

## I. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1. PROJECT TITLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION - DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM GRANT (CDF)		APPENDIX ATTACHED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES A, B, C <input type="checkbox"/> NO
3. RECIPIENT (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> COUNTRY _____ <input type="checkbox"/> REGIONAL _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INTERREGIONAL <u>Worldwide</u>		2. PROJECT NO. (M.O. 1095.2) 932-13-950-064
4. LIFE OF PROJECT BEGINS FY <u>75</u> ENDS FY <u>77</u>		5. SUBMISSION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <u>May 7, 1975</u> DATE <input type="checkbox"/> REV. NO. _____ DATE CONTR. / PASA NO. _____

## II. FUNDING (\$000) AND MAN MONTHS (MM) REQUIREMENTS

A FUNDING BY FISCAL YEAR	B. TOTAL \$	C. PERSONNEL		D. PARTICIPANTS		E. COMMOD- ITIES \$	F. OTHER COSTS \$	G. PASA/CONTR.		H. LOCAL EXCHANGE CURRENCY RATE \$ US _____ (U.S. OWNED)		
		(1) \$	(2) MM	(1) \$	(2) MM			(1) \$	(2) MM	(1) U.S. GRANT LOAN	(2) COOP COUNTRY A) JOINT B) BUDGET	
1. PRIOR THRU ACTUAL FY												
2. OPRN FY	352											
3. BUDGET FY	448											
4. BUDGET +1 FY	400											
5. BUDGET +2 FY	-											
6. BUDGET +3 FY	-											
7. ALL SUBJ. FY	-											
8. GRAND TOTAL	1,200											

## 9. OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS

1A. NAME OF DONOR	1B. KIND OF GOODS/SERVICES	1C. AMOUNT
SCF/CDF	CASH	\$238,408

## III. ORIGINATING OFFICE CLEARANCE

1. CHARTER	TITLE	DATE
PHA/PVC/OPNS, <u>E. W. Wendt</u>	Program Development Officer	5/21/75
2. CLEARANCE OFFICER	TITLE	DATE
PHA/PVC/OPNS, <u>Cleo F. Shook</u>	Associate Director	5/21/75

## IV. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

1. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	
PHA/PVC, Judith Gilmore	Date: 5/22/75
PHA/PVC, John A. Ulinski, Jr.	Date: 5/22/75

2. CLEARANCES					
BUR. OFF.	SIGNATURE	DATE	BUR. OFF.	SIGNATURE	DATE
PPC/DPR	A. Handley	5/21	NESA/TECH	D. Steinberg	5/20
LA/MRSD/SCD	M. Zak		EA/TD	E. B. Marks	5/20
AFR/DP	R. G. Huesmann	5/19	PHA/PRS	D. McMakin	5/20
3. APPROVAL AID OR OFFICE DIRECTORS			4. APPROVAL AID (See M.O. 1095.1)		
Harriett S. Crowley			SIGNATURE		
Acting Assistant Administrator, AAPH			ADMINISTRATOR AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT		

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION PROP

OUTLINE

	<u>Page</u>
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK	
INTRODUCTION - BACKGROUND OF SCF/CDF	1
PROGRAM SUMMARY	2
RATIONALE	4
COURSE OF ACTION	6
PROGRAM COMPONENTS	7
THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK	10
EVALUATION PLAN AND SCHEDULE OF ACHIEVEMENT INDICATORS	16
JUSTIFICATION OF FUNDING	17

ATTACHMENTS

- ATTACHMENT A - COUNTRIES WITH CDF PROJECTS OR POSSIBLE PROJECTS
- ATTACHMENT B - ACHIEVEMENT INDICATORS
- ATTACHMENT C - DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM GRANT BUDGET

**PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY  
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

Life of Project: \_\_\_\_\_  
From FY \_\_\_\_\_ to FY \_\_\_\_\_  
Total U.S. Funding \_\_\_\_\_  
Date Prepared: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title & Number: Save the Children Federation/Community Development Foundation (CDF/SCF)

