

PD-AAM-175  
ISN 15209

932-0113

C O D E L E V A L U A T I O N

PREPARED FOR

Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation  
Agency for International Development  
Washington, D. C. 20520

Contract # PDC-0100-S-00-1038-00

October 31, 1981

Maryanne Dulaney  
with the assistance of  
Jack Mansfield  
James D. Noel, Jr.  
Barbara J. Sims

C O D E L E V A L U A T I O N

PREPARED FOR

Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation  
Agency for International Development  
Washington, D. C. 20520

Contract # PDC-0100-S-00-1038-00

October 31, 1981

Maryanne Dulansey  
with the assistance of  
Jack Mansfield  
James D. Noel, Jr.  
Barbara J. Sims

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I -- Introduction . . . . .	1
CHAPTER II -- The People Being Helped--The Disadvantaged. . . . .	13
CHAPTER III -- Ecumenical Collaboration for Development . . . . .	20
CHAPTER IV -- Projects . . . . .	24
CHAPTER V -- The Programming Process . . . . .	44
CHAPTER VI -- Indigenous Organizations. . . . .	51
CHAPTER VII -- Funding . . . . .	60
CHAPTER VIII -- Staff . . . . .	66
CHAPTER IX -- Relationship Between CODEL and AID . . . . .	76
CHAPTER X -- Findings and Recommendations . . . . .	83

APPENDICES

1 - Figure 1	CODEL Members . . . . .	1
Figure 2	Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	2
Figure 3	Principles of Development Assistance to Guide CODEL Members in Project Planning (CODEL Criteria). . . . .	3
Figure 4	Principles of Exclusion . . . . .	4
Figure 5	Criteria for Project Support: Asia/Pacific . . . . .	5

2 - Figure 1	Comparison of Projects in Current Portfolio with 5-Year Period 1975-79 . . . . .	6
Figure 2	Sectoral Distribution of CODEL Projects by Region . . . . .	7
Figure 3	Analysis of Current Project Funding . . . . .	8
Figure 4	Small Grants Funds, April 1981 Portfolio . . . . .	9
Figure 5	Projects Per Country: Joint and Second-Generation Projects	
5.1	Africa Region . . . . .	10
5.2	Asia/Pacific Region . . . . .	11
5.3	Latin America/Caribbean Region . . . . .	12
Figure 6	Number of Current Projects Sponsored by Member Agencies	
6.1	Africa Region . . . . .	13
6.2	Asia/Pacific Region. . . . .	14
6.3	Latin America/Caribbean Region . . . . .	15
Figure 7	Checklist for Evaluation of 10% Sample of Active CODEL Projects . . . . .	16
3 - Figure 1	Notes on Project Process . . . . .	20
Figure 2	Notes on Grant Letter of Agreement. . . . .	22
4 - Figure 1	Project Sites Visited . . . . .	23
Figure 2	Relation of Sponsor to Project Holder of CODEL Projects Visited . . . . .	25
Figure 3	Implementing Organizations (Project Holders) of CODEL Projects Visited . . . . .	26
5 - Figure 1	CODEL's Financial Growth by Source, Amount, and Total Income Per Year . . . . .	27
Figure 2	Expense Data, FY 1980 . . . . .	28
Figure 3	Program and Administrative Support as Percentages of Total Expenses. . . . .	29
6 - Figure 1	Estimated Annual Project Load of Area Coordinators . . . . .	30

ATTACHMENT A -- Project Profiles

#1	Community Health and Informal Education Center Community Wells for Drinking Water . . . . .	31
#2	Comprehensive Community Health and Rural Development Program . . . . .	38
#3	Inter-Church Service Agency Conference Center- Furnishings for Development Conference and Workshops . . . . .	44
#4	Palarivattom Community Development (PCDT). . .	47
#5	Sri Lanka Small Grants Fund (SAMAGI Fund Society) . . . . .	54
#6	YMCA Youth Training Center . . . . .	60
#7	Sri Lanka SMASH Center for Development of Body, Mind and Spirit. . . . .	65
#8	Meru Inter-Church Dry Areas Agricultural Program Liliaba-Mula Ranching Group Water Supply Project Meru Irrigation Project. . . . .	69
#9	Rural Water Resource Development Program . .	77

ATTACHMENT B -- Project Evaluations

#1	Jeevadeen Project - Community Wells for Drinking Water . . . . .	86
#2	Sri Lanka - SMASH Center for Development of Body, Mind and Spirit. . . . .	89
#3	FUNDIFRAN Agriculture & Community Development	92
#4	SSID - Rural Water Development . . . . .	95

ATTACHMENT C -- About the Consultants. . . . . 98

## CODEL EVALUATION

### I. Introduction

This is a record of an evaluation of the work being carried out by CODEL (Coordination in Development, Inc.) to:

1. Promote collaboration of its member agencies; and
2. Support development by providing project funding and other services.

The evaluation focuses on CODEL's current project portfolio as listed in the April 1981 Comprehensive Projects Review and as supported by the Program Development and General Support funds from AID.

### About CODEL

CODEL describes itself as:

a unique consortium of U.S.-based Protestant, Roman Catholic and other Christian-inspired organizations. CODEL's primary goal is to encourage and build upon ecumenical collaboration among persons and institutions in response to and in support of the self-determined, realizable, self-directed and environmentally sound development activities of the socially, economically and politically disenfranchised peoples of developing countries.

Through this concrete expression of Christian cooperation, CODEL assists the disenfranchised in their process of achieving human dignity and self-sufficiency. In carrying out its activities and programs, CODEL reflects its commitment to Christian principles by emphasizing those working relationships which are collaborative and complementary, with organizations of a like mind, be they at the level of the local churches and development organizations, CODEL members and their local counterparts, or private and governmental groups.

## CODEL's Commitment to Evaluation

CODEL has set a high task for itself, not only in terms of bringing together groups which may never before have worked collaboratively, but also with regard to the results which this work is designed to achieve-- viable development projects carried out by people heretofore left out of the development process.

As CODEL notes in its plan for the next three years, "planning and evaluation of its programs are essential to the continued effectiveness and success of this consortium."<sup>2</sup> CODEL involves its membership, primarily through the Board of Directors, in self-evaluations of its work as it did in the formulation of the plan for the coming three years. CODEL should be credited with periodically undertaking these evaluations and with involving its membership in them.

CODEL has experienced some difficulty in satisfactorily evaluating the program however. As the Executive Director notes in his report to the Board of Directors while speaking of the evaluation and implementation of the plan for 1978-81: "The evaluation of both the plan and its implementation is difficult due to definitions, changing circumstances, the mixture of process with content, and important intangible factors which cannot be quantified or easily measured."<sup>3</sup>

These observations are indicative of a stage at which many PVOs have arrived--an appreciation of the usefulness of evaluation coupled with an awareness that evaluation needs to be sharpened and improved. CODEL made the same type of observation on the project level.

Evaluation of projects by CODEL Coordinators is based on the receipt of narrative self-evaluation and financial reports, an annual audit of accounts, and on-site visits. Projects are reviewed by the Coordinators and the Projects Committee in terms of the CODEL Development Criteria, Development

Impact, and ecumenical participation. While the number of reports from each project is few, the compliance in 1979-80 is greater than 1978-79 although further improvement is needed before review and evaluation of all CODEL-supported projects are done with equity.<sup>4</sup>

It is highly commendable that CODEL has achieved the level of evaluation that it has and that it has been able to involve its membership in the evaluation and planning of its program. Now that CODEL has voiced the need to improve evaluation at both the program and project levels, it will need to turn its attention to ways in which this can be achieved. This evaluation is in agreement with the observations quoted above and addresses itself to ways in which planning and evaluation can be improved and, in turn, the high goals which CODEL has set for itself can become increasingly realizable.

CODEL was started in 1969 and currently has 38 members (See Appendix 1). Its headquarters are at 79 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10157. Full-time professional staff include: Rev. Boyd Lowry, Executive Director; Sr. Margaret Rogers, Coordinator for Africa; Dr. James J. Thomas, Coordinator for Asia and the Pacific, Mr. Kenneth E. Brown, Jr., Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean; Ms. Lydia Rodriguez, Projects Assistant; and Ms. Emma Thomas, Financial Manager.

CODEL describes program activities as "the catalyst and the most important part of the work done" including:

1. Meetings of (10) committees;
2. Coordinators' pre-field travel meetings;
3. Overseas workshops and seminars;
4. Selected training for member organizations including consultations (e.g. on development issues and project management) and workshops (e.g. on environmental and financial concerns);

5. A search for partners, especially those who can act as an inter-faith forum for the discussion of development issues;
6. Interpretation and promotion; and
7. Development education.

Project activities include:

1. Initial contact of CODEL and project proponent;
2. Receipt and review of project proposal;
3. Dialogue with the proponent to improve the proposal;
4. Analysis and preparation of Project Summary (including recommendation);
5. Review of Project Summary and recommendation by Projects and Executive Committees;
6. Approval/conditional approval/request for more information/rejection;
7. Notification of outcome sent to project holder;
8. Funding action (commitment, fund-raising, and transmittal);
9. Monitoring of implementation (via progress and financial reports);
10. Responses to progress information (ie. additional transmittals);
11. Evaluation (via evaluation and audit reports);
12. Sharing of learning with members and funders (semi-annual Comprehensive Projects List);
13. Maintaining project files and follow-up schedules;
14. Travel to the field to develop (and monitor/evaluate projects);  
and
15. Liaison with sponsors and donors.

CODEL's project activities are the main responsibility of the three

Area Coordinators (except for the Committee reviews and funding action). Unlike other development assistance agencies, CODEL does not maintain field staff, relying on the Area Coordinators' trips and the assistance of member agency field staff.

#### The Purpose of the Evaluation

Simply stated, this evaluation is intended as an opportunity for all the partners in the development process which takes place through CODEL to reflect on what they are trying to accomplish, what has happened and why, and what might be done to make improvements. The reason for doing the evaluation at this time is practical: a decision-making point for allocating resources is approaching in the AID/CODEL relationship.

In evaluating the work of CODEL with emphasis on the projects in which it participates, it is appropriate to look at the projects from the viewpoint of the PVO Committee:

1. Identify, during the life of a project, its strengths, weaknesses and relevance to local conditions so participants and project designers can make sound decisions concerning modifications of this and other projects;
2. Assess the impact of a project on the lives of local community members so donors, implementors and participants can make informed judgments concerning the project's worth; and
3. Analyze the results and apply the lessons learned to project and program planning, PVO policies and development strategies.<sup>6</sup>

This evaluation is an attempt to sample the project goals and development objectives fixed by CODEL and the project implementors, draw a representative portrait of the work of CODEL, and indicate areas where improvements might be made.

Points to be addressed in the evaluation have been discussed among AID, CODEL and the evaluator, with the agreement to include:

1. The people being helped, the disadvantaged. Do projects reach them effectively? Do they participate? How?
2. Ecumenical collaboration for development (among member agencies, collaborating or colleague agencies). What are the criteria? Does it work? How? What are the effects? What are the needs/expectations of U.S. and indigenous agencies for ecumenical collaboration? How well does CODEL serve/meet them?
3. Programming Process. Is it effective? How might it be improved? Do members learn? Do project holders? Is it useful?
4. Projects. What kinds of projects does CODEL fund (types, sizes, in what countries)? Why do they fund these particular projects (significance)? What is the quality? What impact do they have? Do projects serve as vehicles for learning? How? What is CODEL's (special) role in shaping projects (actual; hoped for by CODEL; perceived/desired by project holder)? What about small grant funds?
5. Indigenous agencies. As a result of interaction with CODEL, do they grow in capacity for development? leadership? Participatory approach? Is there an institution-building effect? What are the pros/cons of involving church agencies in development? How do indigenous agencies perceive CODEL, USAID?
6. Funding. What is the funding history of CODEL? Strategy and potential for private sector fundraising (especially seeking funds for a particular project with undesignated

funds)? Policy on government-private funding ratio? Realistic outlook for the short term (3 years)? CODEL's perspective on OPGs and the Development Support Grant?

It would be arrogant and irresponsible to reach hard and fast conclusions on the basis of such a limited examination. Nevertheless, trends can be noted and listed as the basis for an evaluation of results. This report should be read as an attempt to capture the emerging shape of CODEL operations from the perspective of the projects seen in the field as discussed with the project holders, field-side member-related organizations, and participants in the projects.

#### Methodology

Evaluation methodology used in this case is constructed on two bases:

1. Participation by all parties to the extent permitted by time constraints;
2. Devising formats used to collect and analyze information in a way that builds on the systems already in use, yields desired information, and is suitable for continuing use.

Half of the sixty person days allotted for this evaluation has been spent in the field, primarily in Asia, visiting projects funded by CODEL in the company of the Area Coordinator. One project site was also visited in Kenya and another in the Dominican Republic. One-quarter of the time was spent at CODEL headquarters reviewing the projects files, while the other quarter was used for analysis of data, writing and consultations with CODEL and AID.

Another part of the picture--the organizational perspective--

places emphasis on the way in which CODEL processes projects and relates to their proponents and sponsors. CODEL's own statement of objectives, together with comments from the field, serve as the measure against which to evaluate the work and reflect on how it might be improved.

#### Headquarters Visits

Two day-long consultations were held at headquarters primarily to revise and refine the points to be addressed in the evaluation and to gather some preliminary information. Two weeks were spent in New York on a review of the current project portfolio and an analysis of the programming process.

#### Field Visits

The evaluator visited project sites in India, Sri Lanka, Kenya and the Dominican Republic, most often in the company of the CODEL Area Coordinator and always with a representative of the implementing organization (project holder). The projects were chosen by CODEL for evaluation in the normal course of events. A few project sites were visited because they were in the same area and easy to include.

The project holder had been informed in advance of the evaluation visit, and the purpose and participatory nature of the evaluation were discussed as the first item of business. (I.e. its General Grant Provisions CODEL requires the grantee to "submit to CODEL, on a semi-annual basis, and at completion of the grant activity, an evaluation report, as conducted by grantee . . . . CODEL may also request the right, upon prior arrangement, to participate in mid-term or final evaluation activities.")

On one occasion the evaluator made a decision not to visit a particular part of the project to speak with participants because it seemed it would have made an already troubled situation more difficult (see Profile #4 in Attachment A, Project Profiles); in another case the evaluator decided against making contact with a project holder (NCKK, Nairobi) because it had not been previously arranged for and because the Area Coordinator was not present.

CODEL had set up field schedules of all three Area Coordinators in advance; the evaluator was invited to accompany them as desired. The projects visited are the result of a conjunction of CODEL's schedule, the availability of the evaluator, and AID's scheduling of the evaluation.

Project evaluations were conducted in an informal participatory way while traveling to and visiting the sites and involved personnel from the implementing organization (project holder), the CODEL Area Coordinator, the AID evaluator, and the project participants. On one occasion a USAID representative participated (Sri Lanka).

As time and circumstances permitted, meetings were held to discuss the project in a more formal fashion; sometimes consisting of project staff and other times including a wider group such as the board of directors. The meetings were spent in working through some or all of the CODEL Evaluation Criteria (See Appendix 1.2) or in attempting to solve a particular problem.

One objective of the field visits was to assess the extent to which the project holders, on the one hand, and CODEL, on the other, engage in evaluation on a regular basis, how they do it, and what use they make of the information gathered. Partly for this reason, the evaluator did not prepare formats before going into the field. In addition to not wishing to mask the existing evaluation mechanisms, it was necessary to learn

what they were before choosing or constructing one which seemed most useful and appropriate to the context.

The "raw material" for the format was drawn from the stated and unstated objectives of projects and implementing organizations. To this was added CODEL's Evaluation Criteria (Appendix 1.2), Principles of Development Assistance to Guide CODEL Members in Project Planning (Appendix 1.3), and Criteria for Project Support/Asia-Pacific Region (Appendix 1.4). A working outline was developed in the field, refined with the Asia-Pacific Area Coordinator, and is used in the Project Profiles (Attachment A).

The reason for developing this outline is that the field evaluation questions in use in the Asia-Pacific region (the first visited) did not prove to be inclusive of all key aspects; CODEL's Evaluation Criteria were not arranged in a way that made it easy to deal with them. The Criteria for Project Support (1.4) were duplicative and confusing when used in conjunction with the Evaluation Criteria. The field evaluation criteria used in the Asia-Pacific Region follow:

1. Are the poor being helped to help themselves?
2. What differences has the project made in the lives of the poor?
3. Did the project help improve the quality of life?
4. What impact did the project have on the lives of the poor?

