreement in the amount of only \$360,000. Those modern cooperatives are now providing vital telephone services to 8,000 homes and businesses using American-built digital switches.

- C. Which projects, if any have, have failed to meet their purposes/objectives?

One project in the amount of \$184,108 "Legal Support for Group Business Activities" in Russia with National Cooperative Business Association (NCBA) did not achieve their goals and probably never will. NCBA has been instructed to spend no more money on the project.

IV. Program Implementation

- A. What are the major implementation problems? (eg staffing constraints, contracting procedures, Congressional mandates and earmarks).

Some implementers are tardy in their reporting and need constant reminding. They know that USAID is reluctant to stop their letter of credit since this will shut down all their projects under USAID contract and could bankrupt the implementor.

- B. How successful have you been in bringing new PVOs into your program? What percentage of the PVOs with active grants are repeat grantees? How many first time grantees are included in your FY 95 program?

Three new grantees were awarded core support grants in 1995. Each had previous experience with the program either ~~as~~ a subgrantee or through the Initiatives Grants.

100% are repeat grantees.

- C. What portion of your active grants have received PACD extensions of more than one year? Please explain.

None

- D. Please describe the system you utilize to monitor the grants in your program? What percentage of your grants have received a monitoring visit in the last two years (by USDH or contractor staff)?

Annual reports, annual workplans, quaterly reports, mid-term evaluations, final evaluations, and field visits.

90%

V. Evaluations

- A. What is the current evaluation system for the program and how are evaluations utilized?

Larger core projects have an independent outside mid-term and final evaluation. Small initiative projects have a internal (USAID) evaluation, including the project manager, if possible. Evaluation recommendations are implemented for the rest of the project or for following support projects.

- B. How often are grants evaluated? Are there any grants in your portfolio that have not been evaluated in the last three years?

All have been evaluated at least once in the last three years.

- C. What procedures do you use for review and follow up of evaluation recommendations?

Project manager writes the SOW; contractor reviews it; outside team is chosen by USAID project manager. Internal reviews are conducted by the USAID and implementation managers. Evaluation summaries are written and recommendations are incorporated in annual work plans and results reported in the quarterly reports.

VI. Audits

- A. Are there outstanding GAO or IG audit recommendations? If so what are your plans for closing them?
- B. Have appropriate audits been conducted on the programs in this portfolio and are there any outstanding recommendations that require attention?

VII. Financial

- A. When FY 95 obligations are excluded, the program pipeline is 36% - well below the benchmark of 50%.
- B. Unliquidated obligations by program on or before December 1994 total about \$151 thousand. It includes amounts from Mission buy-ins which Missions must deobligate as well as small amounts from several of the core grants.