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p><b>Program or Sector Goal:</b> The broader objective to which this project contributes:</p> <p>To significantly improve ECON/SOC well-being (income, health, education, community interaction) of low income rural persons in 12 LDC's.</p>	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>72 management-level nationals and 4,000 community-level leaders trained.</li> <li>59 CDF integrated CD projects improve ECON/SOC well-being at community level.</li> <li>Ten CDF community projects linked to regional/national infrastructure/institutions.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow-up questionnaires to participants.</li> <li>Examination of ECON/SOC indicators.</li> <li>Review output-oriented evaluation documents.</li> </ol>	<p>Assumptions for achieving goal targets:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CDF CBIRD methodology is in fact a cost-effective approach for mobilization of the rural poor.</li> <li>National elites in the 12 LDC's have a genuine commitment to the development of the rural poor.</li> <li>CDF training programs and demonstration projects actually succeed in influencing the approach to the important host country administrators.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Subsector Goal:</b></p> <p>To significantly integrate CDF activities within host-country institutions in 12 LDC's by 1978.</p>	<p>Measures of Subsector Goal Achievement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Host country contributions to CDF projects increased 100%.</li> <li>Seven projects self-sustaining.</li> <li>CDF contribution declines in 10 projects.</li> <li>72 management-level nationals and 4,000 community-level leaders trained and working within community-or national level host institutions.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly examination of "institutionalization" category of project monitoring and evaluation protocol.</li> <li>Review ratio CDF/host country financing each project.</li> <li>Periodic monitoring of phaseout process.</li> <li>Review training program records &amp; follow-up of graduates.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Host country nationals trained in CDF programs become effective SOC/ECON development administrators.</li> <li>Host countries maintain commitment to improving rural life.</li> <li>Other host country nationals working in rural development influenced by CDF trainees.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Project Purpose:</b></p> <p>To increase effectiveness/scope of CDF in implementing Community Based Integrated Rural Development (CBIRD) programs in 12 LDC's by 1978.</p>	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status.</p> <p>See attached sheet.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual review community-level development indicators.</li> <li>Assessment effectiveness all indicators.</li> <li>Review quality of planning, evaluation and research documents.</li> <li>Independent assessment of quality of training programs.</li> <li>Semi-annual examination income statistics and development new CBIRD projects.</li> </ol>	<p>Assumptions for achieving purpose:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Host government decision-makers "convincible."</li> <li>Local communities able/willing operate independently.</li> <li>Economies allow financing increased services.</li> <li>CDF staff willing/able work selves out of job.</li> <li>Graduates motivated use CBIRD in other institutions.</li> <li>Graduates remain in rural development.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Outputs:</b></p> <p>Improved planning/evaluation/research/implementation systems, expansion capability and institutionalization procedures.</p>	<p>See attached sheet.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CDF planning, evaluation and research materials.</li> <li>Curricula for training programs.</li> <li>Lists of training program participants.</li> <li>Follow-up interviews with participants.</li> <li>Independent inspection of CDF offices and project sites.</li> </ol>	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Six organizational subsystems coherently integrated.</li> <li>CDF staff functioning effectively.</li> <li>Capable staff for new positions available.</li> <li>CDF and AID funds available.</li> <li>The "state of the art" allows systematic and effective implementation of CBIRD.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Inputs:</b></p> <p>AID Funds \$ 1.2 million SCF/CDF Funds 14.4 million Host Country Funds 6.2 million</p> <p>SCF/CDF staff members in U.S. &amp; LDC's Motivated host country nationals at governmental and community levels.</p>	<p>Implementation Target (Type and Quantity)</p> <p>See attached sheet "B"</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Budgets and Audits.</li> <li>Monthly and Quarterly Administrative Reports.</li> <li>Annual Planning &amp; Reporting materials.</li> <li>SCF Organizational Personnel and Job Description Files.</li> <li>Vouchers.</li> </ol>	<p>Assumptions for providing inputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inputs directed effectively for improved planning, evaluating, researching, implementing, institutionalizing and expanding.</li> <li>CDF staff and local nationals motivated to improve effectiveness of project.</li> </ol>

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

PROJECT TITLE: PROJECT NO: DATE:  
 Save the Children Federation/Community Development Foundation  
 Development Program Grant (SCF/CDF)

Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status.

1. Qualitative Indicators

- a. CDF measuring rates of qualitative individual progress and community development
- b. Nutrition, literacy, community interaction, etc. - up 10% between baseline year ('76) and end of grant.
- c. Average project components increased by 30%, '75-'78.
- d. Non-AID CDF expenditures for 12 LDC's increased by 50%.

2. a. International Program Activities

Total Project Activities	1975	1976	1977	1978
	44	49	54	59

CBIRD Projects	1975	1976	1977	1978
	22	31	40	49

Other Activities	1975	1976	1977	1978
	22	18	14	10

Total international projects increase by 15, '75-'78  
 CBIRD projects increase by 27, '75-'78  
 Other international activities decrease by 12, '75-'78

b. Individuals Reached Through International Programs

- Total individuals reached through international programs increased from 198M to 324M, '75-'78
- CBIRD project individuals increased from 132M to 294 M, '75-'78
- Individuals otherwise reached declines from 66M to 30M, '75-'78

c. Leaders Trained

- 4,000 community-level leaders trained, 72 national-level leaders CBIRD trained.

Magnitude of Outputs

1. Rural development systems P&E protocol established.
2. Systems P&E officer in hq. and each LDC office.
3. All hq./field management staff trained and using systems planning.
4. Appropriate methodology used effectively in 12 countries.
5. Selected projects evaluated on cost/benefit analysis.
6. CBIRD development research protocol developed/applied.
7. In-depth research protocols developed for each CBIRD component.
8. 12 significant research projects each year.
9. Training materials developed for host nationals.
10. 37 new project areas identified, surveyed and functioning in 12 LDC's.
11. Ratio of community-based to individually-based expenditures increases from 1:1 to 6:1.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

---

PROJECT TITLE:	PROJECT NO:	DATE:
Save the Children Federation/Community Development Foundation		
Development Program Grant (SCF/CDF)		

---

Magnitude of Outputs (continued)

12. CDF models for institutionalization prepared and tested.
13. All CDF management staff trained to promote institutionalization.

### INTRODUCTION - Background of SCF/CDF

The Save the Children Federation (SCF) was organized in 1932; the Community Development Foundation (CDF) was organized in 1957 as a sister agency. SCF/CDF has dedicated its efforts to assisting the poor wherever located. Its programs over the years have reflected the changing philosophy towards the needs of the poor. Originally, SCF concentrated on assistance for the individual child. A modified approach to emphasize the community and self help approach involving adults in a wider development process was adopted after 1957. In 1972 a high impact program for increasing project effectiveness through geographical concentration, consistent methods, increasing accountability and evaluation was inaugurated. Now CDF, in further evolution of its approach, is placing emphasis on expanding the community-based development process through institutionalization and replicability.

CDF has consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council and with UNICEF. It is registered with the Department of State's Advisory Committee on Foreign Aid. Both CDF and SCF have a cooperative relationship with the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service and the International Council of Voluntary Agencies with representation on various committees. A thirty-six member Board of Directors sets policy and oversees the organization's activities. The present staff consists of 90 at headquarters and 138 field personnel.