These questions are good, but as used they evoked answers that were general and superficial and thus not very satisfactory for purposes of evaluation.

CODEL has done a commendable job of making progress in collaboration--a very difficult achievement. Not only is there collaboration across organizational and national lines, but across religious

boundaries as well. The readily visible indicators of such collaboration do not really tell the whole story; they are but the final fruits of a long, painstaking and sometimes frustrating process to replace fear with trust.

The merits of collaboration are evident: much more can be accomplished when more resources are available and human energies are channeled toward a common goal. Separate efforts, no matter how outstanding, cannot reach the proportions of common efforts. The synergy which results from wholehearted collaboration sparks the human spirit to new achievements.

The importance of development, which CODEL defined in its proposal to AID for program funding from 1978-81 as:

the process through which is generated self-sustaining growth . . . an increased local capability to identify and solve problems which impede growth . . . a process which involves a commitment of local time and resources, of energy, of leadership, land, labor, materials and capital,

was to have been given special attention.

In projecting its activities for the next three years, special attention is given by CODEL to the importance of linkages between all involved in a single development activity and to the retrieval of information relating to the development impact of the collaborative style.

CODEL's criteria were revised in 1978 "to provide firmer guidance to project proponents with respect to coordinated development activity." <sup>9</sup> The criteria, which are the keystone of CODEL's plan, are an expression of the most advanced development philosophy. Many development agencies, including AID, have aspired to some or all of these principles; other development assistance agencies have fallen far short of attaining them. That CODEL has also fallen short should not be interpreted as an indication of CODEL's insufficiency nor should it become a temptation to lower the sights to

other objectives which can be easily attained.

CODEL should retain its principles of development assistance and maintain a realistic vision of how and why the gap between the real and ideal has occurred, and how that gap might be closed. CODEL's commitment to development as expressed in the criteria can be maintained in a mode of operation which CODEL characterizes as working with member agencies in a non-directive fashion. It is a slow process, but well worth the time and effort necessary, to interface with members and colleague agencies about the development process so that the merits of this approach become apparent. The necessary ingredients for such a dialogue are better information about how the process unfolds and a deeper analysis of why it takes place. CODEL has the potential to move closer to its ideals.

---

1

Renewed Directions: 1 July 1981 - 30 June 1984. CODEL 1981-84 Plan Approved July 20, 1981. p. 7.

2

Ibid. p. 1.

3

"Executive Director's Report to the CODEL Board of Directors," October 9, 1980, p. 1.

4

Ibid., p. 7.

5

"November 1980 Self-Evaluation." p. 2. See also Renewed Directions, the 1981-84 plan.

6

See the "Evaluation in the PVO Community," American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., February 18, 1980.

7

"CODEL Request to the Agency for International Development for Program Funding 1978-81," revised October 11, 1978. p. 3.

8

Ibid.

9

Ibid. p. 4.

## II. The People Being Helped--The Disadvantaged

### CODEL's Primary Objective

CODEL's first principle of development assistance is:

to assist the socio-economically disadvantaged to participate more fully in the economic and political life of their country and develop insofar as possible, community self-reliance. (Appendix 1.3)

The application of this principle as a criterion by which to evaluate the intended and/or actual effect of a project activity goes beyond the question of the relative socio-economic advantage of the target group. This single principle has at least three significant components:

1. The socio-economically disadvantaged;
2. Economic and political participation; and
3. Community self-reliance.

As CODEL applies this principle, there is a tendency to limit the application to a consideration of whether or not the project reaches "the disadvantaged," and even then supporting data is rarely given. This limited application of the criterion may merely indicate that it is necessary to break down the "principles" into their component parts so they can be more easily addressed.

For example, in their field visit to the Dominican Republic Rural Water Resource Development Project, the Area Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean and the Executive Director conducted a joint evaluation with the project holder. They used the Principles of Develop-

ment Assistance and the Criteria for Evaluation. In response to the first principle they replied:

This project is definitely designed to assist the socially and economically disadvantaged. Provision of potable water in the area of San Juan de la Maguana assists the economically disadvantaged.<sup>1</sup>

No evidence is presented to support the statement.

There is another practical problem in the application of this principle as a project-evaluation criterion. The category "socio-economically disadvantaged" is quite broad and requires further definition within the context of a project before it becomes a meaningful tool.

The evaluation of whether or not the CODEL-assisted projects reach the poor (the shorter term for socio-economically disadvantaged) can, in fact, be handled in a summary fashion by those who use the criteria. Since the members of CODEL are organizations of Christian inspiration and have a mandate to minister to the poor, it may be assumed by project proponents that reaching the poor is a given.

Nevertheless, the question of the relative disadvantage arises in some projects which have been visited and can affect the way in which project resources are delivered as well as the amount. For example, if a project attempts to create self-reliance through provision of loans rather than grants (see Attachment A, Projects 4 and 5), it is possible that the poorest will not be able to participate if the amount loaned is beyond their ability to repay. As development assistance organizations know full well, it is difficult to reach the people who most need help because their disadvantage creates a gap that is difficult to bridge.

The discovery by the board of the PCDT in Cochin (#4) that the poorest in the community could not afford to repay the cost of new housing came as a shock to them; they felt they had no alternative but

to cancel that (major) portion of the project and drop back to concentrate on training for income-generating activities. In the Sri Lanka Small Grants Fund (#5) which is primarily a loan fund, the ability to repay the loan is a strong factor in the decision to give the loan, but the loans have been kept small.

Limited field evaluations indicated that more description and analysis of the socio-economic condition of the beneficiaries would be useful in matching the project intervention to the needs of the people to be assisted. This observation was affirmed in the examination of the files containing CODEL's current project portfolio.

#### Economic and Political Participation

The second element of this principle, fuller economic and political participation, is the real heart of the matter. It is the "what" of the statement. As with the first element (socio-economically disadvantaged), it is stated in a general way which necessitates definition and elaboration within the context of a project before it can be very useful as an indicator.

Since most of the projects to which CODEL provides funding have been designed in response to basic needs, which are almost invariably stated in terms of physical needs, the concept of economic and political participation is not often addressed. Such increased participation may occur as a by-product, or secondary effect, of the project activities.

For example, persons may increase their economic participation with increased income which results from the project intervention (Project #5). As a result of having accomplished a task within a project, the participants may be motivated to undertake other activities which re-

quire the exercise of political power previously unused.

It may be as simple (and difficult) as getting resources from government programs, for example, land. (See Projects #1 and #2.) In India, the government will make crown land available to the disadvantaged under certain conditions. In the Jeevadeen Landed Poor Project, the question can legitimately be raised with the project holder whether the land was acquired on behalf of the harijans or whether they were able to exercise this power on their own behalf. Such subtle but crucial details of the dynamics of a project are difficult, if not impossible, to see at a distance or during a brief visit.

Viewed in the light of the projects visited, it seems extremely doubtful that this element of CODEL's first development principle, fuller economic and political participation, is the core of most project holder's efforts. Emphasis is given to meeting needs for health care, housing, education, water, land and agricultural inputs. In one of the projects (#4) where the poor evidently thought in terms of receiving benefits, the project foundered not so much because it was seen as not leading to the goal of fuller economic and political participation, but rather because it would mean that only a few could benefit before the project resources would be exhausted.

#### Community Self-Reliance

The third element of CODEL's first development principle is community self-reliance. This element echoes the participatory, activist nature of the core concept, for how could someone be self-reliant without acting on his/her own behalf? It also introduces other elements--the idea of group action, cooperation, working together, sharing resources--embodied in "community." Additionally, it can be read as a

caution to CODEL and its colleague agencies that they not program their assistance in ways which might diminish community self-reliance.

Generally, when people go into the field to evaluate a project, they spent a lot of time looking at things--hospitals, schools, houses, community centers, water systems, wells, latrines, roads, demonstration plots, warehouses, equipment and business premises. None is an indicator, per se, of community self-reliance, even though community resources may have been used in part to acquire, construct or repair those material objects.

Although community self-reliance is intangible, appropriate indicators can be devised. Not only must they relate to the project activities and results, but they should be set as targets which are judged by the project participants to be desirable and feasible. Community self-reliance will take a different shape for "beginners" than for those who have already had experience at working together. The project participants of projects 2, 3, or 4--the harijans, or lowest classes, who have not been accustomed to aspiring to improve their socio-economic status individually, much less together--will of necessity set more modest goals for themselves than project participants who are accustomed to working together because of kinship, religious or political ties.

This setting of objectives in terms of community self-reliance by project participants demands extensive and intensive work with them by the project implementors. In short, participatory modes of programming require more resources in terms of time, personnel and finances--even more so where the "socio-economically disadvantaged" are concerned.

There is evidence that CODEL is providing project implementors with additional time and financial resources in cases which show promise of movement in the direction of this principle. For example, the PCDT

project (#4) as presented to CODEL has never gotten off the ground; in fact, several false starts have been made, and the question can be raised as to whether the project holder's relationship with the project participants has not been irremediably damaged, creating not only a crisis of confidence but also reinforcing expectations of dependency. Nevertheless, CODEL believes that the desire expressed by the board and the staff to turn the project around makes a case for giving them a chance to redesign the project, especially in light of the needs.

Another example of CODEL's willingness to "stick with" a group which seems to be doing a good job is seen in the provision of additional resources to a group through the serial funding of projects (marked B in the code), clustering projects (various grants to same project holder at the same site for different activities), or of adding resources to an existing project. (Project Profile #1, See Attachment A.)

The three projects grouped under Project Profile #1 (Appendix A) are for different activities begun at different times by the same project holder. Two are in implementation, and one is finished. Similarly, there is a cluster of two projects with the YMCA at Paranthon in Sri Lanka plus another with the same group (#6). The same situation holds true for the Meru projects (#8). A number of examples of increasing project resources after the project has gone into implementation can be found in the Comprehensive Projects Review.

In all of the projects visited by the evaluator, it was noted that the needs which the project was designed to meet as well as the ways in which they would operate were initially determined by the organizations which are the project holders. This mode of project

development does not give enough scope to the beneficiaries to design and control the implementation of projects and does not lead to the self-determination and self-reliance which CODEL aspires to facilitate.

A Good Principle Inadequately Applied

The project holders interviewed in the field are grateful for this flexibility and constancy on CODEL's part and tend to view the relationship between them more in terms of a partnership than as donor-implementor. Still it is difficult to escape the dynamics of a giver-receiver relationship and the tendency to create circles of influence around the institution which acts as implementor or project holder; giving way to these tendencies belies a firm dedication to participation and self-reliance. It is likely that most of the implementing organizations and people working in them ascribe to the principles of participation and self-reliance, though they may not know how to apply them in practice. This suggests a role for CODEL in creating and maintaining a dialogue with project proponents/holders and colleague and member organizations about both the improved development effects which can accrue from the application of CODEL's first principle of development assistance and ways in which it can be applied in each case.

---

1

April 10, 1981 Memo: Brown to Lowry.

### III. Ecumenical Collaboration for Development

Collaboration around a shared developmental objective is necessary if all the resources available are to be brought to bear on improving the quality of life of people whose resources are severely limited.

Collaboration among individuals and institutions adhering to different religions is difficult to attain as centuries of enmity have hardened the divisions among them. Often a major step is getting people into the same room to talk with one another. The level of ecumenical collaboration throughout the world is very low, in spite of talks which have been held and the attempts which have been made. Among Christians, the current level of ecumenical collaboration is usually an agreement to divide the turf and avoid competition. It is the general rule that Protestant denominations agreed to divide the territory in developing countries; the Roman Catholics might or might not be found in those areas. Where united churches were formed, the lines were blurred, but not removed.

CODEL has made significant advances in these preliminary stages of collaboration. Laying the groundwork is a long process, and the results are often not tangible. In the context of projects, there are very few in which institutions are jointly operating a project. CODEL must continue to convince its member and colleague agencies of the benefits of joining forces in sites where more than one religious organization is working.

Ecumenical collaboration for development is the single most distinguishing characteristic of CODEL, the feature which sets CODEL apart from other church or private voluntary organizations working overseas in development. This characteristic is addressed in this section through the following questions:

1. What are CODEL's expectations and requirements for institutional collaboration among its member agencies within the framework of a project? . . . Among member-related agencies in developing countries who may be project implementors?
2. How does ecumenical collaboration for development work--that is, what forms does it take?
3. What are the results in terms of improved project performance? . . . In broader terms?

#### How Does It Work?

The perspective from the field is that CODEL pushes hard for collaboration among Protestant and Catholic institutions within a project context. However, neither its stated policy nor its funding decisions indicate adherence to such hard and fast rules. In its statement of principles, (Appendix 1.3) the ecumenical collaboration to which CODEL aspires is much broader:

Development projects should demonstrate a positive and complementary working relationship between local churches and development organizations, as well as CODEL members and their local counterparts; extending to and including regional and national development organizations, private as well as governmental, involved in any country's development process. Such relationships may occur in the pre-planning, planning and implementation phases of a project, and may include contributions by way of consultative services, contribution of personnel, funds or buildings and equipment, as well as joint participation in the implementation of the project itself.

Of interest is the all-encompassing definition of "ecumenical" given in

Appendix D of the new three-year plan, "Renewed Directions."

In places where Christian religions are practiced by a small minority, as in India and Sri Lanka, two divergent cases can be found:

1. Little or no active collaboration either among Christian or non-Christian organizations (#1 and 2) or
2. Collaboration which includes Christian and non-Christian individuals with institutional ties (#4 and 5).

While eight project sites is an admittedly small sample, some conclusions may be tentatively drawn.

#### Positive and Negative Factors

It almost goes without saying that the most important factor in successful collaboration is the personal disposition of individuals working in the field. Some people are more inclined than others to disregard sectarian limits, encompassing the leadership elements and organizational resources of a whole community in an effort to facilitate development. However, what may be perceived as good for the participants in a project may not be thought of as contributing to the institutional growth of a sponsoring or implementing organization.

It seems, from initial inspection in the field, that inter-faith collaboration occurs in inverse proportion to the extent to which a project implementor is identified as having "ownership" of the project and the extent to which he/she is attached to a religious institution. In cases where there are strong, charismatic leaders within the church, the projects developed are more likely to be regarded by the people as not theirs, but the leader's project. When the leader is identified with an institution, it is the institution which "gets the credit" for the project. Such perceptions of institutional "credits" or ownership of

a project by a strong, capable leader of an institution create barriers to the participation of other, similar institutions or even of individuals who may not be affiliated with the "owner" group.

In all of the projects visited in the field, with the possible exception of the Sri Lanka Small Grants Fund (#5), there is strong institutional identification with the project. Most of the projects have been developed by capable, charismatic leaders identified with those institutions. In some cases the participation of the people has been built up during the life of the project and an attempt made to play down "ownership" (for example, #8), and in others (#4) the leader has left, but the perception of institutional "ownership" lingers, even though there is an inter-faith board of directors composed of citizens.

Ecumenical collaboration for development is a worthy goal, but one which comes only with great effort.

#### IV. PROJECTS

Three major areas are of concern in evaluating CODEL's project work:

1. The developmental impact of the projects;
2. The learning from project experience that accrues to CODEL members and staff, to project holders, to project participants (beneficiaries) and others; and
3. The management effectiveness of project planning, funding, implementation and evaluation by CODEL staff and project holders.

This chapter describes the projects in CODEL's current portfolio (Comprehensive Projects Review List-April 1981), discusses their significance, and attempts to assess their impact both in terms of meeting the objectives set for the projects and in the broader context of CODEL's criteria. One CODEL objective, learning from project experience will also be described and evaluated. The third concern, management of the project process, will be covered in Chapter V, The Programming Process.

##### Types of Projects

CODEL has decided to categorize all of the projects to which it responds in one of four ways: agriculture, education, medical or community development. Of the 136 projects in CODEL's current portfolio (per

the April 1981 Comprehensive Project Review), clearly the highest percentage of projects falls into the sector of community development.

Appendix 2.2, Sectoral Distribution of CODEL Projects by Region, shows the number of projects per sector and the percentage of the total. Community development is highest in the Asia-Pacific region at 53 percent. It is 45 percent in Africa, and 43 percent in Latin America and the Caribbean. This distribution has limited significance as the category of community development seems to be a catchall category for projects which are more in the nature of integrated rural development projects or which do not fit into the other categories.