This DPG is intended to improve SCF/CDF's capabilities to plan, manage and evaluate grass-roots-level integrated rural development (IRD) programs. SCF/CDF is presently implementing such programs in several LDC's with encouraging results, but has requested AID support to enable it to move more completely into IRD with a continued strong community development focus. The DPG would provide intensified and more sophisticated training in the techniques and substantive aspects of IRD for SCF/CDF and host country staff, would enable SCF/CDF to expand its pool of resource persons in the various necessary technical areas of expertise, and would strengthen SCF/CDF staff capabilities in program planning and evaluation. The ultimate objective of the DPG, together with operational grant support of programs in selected LDC's, is to assist SCF/CDF help selected LDC's institutionalize the ability to support and replicate community-focussed IRD programs, through pilot demonstration programs and training of host country personnel in IRD concepts and techniques.

### PROGRAM SUMMARY

The objectives of the Save the Children Federation/Community Development Foundation Development Program Grant (CDF) are (1) to improve CDF's capacity to plan, manage and evaluate a program of community-based integrated rural development in selected LDC's, and (2) to enable CDF to initiate or expand programs in six LDC's. The ultimate goals of the program are (1) to improve the economic and social well-being of low-income persons in rural areas through increased income from agricultural production and off-farm employment, and through improved health services, education, and other programs of priority to assisted communities, and (2) to demonstrate a low-cost approach to achieving these goals, based on maximum community participation and self-help efforts, for institutionalization within and replication by host-country institutions.

CDF is presently active in nine LDC's and four intermediate-income countries, as well as Europe and the U.S. CDF's program in the LDC's at present consists about 50% of older, somewhat piecemeal, often welfare-oriented child sponsorship or other programs, and about 50% newer "multi-purpose high-impact" community development (CD) programs. It is this latter program that PHA/PVC proposes to support and build on, and CDF has stated its intent to transfer resources into this newer program, and to consolidate its older programs during the DPG period.

The requested AID grant will enable CDF to add the following components to its program: a program planning and evaluation specialist; an applied research specialist; increased use of technical consultants for program planning and execution; expanded basic training in rural and community development, and advanced training for key personnel in planning and execution of community-based integrated rural development; and three additional headquarters program officers and seven local management aides.

The basic objectives of this assistance are to help CDF transform its present community development program into a community-based integrated rural development program, and transform its somewhat random, isolated program benefitting only a few thousand people per location and heavily operational in focus, into a program whose principal objective will be not only to benefit its recipients but also to select those situations where it can institutionalize itself within the appropriate host-country government or other institution(s) as a model for replication throughout the country, using local human and financial resources.

At the same time that there is a growing interest in integrated rural development or regional development programs in many LDC's, there is also a growing recognition that to be fully effective there must be "bottom-up" as well as top-down planning and involvement in these programs, to provide proper linkage between the intended beneficiaries--the rural poor--and higher-level regional and national planning and programs. A revival of the community development approach is felt to be important to achieve this linkage, provided it is accompanied by (1) an improved capability to plan programs and take more systematic account of all constraints to development within the macro as well as the micro context, and by (2) the improved technical and management capability needed to implement effectively an integrated program at the local

as well as at higher level. CDF proposes to include these considerations in its future program activities.

The DPG will also enable CDF to expand its program selectively, and although approval of the DPG will imply no AID commitment to fund any CDF country programs except as they may be separately approved, it has been assumed in designing the DPG proposal that OPG or other AID funding would become available for partial support of new or expanded CDF programs in six countries. The countries for which CDF has submitted OPG proposals or which otherwise appear of interest either to CDF or AID are listed on Attachment A to this memorandum. Of these countries, prospects for AID funding already appear highly probable in Cameroon, Upper Volta, Tunisia, and Laos; good possibilities appear to exist in Liberia, Ghana, Vietnam, Honduras and the Dominican Republic; and the other twelve countries listed are at varying stages of development. A projection of AID funding in six countries therefore appears not only realistic, but conservative.

The funds requested from AID total \$1,200,000 over three years (May 1, 1975 - April 30, 1978). It is anticipated that CDF should be able to support from its own resources the ongoing costs of the program in the fourth year. The DPG as a percent of total home office costs is 34% for the three years of AID funding. Projected OPG funding during FY 76-80 is only 9% of projected total CDF field expenditures. Combined DPG and OPG funding for five years is 11% of projected total expenditures. CDF's revenue projections for this period are based on past experience and projected at a lower rate of increase than has occurred during the past few years; and it is encouraging that they are on target with respect to FY 1975 despite the recession.

## RATIONALE

Analysis of the results of development assistance allocated over the past three decades has led to increasing attention being directed to several key facts and issues. Among the most important of these issues are:

(1) That approximately 700 million people in the developing world have an annual per capita income equivalent to \$50 or less and that these income levels have grown little if at all as a result of capital-intensive development efforts;

(2) That the circumstances facing these "absolute poor" are likely to get worse if population continues to expand rapidly while productivity remains stagnant;

(3) That rapid rates of population increase in areas of poverty generally decline only when basic economic and social needs are met;

(4) That most of the 700 million absolute poor live in rural villages and that externally-induced productivity increases and social changes rarely succeed unless the community itself has been involved in the planning and implementation of manageable projects;

(5) That each of the critical issues facing the rural community -- productivity, nutrition, health, shelter, appropriate education, and integration within district, regional and national institutions -- must be confronted as an interactive system and dealt with in an integrated way; and

(6) That rural communities generally possess underutilized land, labor, and even capital which can be mobilized with relatively small amounts of properly-coordinated financial and technical assistance.

CDF believes the evidence supporting these conclusions is increasingly persuasive. Their experience in several hundred rural villages in the LDC's has produced much preliminary evidence that significant improvements in productivity and in social life can occur through the mobilization of community-level resources. CDF's community development approach ensures that the program impacts directly on the lowest-income majority, and that there is maximum local participation in planning and executing the program. This includes maximum participation of women in determining program priorities. In giving emphasis in the LDC's to rural programs, and in activities raising productivity and income, CDF is a vehicle for substantially increasing food production and small-farmer income, and for other labor-intensive activities reducing unemployment and underemployment in the rural sector.

The focus on increasing small farmer production appears particularly interesting in view of recent evidence that small, labor-intensive farms are in fact more productive per acre for many crops than larger, more mechanized farms. Rural health services, including nutrition education and family planning, are also generally an element of the program, as are a variety of non-formal training programs (including use of various audio-visual

techniques) to raise rural productivity and well-being. Finally, CDF as a matter of policy tries to ensure that there is minimum ecological and cultural disruption from its activities, and maximum preservation and reinforcement of positive elements in the local cultural heritage, as well as maximum utilization of local materials, labor, and money.

CDF also expects to expand its single pilot-community approach to include the typical configuration of a district market town with a number of surrounding villages and hamlets. In the past there has generally been a concentration on only one such village. An emphasis on district-level development and integration offers the possibility of reaching a significantly larger number of people in a more cost/beneficial way through allowing coordinated technical assistance and training to be provided an integrated cluster of villages and towns.

It seems clear that in the near term the rural poor will have to deal with the interrelated set of constraints defining their every day circumstances in the areas where they are now living. Urban migration offers no solution to present day problems, and one of the few approaches offering any expectation of improving the lot of the rural poor is an integrated approach that considers the entire system of constraints and develops a coordinated plan of action which deals with each of them at the proper time. Although final conclusions cannot yet be drawn, there is adequate evidence to suggest that a community-based, participatory approach to the problems of the rural poor is an essential variable in the development equation. At a minimum it is critical that this hypothesis be tested in a variety of culture areas and economic conditions to determine more systematically the effect of a focus on the rural community in national development. CDF's programs include a number of activities emphasizing institutionalization and replicability, which offers the probability of project results having an impact beyond their direct benefits.

COURSE OF ACTION

The implementation plan and schedule involves the following principal elements:

(1) That new headquarters personnel will be recruited and given orientation beginning May 1975 and all such staff will be in place by the end of December 1975;

(2) That the regional directors will begin the selection and preliminary survey of new and expanded programs in the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1975, and will participate in the detailed planning designs for new and expanded programs during the first quarter of FY 76. Continuing direction of new and ongoing programs and general supervision with particular emphasis towards institutionalization and replicability will continue throughout the grant period.

(3) That seven local planning and evaluation specialists for ongoing programs will be recruited and given orientation commencing August 1975. All such staff are expected to be in place by November 1, 1975;

(4) That the panel of technical experts will be selected and that the first meeting will take place in July 1975. It is planned that the panel would meet three times per year;

(5) That the selection of consultants will begin in August 1975 based upon recommendations from the panel of experts. Actual assignment of consultants is dependent upon project requirements.

(6) That during the period June 1975 through November 1975 a feasibility study will be conducted to determine various criteria for implementing the advanced training program. The sending of some trainees may get underway before the conclusion of the feasibility study. It is expected there will be through the DPG funding 12 graduates per year for a total of 36. An additional 36 graduates of the advanced training are expected to be funded through the OPG's.

(7) That the organization of the basic training program will begin August 1975 and should be operational by February 1, 1976. At least 22 district-level leaders such as CDF field coordinators, extension agents, and functional specialists will be trained each year. In addition, at least 700 community-level leaders will receive training each year.

(8) That beginning in September 1975 the additional support to provide the data necessary for qualitative improvements in reporting and administration will begin;

(9) That beginning in November 1975 the CDF Audio Visual Center will be provided with increased capability for backup support to the overall training program.

## PROGRAM COMPONENTS

In order to develop the capabilities in terms of planning, evaluation, applied research, staff expertise, institutionalization, program expansion, consolidation, and management necessary for implementing, institutionalizing, and replicating a community-based integrated rural development program (CBIRD), CDF proposes to add the following components in order to increase organizational scope and effectiveness:

### Program Planning and Evaluation Officer:

To prepare a planning and evaluation system to measure project results, including cost/benefit analysis to the extent practicable; to monitor evaluation of ongoing programs; and to train CDF staff in program planning and evaluation techniques.

### Technical Advisory Committee:

To be established for the purpose of planning and utilizing more effectively technical services in the design and implementation of the CDF program.

### Applied Research Specialist:

To identify and carry out research relevant to specific project components in integrated development such as loan policies, small farmer credit constraints, etc. and to serve as staff coordinator of the Technical Advisory Committee.

### Consultant Services:

To provide the services required to assure that project design and implementation will maximize the development potential of each project undertaken and insure the fully professional planning and implementation of such components as productivity, participation of women, health, education, and ecological implications.

### Country Director's Meeting:

To involve CDF country directors in the process of developing new planning, management and evaluation methodologies and to assure staff understanding of, and commitment to, new organizational approaches.

### Training Director:

To coordinate for the design and curriculum of community-level and management-level training programs appropriate for community-based integrated rural development; to identify in-country training sites and resources; to prepare line staff to be able to identify and meet training needs.

Basic Training:

To provide funding for training activities concentrated on field coordinators, field specialists, government allied personnel and community participants in at least twelve LDC's.

Advanced Training:

A preliminary study by the Training Director will determine the scope and nature of an advanced training component in conjunction with the implementation of CDF-assisted integrated rural development programs. The study will explore methods and resources, relative costs, and eligibility considerations for the anticipated initial participants. An average budget figure of \$2,500 per participant is provided for implementation of the advanced training program.

Two Regional Assistant Directors:

To assure effective management of SCF/CDF's ongoing and new programs during the prolonged absence of the Regional Directors in the field expansion and supervision. Regional Directors will be required to spend a significant amount of their time in the field consistent with the policy of CDF to move more forcefully to integrate CDF programs in host country institutions, and to introduce the other new elements described herein.