In the analysis of projects in the current portfolio, the evaluators coded the type of activity from the information in the project file without reference to the CODEL-assigned sector. The community development designation has been given to projects which run the gamut from agriculture, bridge-building, cooperatives, health and nutrition to small business and wells. The designation "community development" may be read as "integrated development."

It is evident that even projects which fall into single-sector categories include a mix of activities. In fact they must, if they are to provide the results CODEL seeks according to its principles. People's needs are not limited to one sector; they are intertwined. CODEL as an agency with a participatory grass-roots approach to development, acknowledges this by encouraging an integrated approach to project planning.

There may be a tendency to place too much importance on sectoral emphases. The rank of sectors in two regions, Asia/Pacific and Latin America/Caribbean, is community development, education, agriculture and medical. The Africa region reverses the position of medical and educa-

tion with a fairly high concentration (24 percent of projects) in the medical sector. This distribution is indicative of the interests of CODEL's member agencies, colleague agencies and of development realities in the region.

### Size of Projects

The average amount which CODEL has approved per project is around \$43,000. (See Appendix 2.3, Analysis of Current Project Funding.) Assuming that there is a three-year average life of project, the annual average would be \$14,333 per project. The range of amounts approved per project is between \$2,800 and \$210,000. This may be a little misleading as CODEL has tended to use several mechanical devices to support additional activity of a particular group in a particular site. As discussed in an earlier chapter, CODEL may fund several projects (a cluster) with the same project holder for different activities although they operate within the same program.

Size is relative; \$43,000 for a 3-year project is not considered large in terms of international or bilateral funding organizations, but it would be considered a healthy amount by some PVOs and by many grass-roots organizations in developing countries.

CODEL rarely fully funds a project. The approximately 11 percent of fully-funded projects in the current portfolio is affected by the much higher frequency of fully-funded projects in the Africa Region. The range of total value of a project is between \$6,098 and \$605,000 in the current portfolio. Some of the difference has already been committed by other international donors or by local sources.

CODEL sometimes requests the project holder to find another source to share the external funding. It can be argued that this decreases

dependence, enables agencies with other types of resources to pick up costs that CODEL may not wish to cover, and encourages joint funding leading to increased collaboration of funding agencies. It may also work a hardship on the project proponent who must spend limited time and resources seeking other funding, following various instructions for application and reporting, and receiving agency representatives who wish to learn from the project. For example, is development well served by the IAF and CODEL both supporting the Dominican Republic Water Project (Profile #9)?

A danger lurks in the capability of CODEL to allocate significant amounts of funds to a project. A significant amount for a small community group may be very little to a larger institution; the absorptive capacity of small groups can be easily overwhelmed. Projects which bring in much higher levels of resources and technology than can be generated locally often decrease the power of the people to dominate and control the activity and increase their dependence on others. While espousing the principle of self-reliance, CODEL's projects exhibit a tendency toward building infrastructures which cannot readily be maintained by local resources.

The average size of a project approved by CODEL may seem substantial to some, but it does not mean that CODEL gives only larger grants. The bottom of the range is approximately \$3000 (which could be a multi-year grant.) This would come to a very modest amount--\$1000 per year per project at the very least. The main determination of CODEL's participation is the extent to which the project meets its criteria, especially concerning ecumenical collaboration. In a number of cases, CODEL gives sums of money which are meant to be granted in yet smaller amounts to groups or individuals by collaborating organizations. CODEL

calls such grants a "small grant fund."

#### Small Grant Funds

CODEL made a policy determination in 1975 after consultation in Africa to support small grants funds. It sees small grant funding as meaning:

...the transfer of power of decision in respect of the application of grants for modest development projects to a competent body in accordance with mutually approved criteria and agreed accounting, reporting and evaluation procedures, to encourage leadership and progress in development.<sup>2</sup>

CODEL has a number of projects in its current portfolio which it calls small grant funds. (See Appendix 2.4, Small Grants Funds, April 1981 Portfolio.) Small grant funds are usually provided to enable organizations working with the disadvantaged to respond immediately with small amounts of money to initiatives which have a relatively large impact on development for the people concerned. Otherwise the opportunity is often lost in the time spent sourcing funds.

Of the eight projects listed in Appendix 2.4, none seem to really fit this description. Four are actually small loan funds and are fairly well focused on certain activities such as small business and agriculture (#s 4, 5, 7 and 8, which is called a loan fund). Two (#s 1 and 2) could have been regular projects since the purposes were known and the budgets could have been formulated in advance, even if there were some subsequent variation. In fact, the planning might have been a useful exercise. There is not enough information about project #3 to know how those funds are intended to be used. If the grant for project #6 is, in fact, funding both seminars and projects, it would probably be better to divide the two activities. It would undoubtedly be a good learning experience to compare the results of these grants with the broad

objectives stated in the policy determination.

### Significance

What do the array of projects in CODEL's current portfolio mean? Why has CODEL chosen to support the projects in its portfolio? Is CODEL responding to strategies and plans it has set forth for itself? In other words, has it developed certain kinds of projects in certain places with conscious purpose? Or is CODEL responding to the initiatives of member and colleague organizations, a group which is widening year by year?

CODEL has in the past proposed strategies for project development that favor concentration on countries with greater needs using the physical quality-of-life indicators as long as at least two member organizations work there. CODEL has also sought to increase the number of countries per region in which it works. There is a personnel limitation to be considered, as will be discussed later in Chapter VIII, Staff. The additional amount of time that must be spent in working up and monitoring projects in the least developed countries, especially when the project sites are widely scattered, is formidable.

The projects in the current portfolio are spread over an average of fifteen countries per region. (See Appendices 2.5.1, 2.5.2 and 2.5.3, Projects Per Country by Region.) There is only one project per country in approximately one-half of the countries listed. If project management, technical assistance to project holders, and in-depth learning from the project are to be effectively accomplished, each project site must be visited a number of times.

## Member Sponsors

CODEL seems, in its selection of projects, to be responding to the program needs of the organizations with which it has contact. The projects sent to CODEL for consideration emerge from the experiences of those organizations and usually support their regular client group.

The sponsoring organization may or may not be implementing the project; this is somewhat difficult to ascertain. There are approximately 16 member project sponsors per region. (See Appendices 2.6.1, 2.6.2 and 2.6.3, Number of Current Projects Sponsored by Member Agencies.) Thirty of the 38 members sponsor projects, although 15 sponsors have projects in only one region.

## Technical Assistance

In assisting organizations to formulate a proposal, CODEL may be successful in suggesting modified approaches which have a better development effect. For example, CODEL can question the advisability of training, whether it be vocational or other training such as literacy, in situations where the trainees may have little opportunity to apply the skill. CODEL may be able to induce a change in direction which, while not modifying the major thrust of the project, may give it a little better chance to have some developmental impact. Another good example is the reshaping of medical assistance programs so that the preventive element is increased as compared with the curative.

What is most needed is assistance in project planning. Review of the project files indicates that a large number of the current projects could use a good deal of assistance in the areas of setting objectives, testing feasibility, drafting implementation plans and budgets, and structuring the project so it can be evaluated for achievement of

objectives and developmental impact (or goal achievement).

### Developmental Impact

The initial plan was to do a quick review of the total portfolio for data that would indicate how the funds were being spent, then select a ten percent sample for more thorough analysis, using a checklist constructed by the evaluators (See Appendix 2.7). The lack of information in the proposals and reports led the evaluators to concentrate on the total portfolio rather than on a ten percent sample in order to better analyze the shortcomings. These will be discussed in the following chapter.

The developmental impact of CODEL-funded projects was assessed using the CODEL criteria (Appendix 1.3). These criteria are heavily weighted for participation, self-reliance and collaboration. All of the projects listed in the April 1981 Comprehensive Projects Review were examined for the types of materials and activities being funded, using the documentation in the project files. Since most of the CODEL funding is given in support of the over-all project budget and not restricted to specific line items, all items listed in the budgets have been considered as being supported by CODEL funding.

The materials acquired and activities supported in a project are indicative of the nature of the developmental impact sought. For example, if the project supporters wish to facilitate self-reliance, it is not likely that they will support the provision of expensive (for the people involved) buildings, equipment and land. It is generally agreed in development circles that doing so creates dependence and may even be counter-developmental in the sense that the recipients are often unable to pay operating costs. In addition, a giver-receiver dynamic is set up

which leads to further expectations and dampens initiative.

The projects including capital expenses--land, buildings and equipment--are over one-third of the total of the projects reviewed (46 of 126). It is generally agreed that provision of credit funds leads to self-reliance and independence, though this may not be so in all cases. Only ten percent of the projects include credit funds (13 of 126).

Evidence of participation of the project "beneficiaries" in their own development is hard to detect from documentation in the project files. However, one satisfactory indicator is the degree to which "beneficiaries" are organized to work on their own behalf and the role that community organizations of the disadvantaged play in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the project.

The Philippines projects had an unusually large number of community group project holders, but evidence of poor people being in charge of their own development was not found in the documentation. It is likely that increased attention to the quality of participation will yield information on the actual dynamics as well as stimulate the growth and improve the quality of participation. In any event, it is an area which needs attention and will take time to develop.

More work is needed so that resources made available through channels other than CODEL may also eventually be utilized more effectively. As CODEL's contacts in the field expand, it would seem likely that the universe of projects from which to choose would include more projects which are directly aimed at fostering self-reliance and participation (as opposed to those which provide goods and services) even though the projects may still concentrate on the satisfaction of basic human needs.

CODEL has set a high goal for itself in the articulation of its criteria. That it is currently funding projects which may not fully

meet those criteria signifies both that the job is not easy to do, especially with so few resources, and that time and a combination of persuasion and demonstration are necessary to modify the way in which member and colleague agencies work in the field to make it more developmental.

Some of the kinds of activities represented in CODEL's current project portfolio are perhaps more appropriate for funding by member agencies rather than CODEL. Life is less than perfect, and a starting point must be made somewhere. Hopefully the goal is a greater awareness of ways in which CODEL staff and members could facilitate increased participation and self-reliance, helping people to take responsibility for their own development.

#### Quality

In other sections of this report there has been considerable comment on the degree to which projects in the current CODEL portfolio meet the criteria which CODEL has set for itself, its member agencies and potential project holders for quality as it relates to development.

There is no doubt that a gap exists between the ideal and the actual. However, the process of change takes a long time, especially when done in a collegial fashion with 38 member agencies, their field staff throughout the world and a myriad of colleague agencies.

The change required to meet the CODEL criteria more exactly is not primarily a question of moving from an emphasis on responding to people's immediate and basic needs to the longer-term nurturing of their ability to grow and develop as people. Mission-sending societies have long had a strong commitment to human development. They were often the first to serve the medical and educational needs of the developing

world, and, in some cases, are still in the forefront after years of independence.

In order to attain the ideals CODEL has established for itself, change must be concentrated not so much on the kind of assistance as on the way in which it is provided. As agents of change, development assistance workers must be careful to act in a way which enables people to do things for themselves and to make their own choices. It is all too easy for someone who sees the potential and loves the people to act in their behalf. If the work is only FOR the people, not OF and BY the people, it cannot endure nor does it constitute true development.

The organization, CODEL, was founded specifically because of an awareness of that reality, coupled with an awareness of the need for people who work in other countries from a religious conviction to work together, not separately, and certainly not against one another.

Improving the quality of CODEL projects through improving the quality of participation is an on-going process which CODEL can only seek to influence through its dialogue with its members and with those in the field with whom it collaborates. The quality of participation by the people whom the project is intended to help cannot be judged without both a vision of how that participation should manifest itself and the time and ability to observe the development process taking place within the project. Although CODEL has set forth excellent criteria, and even though the questions which it asks people to think about while evaluating the project speak to participation, that is not enough. CODEL's vision of a "high-quality development project" is in many cases not the vision of the project holder nor perhaps of the sponsoring and collaborating organizations.

It seems that CODEL has a responsibility to take the time and

resources to enter into a dialogue to raise the awareness level of the organizations which are closer in the helping process than CODEL. The words of the criteria must take shape--must be reflected in the deeds and actions within the project--and must be communicated and analyzed within the CODEL community so that the awareness level of both the group and the project implementors can be raised.

It must be noted that some organizations do not even include participation in their guidelines for development assistance. Others include it without understanding the implications for translating it into action. CODEL is to be commended for its high goals and to be assisted in the process of changing to meet them. In fact, CODEL will only achieve its desired impact on the process of development to the degree to which the awareness of the importance of true participation in development is enhanced in member organizations, project holders and colleague agencies in the field.

#### Impact

In the process of evaluation, we need to not only specify the resources, services and activities provided, but also their impact on the lives of the people that were involved in the project, on the lives of their leaders, on the institutions delivering the development assistance and on the larger context--the community, the nation, and the government.

The changes which have occurred and the learning which has taken place because of the project also need to be surveyed, especially with a view to ideas which can be applied to other situations. CODEL attempts to lead the project holders in an exercise of simple impact evaluation by asking a series of questions (see Appendix 1, Figure 2.)

To generalize on the basis of projects visited in the field and, to some extent, from evaluation reports read in the project files of the current portfolio, impact occurs on several levels.

Most notable are the changes in the lives of the disadvantaged. Their physical situation is often improved through the provision of improved water supply, immunization, medical and dental services, and agricultural inputs which increase production both for sale and consumption.

Other projects provide people with increased skills, most often in the area of vocational training. These skills may either help people organize their lives to become more productive and more able to solve their problems, or they offer new skills the disadvantaged may use to earn an income such as carpentry or dressmaking. The vocational component often also offers training in the management skills needed to effectively run a small business.

Sometimes the impact of a project is not limited to these first-level results. In addition to bringing clean water to a community, a project may provide an opportunity for interaction and leadership which did not exist in the community before the project. This is what happened in the water supply project in the Dominican Republic (See Attachment A, Project Profiles.)

People in that particular community had never participated in a common effort before. They were so pleased at the experience of organizing a well with a pump and the resources to help pay for it that they continued to provide other needs for the community after the well project was completed. At the time of the field visit, for example, a school was half-way constructed, and another project was in the planning stage.

Such second-level effects which energize the people of a community to do things for themselves have an impact which is far more important than that of the first level of the project, be it the acquisition of an improved water supply, the possibility of better health care or even skills training.

Impact on institutions which channel development assistance is also important. Project experience builds institutional knowledge and skills about certain kinds of projects, their technical aspects, and, perhaps most importantly, the organizational dynamics of the project. If such development assistance institutions are sensitive to project dynamics, they can learn how they may help to induce such effects within a community by, for example, the approach that is made, the way assistance is offered, and the relationships the agency sets up with the people who are to benefit from the project.

Sometimes more can be learned from an experience which has not resulted in the meeting of project objectives; often such "failures" are hidden from view out of a sense of embarrassment, thus destroying an opportunity for learning. CODEL may be able to facilitate a consideration of some of these experiences with a number of implementing organizations or intermediate channels of development assistance and not only turn a negative experience into a positive one, but also disseminate the findings to a wider audience.

Often a small project which allows the people to organize themselves and invent their own solutions offers a breakthrough in development technology. Traditional ways of doing things may be looked down upon by "modern" developed societies, but they are often quite appropriate to the needs and resources of a particular group.

People at similar levels of development, no matter what their

cultural background, share certain realities. Their resources are scarce; they must guard them and use them wisely. Often small projects which allow people to design their own interventions become the model for larger projects and do have the possibility of being replicated. Replication is one of the tests of project success, and it usually happens spontaneously. If people in one village are doing well and improving their lives, people in surrounding villages hear about it and begin to try to copy. The same thing is true for governments.

The impact of CODEL-sponsored projects around the world on other agencies and on the host governments could be measured if more time and resources were spent and if there was sufficient communication for local institutions to monitor the situation. For the moment, we need to concentrate on assessing the impact on the beneficiaries, the immediate institution, the intermediate institutions and especially CODEL members.

#### Projects as Vehicles for Learning

In the original concept of CODEL as a service organization to its members, projects were regarded as vehicles for learning about development. At this time it is possible that the learning is quite superficial simply because of the quantity of projects to be processed and the limited number of staff.

Another consideration is that learning only occurs when people want to learn, are ready to learn and are paying attention. Potential learners must also have information available in a form which they can understand. Since this evaluation, for lack of time, did not include interviews of member agencies in the collection of data, it is not possible to make a definitive statement about the degree to which member

agencies have increased their knowledge about development, changed their attitudes about it, or, most importantly, started to act in a different way.