Local Management Assistants: (Host Country Nationals)

Seven new personnel are required to expand and develop the potential for integrated rural development of existing CDF programs with more emphasis upon institutionalization and replicability.

Program Support Costs

Three Secretaries:

To provide secretarial/clerical assistance for the five new substantive officers: Planning and Evaluation Officer, Research Specialist, and three Regional Assistants.

Computer Assistance:

To provide for a programmer, supplies and computer time as needed to develop programs for refining the evaluation system utilizing the existing computer capability.

Audio Visual Training Support:

With existing staff, or expanded staff, to provide training back up support through provision of audio visual materials and support.

Regional Directors' Travel and Per Diem:

To insure CDF's planning and development capability as outlined in the purposes and goals of the proposal by providing travel and per diem. There would be a particular responsibility to insure that community people themselves were included in the initial planning and implementation processes.

Administrative Coordinator:

Responsible for new administration details with respect to implementation of the DPG/OPG Grant regulations and procedures.

Other Project Support Costs:

Additional costs are included for such program support as recruitment, clerical assistance, accounting and personnel department support, cables, supplies and miscellaneous expenses.

For budget summary of components, see Attachment C.

THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

1. The Project Goal

a. Statement of Goal

The goal is to significantly improve the economic and social well-being, including income, health, education and community interaction of low income rural persons in at least 12 LDC's.

b. Measurement of Goal Achievement

(1) 72 management-level nationals and 4,000 community-level leaders trained by CDF contribute to farm and off-farm enterprise development, literacy, health and community organization at local, regional and national levels.

(2) 59 CDF integrated community development projects improve economic and social well-being at community level.

(3) At least 10 CDF community projects significantly linked to regional and national infrastructure and institutions.

c. Means of Verification

(1) Follow-up questionnaires to training program participants to determine activities and effectiveness where available.

(2) Examination of economic and social indicators for regions where CDF is operating.

(3) Examination of output-oriented CDF evaluation documents.

2. Subsector Goal

a. Statement of Subsector Goal

The subsector goal is to significantly integrate CDF activities within host-country institutions in at least 12 LDC's by 1978.

b. Measurement of Subsector Achievement

(1) Total host country cash and in-kind contributions to CDF projects are increased by at least 50%.

(2) At least 7 projects are self-sustaining.

(3) CDF contribution is declining in at least 10 projects.

(4) At least 72 management-level nationals and 4,000 community-level leaders trained by CDF are working within community-or national-level host institutions.

c. Means of Verification

(1) Quarterly examination of "institutionalization" category of project monitoring and evaluation protocol.

(2) Examination of ratio of CDF to host country financing for each project.

(3) Examination of project reports to monitor phasing-out process.

(4) Examination of training program records and follow-up of graduates.

d. Assumptions

(1) Host country nationals trained in CDF programs become effective social and economic development administrators.

(2) Host countries in which CDF is operating maintain commitment to improving rural life.

(3) Other host country nationals working in rural development influenced by CDF trainees.

3. The Project Purpose

a. Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the project is to increase the effectiveness and scope of Community Development Foundation in implementing Community Based Integrated Rural Development (CBIRD) programs in at least 12 less developed countries by 1978.

b. Conditions Expected at End of Project

(1) Qualitative Indicators

a) CDF will be able to measure, and is measuring, rates of qualitative individual progress and community development.

b) Rates of qualitative improvements -- indicators of increased nutrition, literacy, community interaction, etc., -- up at least 10% between baseline year (1976) and end of grant year (1978) in CDF projects.

c) Average number of development components systematically addressed by each CDF project increased by an average of 30% between 1975 and 1980.

d) Total CDF expenditures for LDC's increased by at least 50%, none of which comes from AID.

(2) Quantitative Indicators

a) International Program Activities

	1975	1976	1977	1978
Total Project Activities	44	53	68	74
CBIRD Projects	22	35	54	64
Other Activities	22	18	14	10

b) Individuals Reached Through International Programs

Total Individuals Directly Reached	198,000	264,000	366,000	414,000
Individuals in CBIRD Projects (6,000/Proj. Av.)	132,000	210,000	324,000	384,000
Individuals Otherwise Reached	66,000	54,000	42,000	30,000

c) Leaders Trained

4,000 community-level leaders trained, 72 national-level leaders trained in CBIRD.

c. Means of Verification

CDF will report to AID, and AID will independently assess results by:

(1) Annual examination of community-level development indicators for improvement.

(2) Assessment of increased effectiveness over the range of indicators.

(3) Expert examination of the professional quality of planning, evaluation and research documents, materials and protocols.

(4) Independent assessment of quality of training programs.

(5) Semi-annual examination of statistics for income and for the development of new community-based integrated rural development projects.

d. Assumptions

(1) Host government decision-makers "convincible."

(2) Local communities are willing and able to operate independent of CDF.

(3) Economies in host countries and world allow financing of increased services.

(4) CDF staff willing and able to work selves out of a job.

(5) Training program motivates graduates to use CBIRD approaches in other institutions.

(6) Graduates remain in field of rural development.

#### 4. Project Outputs

##### a. Statement of Project Outputs

The expected project outputs are an improved planning system, evaluation system, research system, implementation systems, expansion capability and institutionalization procedures.

##### b. Output Indicators

###### (1) Planning and Evaluation

- a) Rural development systems planning and evaluation protocol in place.
- b) Systems planning and evaluation officer in headquarters and each LDC office.
- c) All management staff at headquarters and field offices trained in systems planning and using same.
- d) Appropriate community-based, "bottom up" planning methodology used effectively in 12 countries.
- e) Where possible, projects selected and evaluated according to formal cost/benefit analysis.

###### (2) Research

- a) Common research protocol for CBIRD developed and applied to all projects.
- b) In-depth research protocols developed for each CBIRD component and used where necessary.
- c) At least 12 significant research projects carried out each year.