At the present time, the information being shared on projects is limited. The widest audience is member organizations, funders (when they are different from member organizations), and perhaps some other development assistance agencies. The major way of sharing information about projects with this audience is through the semi-annual Comprehensive Projects Review. This is a list of active projects which gives the project number, the title and the location, together with a brief statement of the project objectives, some financial data and any outstanding features of the project. Comments on the current status are also included--whether the project has been funded, whether it has been reported on, or whether it is about to be closed.

It is likely that these brief statements are read by the sponsoring member organizations as a status report on the project and by all others in a cursory fashion to get an over-all view of CODEL's portfolio. These project updates seldom provide much in the way of analysis; they are more in the nature of reporting facts.

Another way in which CODEL members can learn about projects is through participation in either the Projects Committee or the Executive Committee. The Projects Committee, according to the CODEL manual, has a role which is "vital to the success of CODEL," although it has only an advisory function. The members receive the Project Summary which contains the recommendation of the Area Coordinator and, in turn, make a recommendation of appropriate action to the Executive Committee.

The Projects Committee is chaired by one of the CODEL Vice-Presidents, and its membership, as a rule, is drawn from the Board of

Directors. There are currently twelve members on the Projects Committee, including persons with other responsibilities such as Finance Committee, Executive Committee, Secretary, President and Vice-President.

The source of project information, the Project Summary, is usually a brief document which includes the basic data about a project such as title, location, submitting organization, field representative, sponsoring member, cooperating members and organizations, total cost of project, and amount requested from CODEL as well as a brief description of the project and a recommendation from the Area Coordinator to the Committees. In addition, a summary budget is usually included together with a brief statement evaluating the project according to CODEL criteria. Members of the Project Committee are sent the project summary in advance of the meeting. They do not receive any other documents on the project although they may request that the Area Coordinator show them the file at the meeting.

Another way in which information is distributed to the membership about projects is through the distribution of the Area Coordinators' field trip reports. However, these reports tend to be similar in nature to the projects review in that they pick up the most interesting aspects of the current project's status rather than providing a full report.

Other ways in which membership can learn about projects is through the CODEL News and special bulletins that may be put out about projects; in this case, however the information is even more limited. All CODEL publications are shared with field-side colleague agencies and project holders on a sporadic basis. Sometimes there is a special issue that warrants spending the postage to send a document, and at other times the Area Coordinator carries CODEL documents with him/her into the field. Obviously, these ways of sharing learning about projects are

limited; the information available tends to be factual and the analysis superficial.

#### CODEL's (Special) Role in Shaping Projects

Based on the impressions gained from the field visits, CODEL's most notable quality is the relationship it has established with the project holders. In all cases, the project holders expressed appreciation for the collegiality and partnership which marked CODEL's mode of developing projects.

At times, the taste of partnership created an appetite for more. Project holders stressed the need for the CODEL Area Coordinator to spend more time with them in the field. The visit, they said, was too brief to allow for a proper discussion of the project, details of transactions such as reports and transmittals between CODEL and themselves, and some help with problems they might be having in the project.

In one case (See Project Profile #1), the project holder had been able to develop a relation with funding agencies in Europe which it felt CODEL was not yet ready for. This relationship entailed a coming-together of First and Third World development assistance organization representatives to discuss lines of influence and arrive at an understanding of one another's positions so that greater equality in the relationships might be achieved.

CODEL does indeed have a special role in shaping projects. Its mission of bringing together diverse religions and peoples for the sake of development makes its catalytic role both a delicate and an exciting one. It has had some astonishing successes. The small grants fund in Sri Lanka (See Project Profile #3) is administered by an organization in which all the religions in the country work harmoniously together. This

ad hoc grouping is becoming an institution whose influence may well be felt in ways which cannot be measured.

#### Ecumenical Collaboration

Collaboration with local churches and development organizations, including government, is also difficult to measure from the evidence in the files. According to the CODEL criteria, collaboration may occur at any stage of the project process and may take the form of various kinds of inputs or contributions: consultative services, personnel, funds, buildings or equipment. Of the 136 projects in CODEL's current portfolio, 82 percent are listed as joint projects. (See Appendix 2.5.1 - 2.5.3 for regional breakdowns.) Collaborating organizations are listed in the project summaries, although it is difficult to ascertain the nature and extent of collaboration. Thus the quantity of collaboration is commendable, while the quality is not readily apparent because of a lack of precise information.

Some of the types of activities which CODEL has funded also indicate that there is more emphasis on social welfare activities than desirable. Some of these activities can be justified on the basis of one or more of the criteria. For example, feeding and clothing beggars in a social service center is certainly reaching the disadvantaged, and it can even be argued that it is a local priority need according to those directly affected. However, it is questionable whether it also meets other criteria for fostering self-reliance and participation. This is not to argue that such projects do not have value and a place in the portfolios of the member organizations. It does question whether they belong in the project portfolio of an organization concentrating its efforts on self-development.

Although there are outstanding bright spots in the current list of CODEL-funded projects, on the whole there seems to be a preponderance of projects which do not measure up to the criteria set by CODEL. Why is this so? What can be done to improve the situation?

Many of the projects fall within the activities traditionally undertaken by church mission-sending societies: education, medical care and social welfare. The member organizations of CODEL are by and large dedicated to these endeavors. If CODEL wishes to emphasize developmental activities, it has two main recourses--to assist its members to move into developmental activities, supporting these activities to the exclusion of others, or to develop contacts and consider project requests from non-member organizations which work in development. CODEL may wish to do both.

This would mean that projects eligible for CODEL funding need not be sponsored by a member agency. This is not prejudicial, especially in view of the fact that in a number of cases sponsorship is nominal and does not carry with it responsibility for involvement in the project.

Other factors possibly contributing to the projects' failure to measure up to CODEL's development criteria are the relative inexperience in development of personnel in the implementing agencies, the lack of a common development philosophy among the members of the CODEL staff, and the failure to develop and implement country strategies.

---

<sup>1</sup>Request to AID, 1978-81, page 21.

<sup>2</sup>CODEL, Small Grants Fund, September 10, 1975, p. 1.

## V. Programming Process

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the management of project development, funding, monitoring and evaluation, it is necessary to outline the process used and the results desired. Then an examination can be made of the application of the process, the results achieved (together with the cost involved), and the recommendations made for any improvements indicated.

### Project Process in Use

The CODEL Administrative Procedures for Sub-Grants contains the following steps which are called the CODEL Project Process.

#### Initial Screening

1. Acknowledgement by coordinator
2. Determine sufficiency of information
3. Determine relationships of request to CODEL criteria
4. Determination as to staff rejection or complete study for Project Committee review
5. Open file and internal control

#### Staff Project Analysis

1. Coordinator initiates analysis of feasibility according to CODEL criteria. The PAP is a development planning educational tool to guide both staff and project holder in reaching clear and more detailed understanding of his own proposal and an understanding that offers larger guarantees of achieving its intended purpose and motivating support, as well as contributing to CODEL ecumenical objectives.
2. Dialogue with applicant and principals of project; site visit and workshop if necessary
3. Coordinator completes proposal, explicitly details an idea of data completeness to facilitate evaluation of project efficacy in 1) achieving its own purpose; 2) sharing its

projected impact and 3) contributing to more unified (Christian) support of development efforts.

#### Preparation of Proposal for Projects Committee Review

1. Summary of PROP for distribution in advance of Projects Committee meeting
2. Circulation to Committee with Log-Frame and other agenda materials.

#### Projects Committee Action

1. Discussion with coordinators in light of knowledge, experience and interest of officers, and of CODEL policy
2. Committee recommendation:
  - a. approval or rejection
  - b. approval with conditions
  - c. referral back to staff for further study
3. Applicant advised

#### Executive Committee Action

1. Review of Projects Committee minutes and project recommendations
2. Action on project recommendations at formal Executive Committee session
  - a. approval or rejection
  - b. approval with conditions
3. Applicant advised

#### Funding Action

1. Funding Search
  - a. membership
  - b. undesignated funds CODEL
  - c. government
  - d. foundations and corporations
2. Applicant notified

#### Grant Agreement

1. Contract by which mutual responsibilities are defined, including the definition of criteria by which both interim and final evaluations will be shared, and forms to facilitate reporting
2. Agreement on pay-out schedule, and financial reporting (type of form)
3. Notification to Financial Officer to effect transmittal

#### Project Evaluation

1. Quarterly financial reports
2. Semi-Annual evaluations which are shared with Board and donors

3. Retrieval of data by coordinator on project finished in re. project goals and CODEL goals

#### CODEL Evaluation

1. Annual Report published by CODEL and made available to Board and to public
2. Analysis and reporting of sum of CODEL activity impact
3. Information retrieval for records

#### Application of the Process

The system set forth in the CODEL Administrative Procedures for Sub-Grants in the CODEL Project Process Chart is not currently fully used. It seems that it was too detailed and complicated for a small staff with a heavy project load to handle, and that some of the details were not necessary for adequate management; therefore the detailed application eroded with the passage of time. With a few simplifications e.g. drop the requirement for a Log Frame), the process should be fully utilized.

The consultant interviewed two of the three Area Coordinators and constructed the process to be followed. It consists of:

1. Initial Contact;
2. Presentation of the Project to CODEL;
3. Dialogue with the Proponent (improvement of the plan; development impact); (Depends entirely on Area Coordinator's judgment)
4. Analysis and Preparation of the Project Summary;
5. Committees' Deliberation and Action (Projects and Executive);
6. Funding Action (Commitment, Fund-raising, Transmittal);
7. Implementation and Monitoring (Progress and Financial Reports);
8. Responses to Progress Information (eg. further funding);
9. Evaluation; and
10. Learning. (See Appendix 3, Figures 1 and 2 for Notes on Project Process and GLOA which were taken during the evaluation.)

### Results Desired

Minimum results desired include the verification that:

1. The plan outlined in the project proposal for implementation and use of the resources is followed or, if modified, that the reasons are justified by changes in conditions which are acceptable to the grantor, AID, and CODEL, the sub-grantor; members do not impose additional conditions. Major changes should be conveyed to CODEL and agreed upon before they are initiated by the project holder; and
2. The conditions imposed by AID on use of funds (categories having flow-down application to the sub-grantees) are met (e.g. procurement, international travel, and earned interest refunded to CODEL and AID) or that a waiver is obtained if such a procedure is allowable.

### Results Achieved

In many of the project files reviewed in the course of this evaluation, it was not possible to ascertain whether either of the minimum results was fully attained as reports were either completely lacking or deficient in information. (Minimum requirements include: financial and progress reports semi-annually and mid-term and end-of-project evaluation reports.)

In field visits to selected project sites it was noted that the project holders were not fully aware of CODEL's conditions and requirements although these had both been attached to the Letter of Agreement (GLOA). (Note that the GLOA and its attachments are provided in English; this may pose a problem for some grantees.) The burden is on the project holder to understand and comply with the requirements upon

written notification; this is somewhat unrealistic given the skill levels and experience of most of them.

The presumption by CODEL that the grant conditions and report outlines attached to the GLOA are "of the type required for your own internal management purposes. . . .(which) you will compile in any case" is probably not realistic. These conditions and reporting requirements need to be reviewed with grantees before they sign the GLOA so that they have a full understanding of the implications before agreeing to them.

#### Areas Which Need Strengthening

There do not seem to be any basic requirements for planning; perhaps these should be created. (By accepting proponents' proposals, the guidance given in the Project Application Form is not used.) There is also a lack of information in some project documents which indicates the possibility of problems in implementation which might be avoided. In some cases, exceptions to the CODEL criteria are granted which predispose the project to problems in implementation, but since the exceptions are not noted, steps can not be taken to cushion the effect. (Example: serious questions about participation.)

Another general problem is the apparently inadequate communication between CODEL and the project proponent/holder. At times this can be harrowing; in one case the project holder understood that the grant was for \$40,000 a year for three years rather than for \$40,000 to be spread over three years. CODEL's communication was unclear. The Grant Letter of Agreement needs to be revised to alleviate this problem.

Mechanical processes are not always adhered to while opening/closing projects and transmitting funds. These "triggers" need to be sharpened, perhaps by installing a system of reminders, especially

in the cases of progress and financial reports.

CODEL does not provide the project holder much assistance in reporting on the progress of a project, in evaluating its impact, or in understanding the regulations to be followed in the case of an AID sub-grant. Sending out pieces of paper is not sufficient, especially when they are sent to a non-English speaker written in English. The Area Coordinator needs to personally review these items with each project holder. It is also recommended that CODEL assist the proponent in devising an evaluation plan tailored to each project and that both parties agree upon it as part of the program.

#### Implications

One of the general problems is that not enough quality time is invested in the preparation of the project plan. This is an area which can greatly benefit from technical assistance provided to the project proponent by the Area Coordinator. The project load per Coordinator must be significantly reduced, however, to make this feasible.

Implied in the above findings is the need for CODEL to return to the use of the Project Process as outlined in the Administrative Procedures for Sub-Grants, with a few minor changes such as the elimination of the requirement for a Log Frame. In order to do so, it will be necessary for the Area Coordinators to spend more time in the development, monitoring and evaluation of each project than they have been able to do with their present project loads.

This, in turn, implies the reduction of project loads per Coordinator, or the addition of Coordinators or other staff to assist them. Probably both approaches could be effectively combined. Fewer

projects in fewer countries, but with higher amounts of funding for longer periods of time might be a target which will give CODEL the development impact it seeks.

The quality of CODEL-funded projects could be improved with the provision of objective, disinterested, critical review, especially at the selection stage. The project rejection/approval process does not now guarantee impartiality. Area Coordinators control project information as they prepare the material seen by the Executive Director, the Projects and Executive Committees and the membership. They may also turn down proposals without going through higher channels and may approve changes in grant conditions.

Information received by the Committees is not only screened, it is limited. The Project and Executive Committees are made up of members who may be sponsors of the projects brought before them for approval. It is hoped and expected that the Area Coordinators and sponsors act in the place of project proponents who may not be able to be present to advocate their support of a project. At the same time, the decision-making process would benefit from the critical review of an outsider.

CODEL should take steps to include persons other than staff and members in the project review, perhaps by setting up a pre-Committee independent review or by constituting the Projects Committee with outside development practitioners. The advantages of an independent projects committee with power to approve projects should be weighed against the learning benefits now received by members sitting on the Projects Committee. Perhaps the learning function can be continued in another context.

## VI. Indigenous Organizations

In the desire to reach the disadvantaged with assistance so that they may improve the quality of their lives in a way that they may not only HAVE more, but BE more, those who help often despair of the great gaps which exist between the disadvantaged and themselves. It is even more frustrating to try to reach the disadvantaged in a country on the other side of the world where the cultures are foreign to their experience. Individual to individual aid, if it is possible, limits the scope of intervention.

Governments which are organized to serve their people often have the same problems in reaching and relating to the disadvantaged, especially in view of the fact that the disadvantaged not only wield little political influence, but rarely are able to effectively bespeak their need and therefore most often become recipients of "what is good for them" as perceived by others.

CODEL's solution to this seemingly insurmountable problem is to use its 38-member agencies working throughout the world who are most often specifically dedicated to serve the disadvantaged. The network is built through contacts, discussions of development and sharing of mutual concerns. CODEL is able to link not only people, who are the true catalysts of development, but also institutions which have the resources to help facilitate that process.

### Description

The nine project sites and organizations visited during the course of this evaluation provide a sample of indigenous agencies which were examined to learn something about their nature and function. This is not a representative sample; it is heavily weighted for India and Sri Lanka, but the organizations are surprisingly diverse and creative.

One would think that CODEL project holders would tend to be CODEL's member organizations; in none of the nine cases is this true, although in two cases there are counterpart relationships. Church World Service relates to the SSID in the Dominican Republic, and the YMCA in Sri Lanka relates to the "Y" in the United States.

It might also be assumed that many of CODEL's projects would be placed with church hierarchies in developing countries; this is true for only one of the nine cases. The list of project sites and projects visited in Appendix 4, Figure 1, together with the list of project holders and sponsoring organizations in Appendix 4, Figure 3, give an idea of the way in which networking through CODEL member agencies has provided an opportunity to participate in work with the disadvantaged. The kind of relationship between the American sponsor and the local project holder ranges from a knowledge of each other's work because they are doing similar activities in the same part of a country to a relatively close relationship as a counterpart agency.

The character and scope of these nine organizations are varied. Many of them are inter-denominational or inter-religious organizations. (See Appendix 4, Figure 2.) Often they are organizations started by missionaries or churches to carry out development work. Four of the organizations and facilities are national in scope; five are local. Of the nine, some work in both urban and rural areas, and one organization

(ICSA) provides services to organizations working in both rural and urban areas. The focus is about evenly divided. These implementing organizations work within the projects with other local and national organizations, including governments. Thus, the focal point of a project brings together a number of local, national and international organizations.

Not many of the projects funded by CODEL received their total support from CODEL or the full amount of funding requested. This seems to be a policy of CODEL's--supporting only part of the project costs. Therefore, the indigenous agencies also maintain relationships with funding agencies outside the CODEL network, primarily in Europe. The capacity for even greater networking is evident.

In one case, the local implementing organizations (the Catholic diocese of Meru) joined with a European donor to facilitate a development education experience in which funders, implementors, and beneficiaries were able to discuss development from their various perspectives. This is an interesting approach which CODEL might wish to consider for future work.

#### Capacity in Development

CODEL and other foreign development assistance agencies seek ways in which to participate more fully with their cooperating organizations--those which implement and participate in the project work. Similarly, the implementing organizations, in order to be effective, seek ways in which to facilitate participation of the people with whom they work.

Many of the implementing organizations were started by dynamic, charismatic people whose very nature it is to dare to dream and to lead

with the full expectation that others will follow. Sometimes they end up doing things singlehandedly. Zeal is a fuel which really gets things accomplished, for which people are usually grateful. They look to leaders to make decisions for them and to carry them along on the wave of action. If promises and expectations do not become reality, they may feel bitter or discouraged, but very seldom do they think of the possibility that they could have taken some action. Power is invested in the leader, often weakening the feeling of power in the followers.

Some of the organizations which are implementing the projects visited during the course of the evaluation have recognized, and are daily recognizing, the long-term negative effect of taking too strong a leadership role; in the Dominican Republic project, for example, the community which participated very little in the decision to dig a well had breakdowns with its pump more often than other communities. It is presumed that the people who participated more fully took better care of the pump.

SSID realized that it was necessary for the people in the community to participate more fully in the decision and in the work of digging a well. They, therefore, decided to inaugurate a program of hand-dug wells, choosing not to use the well-drilling rig in cases where it was unnecessary to do test bores or where the water was easily accessible. In addition to lowering the cost of the well, the community organization and commitment needed to get the work done made all the difference in the development impact of the project.

Likewise, lessons are evident within the projects visited in Kenya. The water system which was planned and is being constructed by missionaries, is not considered by the people to be their own project. While it is a marvel which opens up a valley to the possibility of cattle and

even cultivation, the people look upon it as an externally-sponsored public works project.

The projects working with outcasts in India have yet another dimension to them. The missionaries working with Projects #1 and #2 are Indian nationals, but they come from Kerala, a quite different part of India than the places in which they are working--Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. They are looked upon by the majority population as outsiders and, moreover, as social subversives because they work with the harijans. In turn, the harijans, so accustomed to their status, find it difficult to believe that they can and should take action to improve their lives. In these cases, the work is markedly more difficult and the temptations even greater to do things for people, rather than with them.

Providing material and organizational benefits for people when their needs are many and painfully evident is sometimes not the best way to accomplish long-term development, even though it is quite human to want to alleviate hardships as quickly as possible. The case of the PCDT is instructive. It began with a Catholic training facility which was not being fully utilized and which was located close to a poor neighborhood. It was the dream of the then-director to convert it into a model community development center, to open its gates to the people of the neighborhood who might use the facilities and to bring in others to work in this development laboratory.

The Sisters attached to the Center had for some years been doing social work in the community, and the mode of conducting a needs assessment was to get people together and ask them what they needed. Their most pressing concern was for housing which, indeed, was quite poor. They also spoke of water taps. The Center had already embarked on a

clinic program which offered free medical care and medicines as well as a maternal child health program which offered nutritional surveillance of mothers and children under five, providing PL 480 food for a nominal fee. The Sisters had also arranged a course in sewing and had begun a money-saving system which encouraged people to put aside some of their funds in a bank.

The members of the community who served as trustees of the organization came from the distinguished leadership of the neighborhood, as might be expected. The members of the ladies auxiliary were also better-off. Partly due to the high expectations of the people and the lack of planning, it quickly became evident that there was no way in which funds could be used on a revolving basis to provide housing. The people were too poor to ever pay back such large amounts. To make a long story short, the project stalled from being unable to devise ways of working toward its original objectives and not knowing what else to do.

The lengthy discussion which took place during the field trip of the Area Coordinator with the Board of Trustees revolved around the failure of the organization to include the beneficiaries in the planning. The funds, largely unused, were left in the project by CODEL to give the Board an opportunity to redesign the project, this time with participation of the beneficiaries. This might eventually be a resounding success although it will come out looking quite different than at the beginning.

Most of the organizations include people of various faiths, sometimes in areas where such cooperation was unheard of in the past. Particularly interesting is the case of SAMAGI in Sri Lanka, a group started in response to CODEL's call for working together. The persons

who form the Board of SAMAGI, and especially those who volunteer to develop the subprojects for grants, to personally back them up and to call upon them periodically, are dedicated people who know a lot about development and are learning even more from one another.

The development office of the Catholic diocese of Meru in Kenya has a problem. It says it wants to work in an ecumenical fashion with the Methodists in the area on its agricultural project, which has been quite innovative. Circumstances, distances, misunderstandings and fears seem to have been responsible for the failure to work in an ecumenical fashion. It is quite possible that CODEL could help soothe the fears and straighten out the misunderstandings.

In any event, the experiences of the Catholic church in development have been growing and may offer the membership of CODEL an opportunity for learning. The team approach and the highly participatory nature of development work which is being used throughout the country can be copied by others and, indeed, this has been done by projects in two other countries. CODEL might well avail itself of this resource in an ecumenical fashion not only within the Africa region, but perhaps including neighbors across the Indian Ocean such as India and Sri Lanka who would undoubtedly benefit from the experience.

The one organization on the list which does not work directly with the grass roots, but rather provides services to other organizations involved in such activities, is the Inter-Church Service Agency in Madras. The capability and track record of this organization is admirable. Its capacity for project design and evaluation, feasibility studies, training, management consultation and engineering services provides a great resource to anyone working in the area.

This resource is not being tapped extensively, partly due to a lack

of knowledge about it, but mostly due to a lack of resources. As with any consulting organization, it must charge fees in order to cover its expenses. The organizations most in need of such services tend to feel that they cannot afford them.

CODEL is in an extraordinary position to facilitate the use of these resources by organizing discussions of common problems in development for its own project holders and those collaborating organizations working in India. This would be a starting point for the better utilization of ICOSA's services which could result in greatly improved planning and management of development projects. It would also enable people to seek better solutions to common technical problems such as the problem of drylands agriculture in a habitual drought zone or that of minimal-cost housing for the very poor.

ICOSA has developed a section on appropriate technology and is very interested in promoting consideration of the role of women in development, but it requires resources to enable it to accomplish these goals. It would seem that providing such services to project holders would build institutional capabilities which are well within CODEL's objectives. The use of such indigenous service organizations would also result in decreasing the load for CODEL staff and locating the technical assistance closer to the project holder; these are both highly desirable objectives.

#### Perceptions of CODEL and USAID

During the evaluation, indigenous agencies were queried about their attitudes and perceptions of U.S. development assistance agencies, especially CODEL and USAID. In all cases, CODEL was perceived as a highly-respected partner, but one which was very difficult to reach when help

was needed. Every implementing organization complained of the small amount of time being spent with them, voiced their need for more advice and discussion about project implementation and evaluation, and, in one case, even became angry at the frustration of not receiving it.

It was easy to see from these reactions that CODEL is not just another funding agency. With the exception of two organizations, SAMAGI and SMASH, everyone had dealt with a number of other funding sources, both in the United States and in Europe. They clearly regarded CODEL as different. CODEL would be missing a great opportunity, and even would be remiss, if it did not explore a way by which it might better serve these needs which it seems called to do.

In only one case was there the slightest question raised about USAID. Most often AID was looked upon as a governmental co-partner about whom people often said bad things, but who was thought to be not so bad after all. The financial and political difficulties that occurred because of AID's participation or potential participation in project funding did not even seem to be serious. That was probably because CODEL was able to provide private funding so that the projects could be implemented. Feelings might have been quite different had the case been otherwise. Because CODEL is regarded as independent, AID's participation in the project is made palatable and even is welcomed.

## VII. Funding

### How CODEL Gets Its Funding--History and Trends

CODEL was founded in 1969 in response to a need to coordinate the fund-raising efforts of mission societies. From 1970 to 1975, CODEL's sources of income were entirely private. In 1971 projects and joint development activities were added to CODEL's scope of work, and in 1974, the year of the Development Program Grant (DPG) from AID, private funding increased considerably. (See Appendix 5, Figure 1.)

In the 3-year period of the DPG, member organizations of CODEL contributed a total of almost \$2 million, more than double the DPG of \$775,000. During that period membership expanded from 31 to 41 organizations. AID funding provided a considerable boost to CODEL as an organization.

The Agency for International Development followed the DPG with a General Support Grant which did not make funds available until August, 1979 because of procedural delays and which is about to terminate. A total of \$1.4 million was granted to CODEL under this category for the purpose of providing:

support for the grantee's program in sponsoring development projects in selected developing countries. . . . CODEL . . . will sponsor approximately 155 development projects in about 50 selected developing countries in Africa, Latin America, Asia and the Pacific in agriculture, rural development, health, nutrition, family planning, non-formal education and women's developmental activities.

Using its own principles of development assistance to guide project selection and development, CODEL reviews and funds project proposals of its member agencies and encourages the collaboration of the members in project design and implementation as well as in the sharing of expertise and talents. The CODEL project programming system provides for documentation and procedures for project monitoring, reporting and evaluation. CODEL staff provides consultation assistance to projects on request. The funds provided under this grant shall be utilized without restriction by the grantee for allowable costs of the activities described above. . . .<sup>1</sup>

CODEL also receives other monies from AID. There are three Operational Program Grants (OPGs) and a grant for environment and development workshops. These are outside the scope of this evaluation. CODEL regards these as integral activities. The Executive Committee meeting in September, 1979

reaffirmed the policy of matching or exceeding project support by AID funds from the private sector and paying program and administration costs 60% AID and 40% private contributions. This policy is not applicable to OPGs or to the grant for environmental and development workshops. It is applicable only to the AID general support grant to CODEL.<sup>2</sup>

The reason is that private contributions to both OPG and environment do not go through CODEL books; they go directly to the project. To include them would result in double matching.

Expense data for FY 1980 (Appendix 5, Figure 2) shows that CODEL has indeed followed this policy. CODEL's contribution to projects was \$675,710, while AID's was \$539,349. The AID grant covered operating expenses of the program, (direct support for project management), while CODEL covered general administrative expenses which they call support. CODEL paid 41 percent of the total operating expenses and AID 59 percent.

The amount of matching funds from the private sector exceeds 50 percent if one does not include funds for programs CODEL considers to be indirectly related to its project work. Excluding Operational Program

Grants which CODEL is responsible for administering and the environmental development program which provides workshops and information to member agencies and collaborating organizations, CODEL is contributing a total of \$809,818 or 53 percent of the total program and operating expenses. Appendix 6, Figure 3 shows program and administrative support as a percentage of total projects at 27 percent. When OPGs and the Environmental Development Program are added to the total, the overhead percentage drops to 16. None of these figures is extremely high for an overhead rate.

CODEL has made several attempts at raising funds from foundations and corporations. It has hired consultants; it has spent large amounts of staff time on fund-raising and development work and has established a committee of members to assist in making contacts and raising funds. There has not been a great deal of success in the past, with the result that the Board of Advisors, at the direction of the membership, is

no longer looked upon as the major source for CODEL funding, but rather as an area for a communication ministry. This does not preclude tangible support, but does lower expectations to a level realistic in the light of experience and economy.<sup>3</sup>

There are two major problems in fund raising for an organization such as CODEL. The most serious problem is that there are very few United States foundations and corporations which express an interest in funding international projects. Of those which do, the funding amounts are usually fairly small and are often restricted to programs other than the kind for which CODEL seeks funds.

One thinks, for example, of the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations' programs in agricultural research, the development of educational institutions and the encouragement of improved management on the part of institutions so they can be self-supporting. All of these programs are

clearly at a higher level than CODEL's beneficiaries are able to use.

Other foundations with an international focus already have a clientele; there are many more people knocking on the door than there is money on the other side. The situation will undoubtedly become worse in the current climate of reduced federal support for all kinds of programs and the poor economic climate which influences the size of funds available to corporations for charitable purposes.

#### How CODEL Uses Its Funds--Projects vs. Over-all Program

CODEL spends the greater part of its budget in direct support of overseas projects. Taking the budget without regard to the OPGs and the Environmental Development Program, \$1,215,059 were spent on projects from a total budget of \$1,540,595 (Appendix 5, Figure 2). The greatest portion of program and administrative support is directly related to the management of projects.

Although CODEL in some places speaks of its program in terms of activities directed toward the members, in others it regards the program budget as the money spent in support of the project work. Conceptually this is an accurate picture of reality. CODEL is not very active in sponsoring large meetings or workshops overseas other than those funded under the Environmental Development Program. CODEL channels the resources of members into projects, in many cases mixing AID and non-AID monies and, as the situation warrants, funding totally with private money.

The ability to be flexible in the application of project funds is one of CODEL's great strengths. The AID grant permits CODEL to begin funding a project immediately, while it "raises" the funds for the remainder from its membership. More unrestricted funds are now made

available by the membership than in the beginning, but a certain control and accountability has been kept by the member agencies. For the most part they respond on a case-by-case basis to the CODEL approved projects list. It would facilitate management and improve development impact if members were to untie their funds, but it is unlikely that this will occur soon. Also, member donors do not significantly contribute to program support. It would be more equitable and a better long-term arrangement for CODEL if members would agree that a percentage of project funds could be allocated toward program support.

#### Grantee Perspectives on CODEL Funding

Generally the grantees interviewed during the course of this evaluation like the idea that CODEL is able to save them work by sourcing funds from a number of organizations. The reality, however, is that the efficiency of a brokering function is in many cases not fully accomplished. CODEL rarely fully funds a project. This means that the project holder must go to other organizations, must comply with their regulations about proposal writing and reporting, and must satisfy different kinds of donors--all of which means more work for the project holder.

The other side of this coin is that the various development assistance organizations which participate in the project can become colleagues, supplying resources and development expertise that some agencies may not have. This, of course, implies that there is contact, exchange of information and sharing of development concepts among donor agencies.

This is the case in CODEL only to a limited extent. More often what happens is that other donor agencies "pass along" applicants who

have a church background to CODEL, often without regard to whether or not their request would comply with CODEL's criteria. This same kind of client referral is done by AID/Washington and missions in the field. If CODEL could find a middle ground between channeling the major part of the resources for a project and the sharing of project support with other development assistance agencies who may bring different talents and concepts to the project holder, this would improve CODEL's service to grantees.

#### Prospects for the Future

It is quite likely that CODEL will be able to maintain a growth in its budget based on donations from AID and from its member agencies. The AID funds have had a positive drawing effect on the private sector. At the same time it is not likely that CODEL will be able to tap significant amounts of foundation and corporation resources.

Steady growth is preferable to ups and downs in the budget, and if some way could be found to get longer term pledges from the membership, it would considerably ease CODEL's project funding ability, especially with regard to the uncertainty of funding which must be passed on to the project holder when a search is initiated. The project holder does not know when, through no fault of his own, he might no longer receive the funds which CODEL has approved for his project, simply because CODEL is unable to raise the funds itself.

---

<sup>1</sup> Attachment A, Grant # AID/SOD/PDC-G-0165 and amendments.

<sup>2</sup>

CODEL Self Evaluation, October 1979, pages 5-6.

<sup>3</sup>

Memorandum Report of the Executive Director to Representatives of CODEL Member Organizations, April 8, 1980.

### VIII. Staff

This section will analyze the present staff composition in comparison with the implied work load necessary to meet CODEL's objectives. It will attempt to resolve the difference between the tasks set forth for the coming period and the staff resources currently available, first on the basis of retaining the same number of full-time staff and then suggesting the minimum additional staff required. The objective of this analysis will be to improve the quality of staff work without adding substantially to operational costs.

#### Present Personnel and Job Description

The present full-time staff of CODEL consists of the Executive Director, three Area Coordinators, the Office Manager/Project Assistant, the Financial Manager, two secretaries and one clerk/typist.