###### (3) Human Resources Development

Training materials and courses developed for community and management level host nationals.

(4) Expansion and Concentration

- a) At least 37 new project areas identified, surveyed and functioning in 12 LDC's.
- b) Ratio of community-based to individually-based expenditures increases from 1:1 to 6:1 in 12 LDC's.

(5) Institutionalization

- a) CDF models for institutionalization prepared and tested.
- b) All CDF management staff trained to promote institutionalization.

c. Means of Verification

- (1) CDF planning, evaluation and research materials.
- (2) Curricula for training programs.
- (3) Lists of training program participants.
- (4) Follow-up interviews with training program participants.
- (5) Independent inspection of CDF offices and project sites.

d. Basic Assumptions

- (1) Six organizational subsystems are integrated so as to produce coherent results.
- (2) CDF staff are capable of functioning effectively in more demanding situation.
- (3) Capable staff for new positions are available.
- (4) CDF and AID funding sources continue to provide anticipated financing throughout period.
- (5) The "state of the art" allows systematic and effective implementation of community-based integrated rural development.

5. Project Inputs

a. Statement of Project Inputs

These consist of:

- |                    |              |
|--------------------|--------------|
| (1) AID Funds      | 1.2 million  |
| SCF/CDF Funds      | 14.4 million |
| Host Country Funds | 6.2 million  |

(2) SCF/CDF staff members in U.S. & LDC's.

(3) Motivated host country nationals at governmental and community levels.

See Appendix for DPG Budget breakdown.

b. Means of Verification

(1) Annual Budgets and Audits.

(2) Monthly and Quarterly Administrative Reports.

(3) Annual Planning and Reporting materials.

(4) SCF Organizational Personnel and Job Description Files.

(5) Vouchers.

c. Basic Assumptions

(1) Capital and Manpower inputs are directed effectively toward producing improved systems for planning, evaluating, researching, implementing, institutionalizing and expanding.

(2) CDF staff and host country nationals are motivated to improve effectiveness of development projects.

### EVALUATION PLAN AND SCHEDULE OF ACHIEVEMENT INDICATORS

As the sections on project goal, purpose, outputs and inputs suggests, evaluation is a principal concern of all elements of the DPG. It is expected that evaluation methodologies will be developed that will include carefully targeted objectives on a semi-annual basis throughout the Grant period. See Appendix for the schedule of achievement indicators to be used in monitoring and evaluating intended results of the DPG. Targeted objectives will include indicators for manpower, income, the development of new training and evaluation materials, and performance criteria. In addition, there will be functional objectives developed for each of the major components of integrated rural development, and these will be applied at the community level in each of the project areas. Finally, project selection will be based on cost/benefit comparisons and these comparisons will be available. There will be the opportunity to compare the resulting targets with actual performance throughout the Grant period. These data will obviously be desirable for assessment of financial, administrative and program effectiveness. CDF will also further its present systems for monthly, quarterly, semi-annual, and annual evaluations, identifying which elements of its total activities may most appropriately be required at particular periods of time.

It is assumed that AID will wish to examine all evaluation materials on a quarterly basis. In addition, CDF anticipates regular reporting to AID on actual as compared to projected program with respect to the implementation schedule, achievement indicators, and budgetary targets specified in this proposal. AID will undoubtedly evaluate progress regularly on the basis of these reports and consultations, and will want to conduct a formal evaluation of its own, presumably on an annual basis.

Thus, a two-fold evaluation system is envisaged. CDF intends to develop its own systems of program and management evaluation as a result of the DPG. In addition to the information generated by existing and proposed CDF evaluation materials, AID will determine other independent approaches to maintaining accountability through the period of the Grant.

As part of the reporting responsibility noted in the Evaluation Plan, CDF will submit a semi-annual report to AID under a five subject heading: Planning and Evaluation, Human Resource Development, Expansion and Consolidation, Institutionalization, and Research. The attached schedules (at appendix ) list the Achievement Indicators under each subject together with the proposed dates by which it is anticipated that certain objectives will have been attained. As the program develops and operational experience is acquired these schedules will be refined and the achievement indicators revised or expanded as the facts warrant and as mutually agreed by AID and CDF.

## JUSTIFICATION OF FUNDING

### Narrative Justification

It is somewhat speculative to project what increased levels of funding CDF can expect to receive over the next three years from foundations, the corporate community, from appeals to the general public as well as from local sources within the less developed countries, since many factors have an influence. CDF projects an overall growth in income for its total program (domestic and overseas) from approximately \$6,700,000 this fiscal year to approximately \$9,250,000 by June 1978. This is a conservative estimate, based upon an average growth rate of 14% over the past 10 years.

CDF anticipates expenditures for its international program exclusive of DPG/OPG funding to increase from \$2,100,000 in 1975 to \$3,600,000 by June 1978. CDF's conservatively-estimated growth projections offers the realistic expectation that DPG-funded activities can be funded by the Agency at the end of the Grant period. In addition, CDF is prepared to allow its administrative/headquarters costs to rise from the present 18.4% to 20.2% and to offset any consequent reduction in funds available for field programs in the LDC's by transferring an appropriate amount from intermediate income countries to LDC programs. In addition, by phasing out of its European activities, increased funds are available for programs in developing countries. Finally, CDF intends to gradually reduce the ratio of domestic (U.S.) program expenditures to international expenditures from 58/42 in FY 1975 to at least 50/50 by FY 1978. This means that the bulk of available new income during the grant period will be directed toward the costs of the LDC programs initially financed through the DPG.

Community High Impact development programs currently active in 1975 will receive gradually diminishing amounts of direct aid, as productivity problems are resolved and host-country funding becomes available. However, new projects will be selected to replace them. Traditional programs will receive lesser financial support as these programs are phased down and local support is increased. It is anticipated that approximately \$1 million by 1978 may be available for programming to newly opened integrated development programs.