The Executive Director directs the work of the CODEL staff, works with the Executive Committee in developing and implementing policy, relates to members, and develops ecumenical collaboration. The Executive Director is also responsible for: fund raising; over-all planning, management and evaluation; and general representation of the agency.

The Area Coordinator has the responsibility to develop contacts in the field with member and other organizations collaborating in development activities; learn of their developmental objectives, projects and resources; interpret to them the CODEL mission and method of operation;

assess the potential for ecumenical collaboration in a CODEL-assisted project; encourage formulation of a project proposal in keeping with CODEL's criteria, decide whether the proposal is appropriate for CODEL, and, if not, notify the proponent and possibly refer them to another agency.

Coordinators also provide technical assistance in conceptualization, planning and presentation of the proposal; study and evaluate the proposal; prepare project summaries together with recommended action for consideration of the Projects and Executive Committees; present and defend proposals in Committee meetings; maintain liaison with and correspond with (potential) project holder at all stages of the project process, providing information and technical assistance as needed; manage schedule of funding and reporting and notify project holder if reports are not received; prepare semi-annual reports to CODEL members/funders; from time to time participate in field evaluations with project holders; assist the Executive Director in sourcing funds, and maintain liaison with U.S. offices of organizations collaborating in the project. In addition, the Africa Area Coordinator is responsible for managing the three OPGs in the Africa region.

The Financial Manager is responsible for bookkeeping and for all aspects of financial control as well as compilation of periodic financial reports to CODEL and to the funding sources, particularly AID.

The Office Manager/Project Assistant, in addition to her duties of managing the office, is responsible for updating and maintaining information on projects in cooperation with the Area Coordinators. This includes compilation of summary data and the production of semi-annual comprehensive projects lists.

In addition, CODEL has the services of part-time personnel: the

editor of the public information materials such as the CODEL News; liaison with the United Nations; a corporation consultant; a consultant in interpretation; and two consultants in the environment and development program.

#### Present Overload on Area Coordinators

The area coordinators are already carrying a heavier project load than is possible for any person to handle. If CODEL seeks to attain its target of developing an additional five projects per region per year as projected in the new 3-year plan, it might be necessary to add additional personnel to carry the workload for the Africa and Asia/Pacific regions.

Appendix 7, Figure 1, Estimated Annual Project Load of Area Coordinators, cites the number of projects being monitored and developed by the Africa Coordinator as 75 per year, with 83 for the Asia/Pacific Coordinator and 44 for the Latin America/Caribbean Coordinator. The load for the first two regions is more than double that of the estimated load of the Inter-American Foundation field representative who is responsible for only one country and usually has an active project list of 30, with 10 new projects developed annually.

The 1979 Annual Report of PACT, which also has three field representatives, indicates a total of 21 new projects plus 12 reviewed for second and third-year funding for a total of 33 active projects plus 48 supporting grants (which are handled separately and do not require field investigation). PACT projects, however, average \$70,000 per year as opposed to CODEL's \$14,000 average.

When CODEL first started funding projects under the DPG, the clearly stated objective was to learn about development, using those projects as live case studies. Demand, in terms of funding requests,

was the major reason for the increase in numbers of projects and countries. The practical effect has been that project management and opportunities for learning have diminished as projects per person have increased. Other CODEL staff are similarly working at an over-normal capacity. Despite the fact that staff is overloaded with current tasks, CODEL is planning to take on additional work with the same number of personnel.

#### Increased Wordload Implied by 1981-84 Plan and Evaluation Findings

The following is the list of new tasks that CODEL is setting for itself in the next three-year period as well as improvements that are suggested in the course of this evaluation. They fall naturally under several headings: the project development, learning, funding, member participation, communication with a broader constituency, and administration.

##### Project Development

1. More profound reflection on how CODEL criteria apply to the development processes as reflected in the projects;
2. Independent critical review of proposals and project performance at key points in the process (second and third-year funding);
3. Improved management of projects both as individual projects and over-all;
4. More technical assistance to project holders and project planning and management including evaluation plans;
5. More and better information from the field on projects (background information, analysis, monitoring and evaluation);
6. Feedback from CODEL to the project holder on the content of reports analyzing and raising key questions and providing information helpful on improving project implementation and impact;

## Learning

7. Field-based meetings of organizations collaborating in a number of projects to discuss and propose solutions to common project problems, draw knowledge from project experience, and consider development process and philosophy, with documentation to enable broader sharing of experience;
8. Improved learning in the CODEL community through analysis of the development process based on CODEL-project experience for discussion by colleague agencies primarily in the U.S. but also in the field;

## Funding

9. New thrust in tapping foundation sources especially selected list of 25, as well as developing a list of corporations and the possibility of United Nations participation (implications for increased staff time to ensure coverage and continuity);

## Member Participation

10. More institutional commitments of member organizations (as opposed to individuals) and even more profound engagement in the work of CODEL;
11. Develop new partnerships with U.S.-based ecumenical groups;
12. Use of volunteers of member organizations in projects;

## Communication

13. Increase and improve communication with broader constituency;  
and

## Administration

14. Improved internal planning, monitoring and evaluation.

The above listed objectives and the magnitude of work implied are in addition to the current work load of the staff, although the lines are not sharply drawn in some cases.

## Matching Personnel Resources to Increased Work Load

### Without Additional Full-Time Staff

Several ways to consider increasing the quantity and improving the quality of work without adding full-time staff are:

1. Restructure present slots to take advantage of present staff strengths;
2. Increase efficiency by improving systems and providing more support;
3. Reduce the work load which does not directly contribute to the objectives; and
4. Use consultants, volunteers, indigenous organizations and member organizations to supplement full-time staff work.

With regard to project development, the area coordinators need to spend more time on project development and need better analytical tools to work with. A consultant with a lot of experience in project development and evaluation could work with the staff on the reformulation of the various sets of criteria and formats that CODEL uses in the project process so that they would be easier to work with, easier to communicate to potential project holders and be suitable for conversion into indicators which could be used for project evaluation.

The case load is too high and could easily be cut back without diminishing the impact of CODEL assistance while enhancing the learning value. It is suggested that each Area Coordinator gradually cut the number of countries overseen to 10 from the current average of 15. The primary candidates for cutback would be those countries in which only one project is currently being assisted, and/or those countries where the needs are not so great nor the resources and interests of CODEL

members so high.

Another consideration in diminishing the countries targeted for project development should be whether the conditions are favorable for development work or whether relief and social welfare assistance are priority needs (e.g. Uganda). The member agencies, themselves, and other organizations are better left to respond to those needs.

It has been noted before in this report that the average project load for an Inter-American Foundation field representative, who has primary responsibility for only one country, is approximately 30 active projects with 10 new projects per year and that in 1979 PACT processed 21 new projects in three regions.

The project load for the Latin American/Caribbean Coordinator is acceptable at 44, but the other two regions are far over the 40 figure at 75 and 83. (See Appendix 7, Figure 1.) Even in projects where there was additional funding to the same project holder, the files did not indicate that planning assistance from the Coordinator was unnecessary.

The travel schedules of Area Coordinators are unduly burdensome, even when targets for visitation, projected in the new three-year plan, are reduced to one visit during the life of the project. In addition, Area Coordinators can improve their efficiency by having better support from others on the staff. At present they are doing most of their own clerical work and some of the secretarial work in addition to translation, where applicable.

By reducing the number of countries and consolidating the project loads by cleaning out the old projects from the active list, they would have more time to spend on analysis and communication with project holders. Points 1, 4, 5, and 6 above could be satisfactorily dealt with by making more time in the schedule through a decreased travel and

project load and with the addition of a consultant for guidance and training. Number 2 can not be dealt with in this way and number 3 only partially so: there would be an improvement in individual project management, but not necessarily over-all.

The possibility of using volunteers, indigenous organizations and member organizations to share some of this work load would require additional staff resources to develop and guide their work. In the short term, this does not seem to be of help although it should be considered as a long-term goal.

The Executive Director has primary responsibility for the work listed under points 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14. Some of this work can be shared with the Executive Committee and taken by consultants to a greater extent than is now the case, but particularly in the matter of fund raising this would have the effect of diminishing returns.

The function of Improved Communication with a Broader Constituency, number 13, is currently handled by part-time personnel with the collaboration of Area Coordinators who must provide the information. It is probably possible to continue on this basis.

The area of Learning, numbers 7 and 8, calls for a mix of development experience and management skills which may or may not be available on a part-time basis through CODEL's current consultants. Some consideration should be given to the goal of involving member and indigenous collaborating organizations more fully in the learning process, while balancing it with the need for CODEL to institutionalize the process of learning. The serious undertaking of structured reflection on development experience, especially when conducted in the field, implies increased expenditures (for staff, for travel, and for associated expenses). Since this learning is a major objective for CODEL,

it is well worth considering making such an investment.

Thus we estimate that points 7 and 8 (Learning) cannot be covered using existing staff, nor can point 9 (funding), while possibilities do exist to cover points 10, 11, 12 and 14 with the assistance of committee members. The communications task may or may not be handled effectively by continuing to use a part-time editor.

#### Using Additional Staff Resources

It is clear from the above analysis that the consideration of additional staff resources is inescapable. The plan for concentrated, long-term attention to fund raising from foundations and corporations takes the task outside the potential of the Executive Director to assume in addition to his other duties. A full-time fund-raising person is needed unless CODEL abandons its plan to tap foundations and corporations.

Similarly, steady attention to the learning process clearly calls for another full-time person. The need for independent critical review of proposals coupled with the need for over-all coordination of project development suggests that it may be feasible to combine project management tasks and learning tasks in the same staff person. This, of course, assumes that CODEL can locate an individual with the background and the skills needed for those two tasks. To combine them in one person would be advantageous because the data from which learning is drawn is the same data which the individual would be processing as a function of project management.

The quality of secretarial and clerical staff has often been neglected in reviews of staff effectiveness, yet much more can be accomplished with excellent support staff than without them. The Area Coordinators are so accustomed to doing everything for them-

selves when out in the field that they may not be aware of the possibility of depending more heavily on support staff.

From the other side, it is likely that secretarial and clerical staff have been hired to function as a pool so that is not planned that they take major responsibility for any particular regional coordinator. The possibility of assigning secretarial staff to Coordinators should be considered in light of cost/benefit. It is likely that upgrading of secretarial staff and the restructuring of their duties would help improve effectiveness and efficiency.

## IX. Relationships Between CODEL and AID

As CODEL is working in partnership with its member agencies and collaborating organizations in the field, so is CODEL working in partnership with the Agency for International Development through its support of CODEL's activities via the mechanism of a Development Support Grant. At the request of CODEL, this evaluation includes CODEL's relationship with AID and, in turn, AID's relationship with CODEL, not only at the headquarters level but also at the mission level in countries where CODEL is working.

### AID Provides Needed Flexibility

On the whole, CODEL staff and members are pleased with the working relationship they have had with AID/PVC, the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation which provides funds through the Development Support Grants. Because the application of these funds to specific projects is left to CODEL, using its criteria and project process, CODEL has the flexibility to respond with funding as soon as a project is approved. The availability of AID money has a demonstrated drawing power as member contributions have risen gradually over the years.

### Member Funding

Headway has been made in getting members to untie their funding. The Maryknoll Fathers, Saint Columbans Foreign Mission Society and the White Fathers have all provided project funds which, by and large, are

undesigned. CODEL would have more flexibility if more member organizations would follow this lead, but the current feeling is that most would prefer to respond to a specific project.

Member agencies have not yet seen their way clear to providing operating expenses as part of the grant funds. CODEL should consider the feasibility of requesting that 30 percent of all project funds be available for costs of grant development and management. The effect of equitable sharing of costs would be to increase member awareness of the necessary costs of grant management and give CODEL more independence from AID.

AID's feeling that they are carrying a disproportionate share of the operating expenses (see the Inspector General's draft audit dated July 2, 1981) seems to be based on a misunderstanding and lack of specific agreement in the Development Support Grant. It is only fair to note that PACT, an organization similar to CODEL, receives most of its project and operating funds from AID. In that case the members do not contribute funds.

#### Drawbacks to Funding Arrangements

Assuming the project holder does not object to government funding, AID funding permits CODEL to supply the first payment so the project can get underway while CODEL solicits responses to the proposal from its member organizations. Since CODEL's approval is always conditional upon their ability to raise funds, this does cause some uneasiness on the part of the project holder and may occasionally jeopardize the smooth implementation of a project.

### Operational Program Grants

CODEL's attitude toward the Operational Program Grants is, however, another matter. According to a 1980 survey of member and colleague organizations both in the United States and overseas commissioned by the Executive Committee of CODEL, there are significant drawbacks to OPGs insofar as CODEL programs are concerned. The consultants made six recommendations for policy considerations that were accepted by the Executive Committee in 1980 "with the understanding that the procedures recommended are open to further ramifications." These are listed below as an indication of CODEL's resources for grant administration measured against the needs of their clients according to the consultants. No action has been taken to date by the Executive Committee to implement the recommendations.

1. CODEL should develop its capacity to support programs which involve longer-term, comprehensive planning, considering OPGs as an option for funding projects which meet CODEL's criteria;
2. The most appropriate role for CODEL is that of a facilitator of OPG resources directly to implementing organizations, and it should be a signatory on OPG project agreements only when no other alternative is available;
3. CODEL should ensure that any larger project it presents as an OPG has a clear, verifiable contribution from other sources of at least 25 percent of the budget requested from AID;
4. Any further involvement of CODEL in OPG-type funding requires that an explicit procedure be established to ensure a more extensive review of potential projects and clear administrative procedures both for the benefit of CODEL and the implementing organizations.
5. In the planning of any larger project, CODEL should provide up to 10 percent as a contingency fund;
6. CODEL should consider all alternatives to fund larger, long-term proposals that it commits itself to supporting, including:
  - a. Create the necessary communications with European funders to make the possibility of co-financing more coordinated and rational.

- b. Encourage members to contribute to these larger programs through CODEL, thereby making it possible to use AID funds received from the General Support Grant on a matching basis.<sup>1</sup>

The current climate within CODEL indicates that when the three OPGs terminate, it is highly unlikely that CODEL will seek any others. The staff load to administer these grants has been a burden to the Africa Area Coordinator, especially considering the special problems which have arisen during the course of implementation and evaluation. CODEL and many of its member organizations and colleague agencies in the field have needs for resources provided in a different mode.

#### Project Holder Attitudes Toward CODEL and AID

During the evaluation, eight project sites were visited in the field--some of them receiving AID funding and others not. (See Appendix 4, Figures 1 and 2.) When the question was raised with the project holders about their feelings toward AID funding, a number of answers were given. Generally, project holders were satisfied with the arrangement CODEL maintains of providing the option to receive private funding only. They were not especially troubled by the mixture of AID funds within the project and were not particularly fearful or suspicious of U.S. government influence via project funding. Of course, countries where this is a more serious consideration were not visited.

There were two problems with AID funding which surfaced in the field. One in India concerned the requirement by AID/India at the time of the award of the grant that excess currency funds be used. In order to use excess currency funds, it is necessary to gain approval from the host country government which, in many cases as indeed in this one, proved impossible to attain. (Often host country governments take

the position that allocation of counterpart funds to foreign PVOs constitutes "raiding the government's money and decreases the importation of foreign currency.")

CODEL was eventually successful in having AID lift this requirement. The project holders misunderstood the situation and, even though private funds were provided, the project implementation was delayed, so they thought, by barriers created by the U.S. government. The actual situation as explained to them by the Area Coordinator was so complicated that it is unlikely that it was completely understood.

When the question of the implementing agencies' attitude toward U.S. government funds in the project, was raised in Sri Lanka, it was recalled that at the time of funding the political relations between the two countries were so strained that any use of AID funds would have jeopardized the project. The project holder was therefore glad that only private funds were made available for the project.

#### Mission Relationships

The USAID missions' view of CODEL, according to the information gleaned from Area Coordinators and brief calls on the missions in Sri Lanka and Kenya, indicates that even though CODEL keeps the mission informed of its activities within the country, primarily through sharing of documents, mission personnel may not be aware of the program nor perhaps very appreciative of it.

When an attempt was made to discover the reason for this attitude, it seemed as though several factors may be combining to create it: the extreme pressure on USAID staff which does not permit even the PVO officer to gain an in-depth knowledge of the small projects undertaken by CODEL; the mind-set of mission personnel toward PVO programs in

general, which in some cases is negative because the programs are seen as being outside the purview of the mission director; and last, but not least, a life's accumulation of sometimes negative ideas about voluntary organizations and their contribution to development.

CODEL, although quite satisfied with its relationships under the Development Support Grant, and having assuaged some members' fears of government influence by the Center of Concern study,<sup>2</sup> nevertheless feels that it has been the undue center of AID attention this past year. The very limited staff resources of CODEL have been taxed, not only by this evaluation, but also by an Inspector General's audit in addition to CODEL's own financial audit. This may have resulted from lack of planning and coordination among government agencies; it has been burdensome for CODEL.

#### For the Future

It is hoped that in the future AID and other government bureaus which are responsible for administering public monies will better coordinate their plans so that all the audits and evaluations of a particular project or program are not conducted in the same year.

The question of CODEL's choosing to work in countries which are not on the AID list for cooperation is, CODEL believes, a matter which is properly left for it to decide. CODEL intends to maintain its criteria for selection of countries in which to work and for selection of development projects to assist. CODEL hopes that AID will continue to give it the freedom to work in countries where there may be extreme poverty although those countries may not be on the AID list.

---

1

Daniel Santo Pietro and Kenneth McDowell, CODEL OPG Survey: An Analysis of CODEL Involvement in Operational Program Grants from AID, CODEL, Inc., September 1980, page 7.

2

Elizabeth Schmidt, Jane Blewett and Peter Henriot, Religious Private Voluntary Organizations and the Question of Government Funding--Final Report, Probe, Third World Studies, 1980?.

## X. Findings and Recommendations

### General

CODEL has set a high task for itself--to respond to the needs of the disadvantaged in developing countries in ways that affirm their autonomy, self-reliance and independence; to work together ecumenically; and to learn together about the process of development. Other development assistance agencies, both governmental and private, have aspired to some of these goals; no one has attained them all.

CODEL has always spoken of itself in terms that do not limit it to channeling resources, but include roles as a catalyst, demonstrator, learner, provider of information and technical advisor in collaboration with others working in the field of human development.

CODEL works through its member organizations, striving for collaboration among all groups which seek to help the poor, but most especially between Protestant and Catholic organizations. That its goals are not always fully met attests to the difficulty of the task. Development, the process by which people change their social and economic conditions with the expectation of improving their daily lives, is, by definition, not a one-time event but a continuous process. When one seeks to better understand the process of development as CODEL as an institution does, time to observe, listen, discuss, experience, reflect and act must be part of the process.

As participants in the process of development, CODEL must give of its experience as well as learn from those with whom it works. Building the capacity to plan and manage their own development after the termina-

tion of outside involvement assures that, whatever the initial material resource situation, the participants will be able to manage better than they could before the CODEL intervention.

Learning requires spending time with the participants and implementors associated with the project as well as with the sponsoring organization's staff in headquarters. The quality of time spent must be enhanced by going beyond the often unavoidable and sometimes valuable ceremonial aspects of a visit to a sharing of the tasks of planning and managing the implementation of the project, responding to the problems of the moment as best one can, and constantly questioning the results. Evaluation then becomes a constant in the process of technical assistance so that it is as natural as breathing for everyone involved in a project to raise questions about the value of the work and to use the answers to modify the implementation of the project.

In its most recent period of growth, CODEL has invested more of its resources in the funding of projects and less in the provision of management, technical assistance and learning.

### General

#### Recommendation #1

Re-examine CODEL's role to determine whether primary emphasis should be placed on funding projects or on using projects which it supports as learning laboratories for the improvement of development assistance as expressed in CODEL's criteria and its three-year plan.

Should CODEL make a commitment to the latter course, it will be necessary to provide more resources for collaboration with project proponents, members and colleague agencies in:

- a. The initial information gathering, analysis and goal setting

which will facilitate the formulation of projects which more closely adhere to CODEL's criteria;

- b. Implementation planning, management and monitoring; and
- c. In-depth evaluation, learning and sharing of that learning.

#### Recommendation #2

Shift a portion of the monies presently allocated for funding projects into program support over the next three years so that CODEL's development assistance is improved in terms of:

- a. Project quality measured according to CODEL's criteria;
- b. Project documentation and management; and
- c. Project evaluation, learning and sharing of that learning among project holders, members and colleague agencies.

#### Reaching the Disadvantaged.

Donors to CODEL are getting quite a bargain. CODEL's projects reach the disadvantaged, an accomplishment that is difficult for most development assistance agencies to achieve, especially at such a low operating cost. Member donors, on the one hand, and AID, on the other, are getting the benefits of the other's matching funds. However, there is a lack of specific information about the beneficiaries and analysis of program objectives and results.

In most project documents the analysis of the condition of the people to be helped is limited to a statement that they are poor or disadvantaged; little supporting evidence is provided, nor is there much analysis as to the reasons for this status. Additional information and analysis would improve the effective allocation of resources and considerably facilitate the evaluation of results. It would also enhance the critical ability of the Project Committee and facilitate learning

about the process and dynamics of development.

The documents also indicate a failure in many projects to focus on the process by which people will be enabled to take charge of their own development in the course of project implementation. Project proponents tend to focus on the provision of material goods (e.g. agricultural inputs and services such as health and education) and their resulting impact on the physical condition of the target group.

This emphasis is acceptable to AID and many other development assistance agencies, but it does not fulfill CODEL's own objectives.

#### Recommendation #3

In order to be consonant with CODEL's criteria, CODEL staff, in collaboration with members, colleagues and project proponents/holders, should gather and analyze information on the socio-economic situation of the people to be helped and the manner in which development is to take place.

This can be approached on three levels: (1) regional strategies can be devised after gathering and analyzing basic data on countries; (2) countries chosen for focus can be further analyzed for needs, resources and conditions favoring development; and (3) projects within these countries can refer to the larger context while providing information and analysis on the local situation in greater detail.

Information at all levels should be specific to the types of projects CODEL participates in (community development, education, medical and agricultural). Basic country data might therefore include population disaggregated by sex and age (M/F under 14, over 14), per capita Gross National Product, Physical Quality of Life Index, life expectancy (M/F), literacy (M/F), school enrollment (M/F), population in

urban areas, major subsistence and cash crops, population of labor force in agriculture (M/F), land owned by top 10% and bottom 10% of the population, population growth rate, infant deaths (during first years of life), major causes of disease and death, per capita calorie supply as a percentage of requirements, and percentage of population with reasonable access to a safe water supply. This data is being gathered by other agencies so it is readily available.

CODEL also needs to include data on its member and colleague resources in that country, a list of projects it has participated in, and field contacts made in the past. Other resources and favorable/unfavorable conditions may be noted--e.g. government policy, presence of other donor agencies, U.S. PVOs, etc.

When strategies are devised, they should be compared across regions; to the extent there are common areas of focus (e.g. provision of water) experiences should be exchanged and a body of knowledge developed from project and other sources. In addition to improving communication among CODEL staff, efforts can be made to involve Project Committee members (and others who are interested) in topical information exchange sessions.

CODEL may choose several ways to involve its member agencies in the formulation of country, regional and agency-wide strategies for project development and learning: staff might do the work; a task force might be named; or ideas might be solicited from the general membership. However it is done, the better the quantity and quality of participation, the better the product.

Involvement of field-side persons is also important and can probably best be done through a combination of written communications and their participation in topical meetings in the field.

### Ecumenical Collaboration in Development

Ecumenical collaboration has grown within the context of CODEL-funded projects: 65 percent of the projects funded in the first five years of project involvement were jointly sponsored, compared with 82 percent in the current portfolio. The collaboration of local organizations also seems to be higher, although it could not be measured quantitatively. The quality of collaboration is even more difficult to evaluate, although project holders interviewed in the field spoke of the value of such collaboration despite a stated initial skepticism based on the difficulties of breaking down barriers.

Among members, collaboration has improved from the perspective of quality, although the number has remained steady. The best measurement is the amount of funds contributed to projects, especially in cases where the funder and the implementor are of different faiths. The increase in the amount of undesignated funds also indicates a greater trust and willingness to work together. According to the staff, member participation in the work of CODEL has improved as measured by attendance at meetings of committees and participation in other tasks.

More time needs to be devoted to learning about the processes by which collaboration is achieved and barriers overcome. On the basis of visits to project sites, it seems that inter-faith collaboration may be hindered in cases where the project holder is attached to a religious institution, is a strong leader and is identified (by him/herself or by the community) as "owning" the project.

#### Recommendation #4

The understanding of the dynamics of ecumenical collaboration should be explored in discussions by those who have worked together on

projects. In situations where such collaboration has been tried, but not achieved, CODEL might be able to lend its good offices to bring people together for discussion.

#### Recommendation #5

CODEL should continue to encourage collaboration of its member and colleague agencies in situations where the project proponent is an organization with a particular religious emphasis. In addition CODEL needs to wield its powers of persuasion to foster the creation of new organizations which are ecumenical in nature and can facilitate community participation in project planning, implementation and evaluation.

#### Project Documentation and Management

Project management has suffered because of the increase in project load and the decrease in personnel coupled with staff turnover which adversely affected project development and management. The burden of administering Operational Program Grants has also been a factor.

Neither the process for project development defined by the Administrative Procedures for Sub-Grants nor the formats for data collection and analysis are being used in their entirety. Although some simplification is helpful, thorough analysis has become the victim of the pared-down system.

#### Recommendation #6

Improve project documentation by following the existing project process, by using existing formats such as the Project Application Form and new formats such as those developed for this evaluation (eg Checklist), and by recording data in the files.

## Recommendation #7

Strengthen project management by improving:

- a. Information gathering and analysis;
- b. Technical assistance with the objective of capacitating the project holders in planning, financial and progress reporting and evaluation;
- c. Feedback to project holders;
- d. Control; and
- e. Support to Area Coordinators.

Specific measures might include:

### Information gathering and information.

- 1) Use a Country Profile and Country/Area Strategy to place each project into a larger context;
- 2) Refine and simplify the CODEL criteria in a more concise and complete manner. Do not use a multitude of criteria as it is burdensome and confusing to the proponent;
- 3) Add other criteria to those now being used (see Appendix 2.6, Checklist);
- 4) Broaden the use of indigenous institutional resources for both the generation and the evaluation of project proposals;
- 5) Use the Project Application Form, even if it means that the Area Coordinator has to fill it in from the proposal. It has the vital questions for analysis that are now being missed, e.g. who will be responsible for implementing the project and a list of qualifications;
- 6) If possible, make a field visit before accepting the proposal if the group is new to CODEL, if the amount requested is large, or if there are any questions;
- 7) Attach the proposal to the Project Summary so the Committees have more information upon which to base their decisions;
- 8) Have the Area Coordinator prepare a memo (Issues Paper) citing the important issues in the project in preparation for the staff critique;

- 9) Use the staff critique to further refine issues and recommendations to be presented to the Committees; and
- 10) Project holders should be encouraged to report in Spanish or French, and CODEL should provide translations for its members.

#### Technical assistance.

- 1) When needed, give technical assistance on planning, review implementation plans for feasibility, and devise an evaluation plan tailored to the project;
- 2) More time on the project site (suggest a minimum of 2 - 3 days) should be scheduled in travel plans to allow more in-depth analysis and the provision of technical assistance. Better use of the time should be made by structuring the visit, perhaps by using a checklist which could become the basis for the report; and
- 3) The "agenda" of project management matters to be taken up during the Area Coordinators' field visit should be prepared in advance and the project holder notified so as to prepare for working on those points which need strengthening (such as financial and progress reporting).

#### Feedback

- 1) Send the proponent a copy of the Project Summary, and invite feedback to assure that both sides view the project in the same way;
- 2) Revise the Grant Letter of Agreement to make it more specific and to include all the terms of the contract (such as the proposal);
- 3) Legal (GLOA) agreements and attachments should be written in Spanish or French in cases where the project holder does not speak English. (If absolutely necessary, the English translation can be attached and signed also; both forms should be cleared by legal counsel so they can be used interchangeably); and
- 4) Substantive feedback on reports and evaluations should be given in writing to project holders with suggestions for improvement of reporting questions to elicit missing information. Indication should be made whether the reports are satisfactory.

#### Control

- 1) Assure that no funds are transmitted before the signed

Grant Letter of Agreement is received;

- 2) Include the costs of auditing in the budget of each proposal which exceeds \$5000 per annum;
- 3) Review the usefulness of audit information, and consider alternative financial reporting which might yield more valuable information;
- 4) Tighten the quality control and timeliness of reporting; consider making subsequent-year funding conditional on satisfactory reporting; if reports are a condition of the grant, do not transmit additional funds unless the reports are satisfactory; send technical assistance if needed;
- 5) Maintain project information in files in the designated format. File field trip report on project in that file as part of the record. Regard forms more positively--not as a hindrance but as a management tool; and
- 6) Clearly designate the beginning and ending dates of the project as well as reporting dates; set up an automatic notification system to give project holders six weeks notice of reports due. If time extensions are given, they should be expressed in dates. The proponent should know in advance that he/she has to ask for an extension or a major change in the use of the funds; this should be discussed, not sent only as a written notice.

#### Support

- 1) CODEL should consider hiring a Projects Manager to develop and coordinate these activities. He/she should be experienced in project development and evaluation and be well-grounded in a development philosophy consonant with CODEL's; and
- 2) Responsibility for project processing should be shared by other staff members; at present it rests almost exclusively with the Area Coordinators.
- 3) Give Area Coordinators more clerical and secretarial support;
- 4) CODEL should include persons other than staff and members in the project review, either as an independent review or as a Projects Committee consisting of non-members.

These improvements imply a need for the allocation of additional resources to successfully implement this recommendation.

### Development Impact

Considering the state of the art in measuring the impact of project interventions to development and in applying that knowledge on development projects, coupled with the relatively small amounts of resources that are channeled to projects through CODEL, a balanced conclusion would be that CODEL's projects are not doing too badly in terms of contributing to development as characterized by improvements in the quality of life and the provision of basic human needs. This statement is subjective, comparative and largely a matter of judgment.

The statement is necessarily unsubstantiated because the accomplishment of project objectives, and, in turn, their contribution to achievement of a higher-order goal, is difficult to ascertain in most CODEL-funded projects. One of the characteristics of the poor is that they lack resources, both material resources to use in development as well as human resources to plan and manage the implementation of development. Thus the lack of well-conceived objectives and the indicators necessary to measure achievement are indicative of the level of development of CODEL's clientele. In many cases reports are either not provided or tend to focus on activities and inputs/outputs rather than on results achieved.

Field visits by CODEL staff tend to focus on the same level, while attempting at the same time to assess by observation and interviews whether the participants are better off after the project intervention than they were before. Visits also provide an opportunity to talk about problems in project implementation which necessitate modifications to the implementation plan. Given the level of development, the lack of objectives and base-line data, this is about all anyone could do.

This fact does not let CODEL off the hook, however, for CODEL aspires to higher accomplishments:

CODEL's primary goal is to encourage and build upon ecumenical collaboration among persons and institutions in response to, and in support of, the self-determined, realizable, self-directed and environmentally-sound development activities of the socially, economically and politically disenfranchised peoples of developing countries.<sup>1</sup>

CODEL can assist the disenfranchised not only by providing material resources, but also by helping people learn how to better manage their existing resources. CODEL aspires to assist people to take charge of their own development and to achieve self-reliance. In short, CODEL wants its clients not only to have more and to know more, but to be more. The projects visited in the field and the review of project files indicate that CODEL must invest more time, energy and resources if it is to fully achieve the results it expects.

#### Recommendation #8

CODEL might begin to focus on these issues by reconsidering its criteria--how they apply to particular projects and how a more profound impact on development could be achieved using staff, members, indigenous organizations, the beneficiaries and the occasional use of others with similar philosophical positions and experience in working in the field.

#### Recommendation #9

To improve the developmental impact of the projects in which it participates, CODEL should seek ways to respond to the needs of its project holders for technical assistance, especially in project planning, management and evaluation, specifically:

- a. Develop a common staff philosophy about the workings of development through discussion and interchange on proposed projects,

and apply this philosophy to the project process as well as communicating it to members and applicants. For example, it would be beneficial to define exactly what is meant by 'participation' and to develop some indicators for acceptable levels of activity in this area.