CDF is cognizant of the limitations placed upon it by their child sponsorship funding source. The general public which supports Save the Children Federation expects immediate results. The contributing public is not generally motivated to help create new knowledge, to support field training, or to facilitate the spreading of a new idea. Contributions for community development are, however, increasing as more of the general public comprehend the wider effect of this form of personalized foreign aid.

CDF cannot expect to make an immediate quantum jump in its allotment of funding for headquarters support and field program expansions. However, over a three year period CDF envisions a gradual increase in level of funding

PROJECT TITLE:

PROJECT NO:

DATE: May 7, 1975

Save the Children Federation/Community Development Foundation  
Development Program Grant (SCF/CDF)

Page 18 of 18 pages

for improving its headquarters and field office support capabilities as AID funds for these purposes are gradually withdrawn and as more progress is made in public education. Furthermore, it is anticipated that communities in the integrated development program will be able to provide increased contributions through self-generation of local funds and other self-help efforts and that local government material and financial aid will be attracted to the projects.

AFRICA

Upper Volta. CDF has submitted a proposal; AFR/CWR is providing funding for detailed program design.

Cameroon: It is expected that CDF will play a role in final design and implementation of the Training Farm Families project submitted by the RDO and reviewed favorably in principle by AID/W.

Tanzania. CDF is operational in Tanzania, and has submitted a proposal for support of an expanded program. USAID has expressed reservations but is awaiting receipt of a revised proposal. The CDF program may offer an effective model for helping AID achieve its expressed desire to reach the villages and small farmers directly in Tanzania, and to demonstrate to the GOT an effective and non-coercive way to increase small farmer production and rural improvements within its policies of ujamaa and villagization. CDF might also possibly play a role in final design and implementation of the Farmer Training and Production project proposal submitted by USAID.

Liberia. Although CDF has not yet submitted a proposal, correspondence between the USAID and PHA/PVC indicates interest in a program such as CDF's, and the matter is reportedly being discussed with the Minister of the Action for Progress and Development Agency. The USAID has also in its DAP requested funds for training of Liberian officials in integrated rural development, which could be handled by CDF if the DPG is approved.

Ghana. The USAID Director has expressed interest in the CDF program as an element of the Farmer Associations and Agribusiness Development project being proposed by the USAID.

Rwanda. AFR/CWA and the Embassy have sought increased PVO involvement in Rwandan development. One project proposed for possible AID support by a REDSO project identification team was an integrated area development program. CDF involvement therefore seems appropriate for consideration.

Sudan. If a limited resumption of U.S. aid to the Sudan, utilizing PVO's, should occur, it would be of interest to the AID Representative. I believe, to reactivate plans being made in late 1973 and early 1974 for support of PVO rural development efforts in the Southern Sudan. CDF might logically play a role here.

Niger. CDF claims that a recent visit there has stimulated AID interest in the field. No proposal yet received. However, CDF plans a follow-up visit.

NESA

Tunisia. CDF has participated with the USAID in designing the Rural Development/Siliana project, and a role for CDF is proposed in this project by the USAID. The PRP is under review in AID/W.

Bangladesh. CDF is operational in Bangladesh, and is preparing an OPG proposal for program expansion. The USAID has expressed some reservations about the impact program, but CDF's single-purpose activities (housing, family planning) in Bangladesh have been favorably commented on.

Afghanistan. CDF has expressed interest in developing a program, but has not yet developed a proposal.

EAST ASIA

Laos. A CDF visit in August 1974 elicited a favorable reaction from the Embassy/USAID. CDF has submitted a proposal to AID/W; EA/TD has expressed strong interest and is looking into the possibility of providing funding for detailed project design.

Vietnam. CDF is operational in Vietnam and has submitted a proposal to AID/W for expansion. EA/TD has indicated interest.

Indonesia. CDF has a CD training contract in Indonesia, has submitted an OPG proposal for an impact program. USAID's reaction was neutral pending submission of a more detailed proposal, which CDF is preparing.

Korea. CDF has been active in Korea for 15 years, has submitted an OPG proposal for expansion. EA/TD is transmitting proposal to USAID.

LATIN AMERICA

Honduras. CDF is operational, has submitted an OPG proposal. USAID is reportedly working with CDF field staff on preparation of a more detailed proposal.

Dominican Republic. CDF is operational, has submitted an OPG proposal. USAID has raised certain questions which LA/MRSD is transmitting to CDF.

Colombia. CDF is operational, has submitted an OPG proposal. USAID response not yet received.

Panama. In December 1974 CDF met with the Asuciucion Panamena de Desarrollo (APADE), which reportedly expressed considerable interest in CDF's program. No proposal yet submitted to AID.

Haiti, Bolivia. CDF has also expressed an interest in these countries but has not submitted proposals to AID.

		Achievement Indicators										
Reporting Subjects		Nov '75	May '76	Nov '76	May '77	Nov '77	May '78	Nov '78	May '79	Nov '79	May '80	
Planning and Evaluation	a) Systems Design	Systems planning to evaluation officers in headquarters and each LDC office	Rural development systems planning and evaluation protocol in place.	Application and Refinement of Planning, Design, and Evaluation System								
	b) Staff Orientation		All management staff at headquarters and field offices trained in systems planning and using same	Completion of orientation of field staff	Ongoing in-service training and orientation to new procedures and practices as they develop.							
	c) "Bottom-up" Planning		Appropriate community-based "bottom-up" planning methodology being applied.	Continuing process of "bottom-up" planning and the development of significant linkages with overall development plan.	Significant number of grassroots communities have assumed independent responsibility for "bottom-up" planning							
	d) Cost/Benefit Selection		Develop and implement effective cost/benefit selection process for CELMO projects	Continued implementation of cost/benefit selection process;								
	Analysis			and begin cost/benefit analysis of ongoing projects	continued implementation and refinement of ongoing evaluation of projects according to formal cost/benefit analysis							

Achievement Indicators

Month Reporting Subjects	Nov. '75	May '76	Nov. '76	May '77	Nov. '77	May '78
<b>Human Resource Development</b>						
a) Advanced Training	Carrying out of Feasibility study for Advanced CBIRD Management Training	Begin Advanced Level Training Program	Twenty-Four (24) Advanced Training CBIRD Managers graduated	Continuation of Training Program	Twenty-Four (24) additional graduates	Twenty-Four (24) Advanced Training CBIRD Managers Graduated
b) Training of Trainers	Recruitment, Purchase of Materials, Site Selection, Administration, Curricula preparation for basic training.	Commencement of basic training with output 35 qualified village level trainers.	35 qualified village level trainers	35 additional trainers		30 additional community level trainers trained
c) Training of Community Leaders	Commencement of Grass Roots Community Training.					
	500 Community Leaders Trained	750 Additional community people trained.	750 additional community people trained.	750 additional community people trained.	750 additional community people trained	500 additional community people trained.

## Achievement Indicators

Page 3

Reporting Subjects	Nov'75	May'76	Nov'76	May'77	Nov'77	May'78
<b>Expansion &amp; Consolidation</b>						
a) New Projects	Preliminary selection and Detailed Design for new projects completed	All 6 new projects functioning*	Progress report on all projects	Peak input of outside help	Communities begin to assume proportionately larger share of project inputs	
b) Staff Expansion		Headquarters staff in place to meet requirements for 100% increase in field operations	Field Staff in place sufficient to meet need for all project operations**			
c) # of ongoing CBHD projects	22	26	31	34	40	49
d) # of other equivalent project activities in LDCs	22	20	18	18	14	10
e) # of individuals reached by CBHD projects	132,000	156,000	186,000	204,000	240,000	294,000
f) Total # of individuals directly reached by CBHD in LDCs	198,000	216,000	240,000	258,000	282,000	324,000
g) # of CBHD projects which are completely self-sustaining		2	3	5	7	
h) # of CBHD projects in which CBHD control is declining	1	3	6	8	10	

\*Includes the (2) project additions to ongoing programs plus new start-ups in four (4) additional LDC's.

\*\*Including consultants

ACHIEVEMENT INDICATORS

Month Reporting Subjects:	Nov. 75	May 76	Nov. 76	May 77	Nov. 77	May 78
<u>Institutionalization</u>						
a) Host Government		New Project plans approved and accepted based on its institutionalization component.	Projects functioning with government acceptance of program's replicability.	Major emphasis by project staff to insure govt. involvement.	Peak CDF Management input with increasing govt input	Major government input with slackening CDF involvement.
b) Host National Staff		Preparation of training program and actual training begins.	Personnel trained by CDF begin contributing to overall project management and institutionalization.	Advanced training in full operation.	Advanced training program continuing.	Trained host government personnel begin to assume responsibility.
c) Community				Community Committee and other local training programs in full operation.		

ACHIEVEMENT INDICATORS

Month reporting Subject:	Nov. 75	May 76	Nov. 76	May 77	Nov. 77	May 78
<b>Research</b>						
a. Technical Advisor	Panel of Technical Advisors selected and first meeting convened. Major research needs identified.	First specialist for assistance in project implementation selected and assigned.	Common research protocol developed and applied to all projects.	In depth research protocols developed for each CSIRD component developed and used where necessary throughout life of grant.	Number of development components systematically addressed by each such project increased by 20% between 1975 & 1978.	
b. Research Volunteers		Peace Corp Volunteers and degree candidates recruited to conduct research for on-going needs.	Research volunteers applying above	Research volunteers applying above.		
c. Publications				First papers published	Continued publication of papers throughout grant period.	
d. Qualitative Measurements				ODF able to measure rates of qualitative individual and community development.	ODF effectively measuring qualitative development in all projects.	ODF reports qualitative measurements of the achievement indicators in yearly percentages.

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM GRANT BUDGET

DPG Obligations from FY 75, 76 &amp; 77 funds

Budget table also shows expenditures in FY 78 from prior year funds

	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>FY 77</u>	<u>FY 78</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>STAFF PERSONNEL COSTS</u>					
Hq. P&E Officer (1)	2,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	50,000
Hq. Applied Research Specialist (1)	1,875	15,000	15,000	15,000	46,875
Hq. Regional Assistants (2)	4,334	26,000	26,000	26,000	82,334
Local Management Assistants (7)	-0-	31,250	35,000	35,000	101,250
Training Director (1)	-0-	15,400	15,400	15,400	46,200
Consultants *	16,000	34,000	64,000	60,000	174,000 *
Technical Advisory Committee	-0-	8,000	8,000	8,000	24,000
Program Planning Design (Salaries: 4 field directors & H.C. planner)	-0-	74,200	-0-	-0-	74,200
Travel & per diem (Program Design Support)	13,080	60,430	40,180	66,380	180,070
Training Program	-0-	102,260	129,660	127,610	359,530
<u>OFFICE SUPPORT COSTS</u>					
Secretaries (3)	3,750	30,000	30,000	30,000	93,750
Admin Coordinator (@ \$10,000 p.a., 1/2 time)	1,249	10,000	10,000	10,000	31,249
<u>OTHER SUPPORT COSTS</u>					
Computer Services	-0-	8,500	12,000	10,000	30,500
Accounting Services (telephone, insurance, etc.)	2,500	53,150	40,200	28,500	124,350
	<u>24,800</u>	<u>449,000</u>	<u>382,600</u>	<u>343,600</u>	<u>1,200,000</u>

\*Over the period utilizing AID funds FY-'75-'78, 88M consultant services at \$2,000 per MM.