- b. Provide for improved technical assistance and more in-depth dialogue between CODEL staff and project proponents/holders. This can be facilitated by refining the criteria, developing strategies, and planning travel schedules to allow for more time at each project site. Some staff training might also be helpful.
- c. Improve the application of existing criteria to project components. Include time in the work plans for in-depth staff critiques of proposed projects before they are sent to the Projects Committee. Such reviews might benefit from the participation of a facilitator who is experienced in project analysis.
- d. The improvement in quality of projects should be given priority over an increase in the number of projects handled by CODEL.

#### Learning and Sharing

The learning within CODEL is primarily drawn from its project experience which, as noted above, provides limited information, subjective impressions of the effect on the lives of the beneficiaries, and little in the way of analysis of CODEL's deeper development aspirations. Information is gleaned from proponent's proposals and reports, from trip reports of the Area Coordinators, and occasionally from members.

Sharing of this information is done through the Project Summary

provided to members who sponsor the project and review proposals (on the Projects and Executive Committees), as well as to those who may be interested in funding the project. Semi-annual updates in the Comprehensive Project List are disseminated to the same audience. Interesting reports are occasionally shared among members or highlighted in the CODEL News. When Area Coordinators travel, they usually carry these publications to project holders and collaborating organizations, at least to those who speak English. Some are on the regular mailing list.

CODEL feels that the main learning takes place in the context of project review by the Projects and Executive Committees. Yet it can be seen that the information and analysis provided in the Project Summary is very limited. Moreover, due to the press of committee business, only fifteen or twenty minutes are usually spent considering each project.

It is apparent that CODEL has been a partner in a number of effective programs. Probably the most critical issue which a development organization must face is determining the value and most beneficial use of a "good" program. Of course, it has an intrinsic worth as an example of the accomplishment of the agency to support the requests for continuing and increased support from funding groups.

The most difficult problem which an organization such as CODEL must face is how this success can be beneficial to other on-going and future programs. The temptation is to replicate the program in various other locations because it is successful and therefore must be the answer to the problem which it solves. Experience has shown that it is not the program design which made it successful, but rather the process of planning and development which took into account the unique problems, resources, needs, objectives and participant characteristics. The program design will only work in that setting--but the planning and

development process can be replicated although it will produce a different program design, but one which has a high probability of being successful.

Recommendation #10

CODEL should take steps to analyze effective successful programs to ascertain the developmental and planning processes which were undertaken and define these methodologies so that they may be offered to other existing and prospective proponents for guidance and even replication.

If it is impossible to permit the Area Coordinators to concentrate their attention on a limited number of "demonstration" projects, then it is recommended that CODEL utilize knowledgeable consultants in the field of program planning to do case studies of selected successful programs which would provide an historical account and analysis of the process which was undertaken and led to the programmatic end product. These studies could then serve not only as guides to other groups seeking to develop programs to meet their needs, but as a basis for a program planning review system which could be applied in screening future funding candidates by CODEL.

Recommendation #11

Workshops, seminars and colloquia should be held in the U.S. and in the field to exchange experience and explore ways in which the quality of development assistance can be improved. Funds should be made available by both private and government donors to CODEL and regarded as a part of CODEL's regular program.

## Recommendation #12

The quantity and quality of information and analysis in the documents distributed to members should be improved, per the preceding recommendations. Project holders and collaborating institutions should receive these documents, or at least those pertaining to their projects, on a regular basis and be invited to comment on them.

## Funding and the Use of Resources

Based on FY 1980 data (the latest year for which data was available at the time of the evaluation), funding levels for projects are about evenly matched between AID and member contributions (AID \$539,349; members/others \$649,345).

CODEL established at the time of the Development Program Grant the target of matching or exceeding AID's contribution to project costs and splitting program and administrative support costs 40 percent CODEL, 60 percent AID. (Note: this does not include OPGs or the Environmental Development Grant.) No proportion was fixed in the Development Support Grant. This target was met in FY 1980.

The average amount of funding CODEL approves per project per year, using the April 1981 Comprehensive Project Review as the current project portfolio and assuming a three-year project life, is \$14,333. The 136 projects in the portfolio (according to the evaluator's count) are distributed among three regions: 51 in Africa (including 3 OPGs), 57 in Asia-Pacific, and 28 in Latin America-Caribbean. This project portfolio is approximately equivalent to the number of projects in the first five

years of CODEL's project work.

Plans for the 1981-84 period are to increase the number of projects in the portfolio by 15 per year. One Area Coordinator per region is handling the project work. Plans for the coming period are to raise increasing amounts of funds from the members and to develop foundation and corporate sources.

Recommendation #13

Consolidate project work, developing fewer projects in fewer countries, but funding projects for higher amounts and longer periods of time.

Recommendation #14

Allocate more funds to project management and learning functions, including the use of indigenous organizations.

Recommendation #15

Increase the amount of undesignated member contributions, giving CODEL the ability to pledge the total amount approved at the time of approval, rather than keeping the project holder in a state of uncertainty until the funds can be sourced.

Increase member contributions to program costs by having members agree to assign a portion of the funds they contribute for projects to cover program costs, giving CODEL the ability to pay half of the combined program and support costs from private funds. This would be more realistic, would result in a more equitable sharing of costs, and would give CODEL more independence.

Recommendation #16

In view of the current financial climate and scarcity of foundation

funding for international activities, concentrate fund-raising efforts on membership while building up contacts for long-term development of foundation and corporation funding sources.

### Staff

Full-time professional staff has not been increased as planned in the 1978-81 proposal which suggested the addition of project analysis and communication slots. The position of Chief of Operations is open (or has been eliminated). These duties have been divided among the three Area Coordinators and the Office Manager who has been given the joint title of Projects Assistant. This is currently an overload for two regions which makes in-depth project development, adequate management and appropriate learning from projects impossible. Project load has increased and is projected to grow by 15 projects per year over the next three years. Communications responsibilities rest with the part-time editor of CODEL News and interpretation consultant. One clerk-typist has been added to the secretarial staff, making a total of three support staff.

CODEL needs to concentrate, intensify and deepen work on projects in a way which improves and increases:

- a. Provision of technical assistance by CODEL to its clientele (project proponents/holders, member agencies and colleague agencies) especially in project planning, management and monitoring/evaluation;
- b. Learning about the process of development from project experiences; and
- c. Sharing that learning with CODEL clientele so that not only CODEL's projects, but also those in which only member and

colleague agencies participate, are improved in terms of effective and efficient use of resources in ways which result in increased self-determination, self-reliance and improved capability of project beneficiaries to direct their own development; and

- d. Quality control of the development, selection and monitoring of projects in CODEL's portfolio.

In order to achieve these results, CODEL must consider: (a) changing the area coordinator projects-ratio, either by adding staff or subtracting projects; (b) cutting down the number of countries each person covers; (c) delegating project development and learning work to member and colleague agencies in the field (which will nonetheless require CODEL management); and (d) setting up different categories of projects, some with intensive participation and perhaps others with merely adequate management and monitoring.

The same intensity of CODEL participation is required whether a project is funded for \$2,000 or for \$200,000 if learning is to occur. Often smaller projects (in terms of funding) require even more technical assistance than larger ones due to lack of management experience among the relatively poorer beneficiaries. Sometimes smaller projects have relatively higher development impact than larger projects which may dampen self-reliance through the provision of outside resources in quantities and ways which are excessive or inappropriate to the local situation.

#### Recommendation #17

Provide for quality control, coordination, continuity and comparison of project work across regions. Although it would be pos-

sible to coordinate and compare across regions by instituting regular staff projects review sessions, it is doubtful that the quality control function can be provided without adding a person to the existing staff. This person would be in a good position to handle the learning and technical assistance planning as well as management.

Recommendation #18

Improve CODEL's capacity to provide technical assistance and to gather and disseminate learning from projects by:

- a. Improving staff knowledge and skills (for example, through learning from other organizations which operate in the same mode);
- b. Using persons outside the staff with pertinent development experience for special short-term tasks (such as independent project review); and
- c. Developing the use of indigenous institutions and members for these functions.

Recommendation #19

Gradually shift the focus for project development to the poorer countries (and the poorer areas within them) which have at least two member agencies working there, and consider instituting funding ceilings on countries with high levels of funding.

AID-CODEL Relationships

Arrangements for unrestricted project funding serve the common development goals of AID and CODEL well. In most cases, they enable CODEL to provide funding as soon as the projects are approved (exceptions are project holders who indicate they prefer only private

funding). This enables the project to get underway while CODEL sources private contributions among its members.

AID is able to participate in assistance to the disadvantaged at costs far lower than possible in government-to-government arrangements. In terms of impact on CODEL, the ability to source private and government funding and develop projects without the implications of government interest has eased the fears of some project holders and members. However, CODEL has had an unusual number of audits and evaluations from government this year which has taxed their small staff.

Recommendation #20

AID should continue its partnership with CODEL and encourage the organization to develop in the direction of its objectives.

Recommendation #21

If at all possible, the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation should coordinate audits and evaluations so that they do not take place during the same period of time.

CODEL MEMBERS  
May 1, 1981

\*American Leprosy Mission  
 Atonement Friars  
 Capuchin Fathers  
 Christian Brothers Conference  
 Christian Children's Fund  
 \*Comboni Missionaries "The Verona Fathers"  
 Communication Foundation for Asia  
 Congregation of the Holy Ghost  
 \*Congregational Christian Service Committee  
 \*Divine Word Missionaries  
 \*Division of Overseas Ministries/NCC  
 \*Episcopal Church  
 Erie Diocesan Mission  
 \*Franciscan Fathers  
 \*Franciscan Missionaries of Mary  
 \*Holy Cross Fathers  
 International Voluntary Services, Inc.  
 \*Lutheran World Relief  
 \*Marist Missions  
 \*Maryknoll Fathers  
 \*Maryknoll Sisters  
 Meals for Millions/Freedom from Hunger Foundation  
 \*Medical Missionaries of Mary  
 \*Medical Mission Sisters  
 \*Mill Hill Missionaries  
 \*Missionaries of Africa "The White Fathers"  
 \*National Catholic Rural Life Conference  
 \*P.I.M.E. Fathers  
 Precious Blood Fathers  
 \*Secretariat for Latin America/NCCB  
 \*Society of the Holy Child Jesus  
 \*St. Columbans Foreign Mission Society  
 St. Patrick Fathers  
 Technoserve, Inc.  
 UCBWM - United Church Board for World Ministries  
 \*United Methodist Committee on Relief  
 \*YMCA - International Division  
 YWCA

Members at Large

\*Dr. James MacCracken  
 \*Mr. Ellsworth G. Stanton, III

\*Board of Directors

## EVALUATION CRITERIA

The grantee shall submit to CODEL, on a semi-annual basis and at completion of the grant activity, an evaluation report, as conducted by grantee in accordance with the evaluation criteria mutually agreed upon by CODEL and grantee within the next six months. CODEL criteria are listed below. CODEL may also request the right, upon prior arrangement, to participate with grantee in mid-term or final evaluation activities.

1. What has been accomplished by the project to date (observable evidence)?
2. What has the project accomplished in terms of affecting individuals or families; informal or formal groups or local organizations?
3. What differences exist between what was accomplished and what you feel might have been achieved?
4. What major problems were encountered in the process to date?
5. What unexpected results (positive or negative) have occurred as a result of the progress to date?
6. How will the project activity continue to function and/or expand when outside support has diminished (ceased)?
7. How will local support and leadership relate to continued project activity and/or growth?
8. Can you draw any lessons from the project experience thus far that would be important in assisting other projects?
9. What difference has the CODEL contribution made, thus far, in terms of:
  - a. Encouraging cooperation among local organizations, churches and persons?
  - b. Provision of technical assistance, introduction of a new thrust or development approaches?
  - c. The provision of project assistance which no one else could provide?

Source: RENEWED DIRECTIONS, 1 July 1981 - 30 June 1984, Appendix I.

PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE  
TO GUIDE CODEL MEMBERS IN PROJECT PLANNING  
(CODEL CRITERIA)

1. The primary goal of a development project should be to assist the socio-economically disadvantaged to participate more fully in the economic and political life of their country and develop, insofar as possible, community self-reliance.
2. Projects should be designed to meet needs which have been accorded the highest priority by the local community and should be implemented in cooperation with those persons who will be directly affected by the anticipated results of the projects.
3. To insure that development projects are interwoven with the socio-economic fabric of a community and ultimately become the responsibility of the community after a limited and prescribed period of outside support, it is essential that the potential of local resources to meet project needs are carefully surveyed and clearly defined in the planning of the project.
4. To insure the effective participation of local personnel in development projects and in public service programs, adequate educational training programs shall be provided whenever necessary. Special attention should also be given to increasing the effective utilization of indigenous natural and material resources. All such programs should be designed to foster initiative, self-determination and self-reliance.
5. Development projects should demonstrate a positive and complementary working relationship between local churches and development organizations, as well as CODEL members and their local counterparts; extending to and including regional and national development organizations, private as well as governmental, involved in any country's development process. Such relationships may occur in the pre-planning, planning and implementation phases of a project, and may include contributions by way of consultative services, contribution of personnel, funds or buildings and equipment, as well as joint participation in the implementation of the project itself.
6. Projects should take cognizance of existing and potential problems of the physical environment. Where problems are recognized, project holders should seek to implement the program in such a way that remedies can be applied where appropriate.
7. While development projects are activities in witness of our Christian faith, they are to be directed toward the resolution of socio-economic problems, and are to be distinctly separate from proselytizing or evangelistic goals.

Source: RENEWED DIRECTIONS, 1 July 1981 - 30 June 1984, Appendix H.

## PRINCIPLES OF EXCLUSION

Certain categories of projects are excluded from consideration by CODEL at this time. The major categories to be excluded are:

1. Projects which are principally designed to serve sectarian purposes.
2. Education projects which train nationals for purposes other than specific roles in the development process, or which prepare U.S. citizens for careers other than in specific development projects or programs.
3. Projects which represent duplication of efforts of other development programs in the same area.
4. Projects which call principally for building funds, unless it is clearly demonstrated that there is no other way to meet the related socio-economic need, and unless it can be shown that the costs of operating these facilities will be met from local contributions within a limited and prescribed period of time.

\*\*\*

REV 3/80

CRITERIA FOR PROJECT SUPPORT  
ASIA/PACIFIC REGION

The primary vehicle which will be employed by CODEL in its relationship with development agencies and people involved in development programs will continue to be through project development and support. The criteria for CODEL's project support and implementation as was shared in my recent visit to Asia and the Pacific are as follows:

1. The project should show some evidence of ecumenical collaboration.
2. All projects should be designed with and/or by persons and structures at the grass-roots level.
3. Projects accepted must show evidence of having as part of their objectives, the development of leadership at the grass-roots level.
4. There should be a clear indication and commitment of local resources as part of the over-all contribution to the project for which funds are being requested.
5. As much as possible, the project should be reflective of the local and national priorities.
6. Projects should have a potential for demonstrating:
  - a. The uniqueness of a local population's initiative;
  - b. The potential to be replicated in other communities and other areas, and other nations.
  - c. The potential for learning some new and improved procedure in project design.
7. All projects funded by CODEL should have a built-in educational quotient so that those who participate in the project building and execution will learn from the involvement.
8. All projects accepted for funding will be with the clear understanding of the project holder that there will be an evaluation of the project which will be required by CODEL. The terms of the evaluation will be agreed upon prior to the granting of funds.

Source: Several, but see Appendix II A, "Report on Field Trip," Dr. James J. Thomas, April 17 - May 17, 1981.

COMPARISON OF PROJECTS IN  
CURRENT PORTFOLIO WITH  
5-YEAR PERIOD 1975-79

<u>Country</u>	<u>Number of Countries</u>		<u>Number of Projects</u>		<u>Number of Joint Projects</u>		<u>Percentage of Joint Projects</u>	
	<u>75-79</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>75-79</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>75-79</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>75-79</u>	<u>81</u>
Africa	14	17	60	51	54	40	90	78
Asia/ Pacific	14	16	56	57	43	49	77	86
Latin Am./ Caribbean	17	13	51	28	31	23	61	82
Intl.	--	--	5	0	3	0	60	--
TOTALS	45	46	172	136	111	112	--	--
PERCENTAGE					65%	82%		

Sources: Report of the Executive Director, April 8, 1980, data on five years 12/1/74 - 12/31/79.

Comprehensive Projects Review, April 1981.

SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION OF CODEL PROJECTS  
BY REGION

<u>Region</u>	<u>Community Development</u>	<u>Education</u>	<u>Agri- culture</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Total</u>
Africa	23 45%	6 12%	10 19%	12 24%	51
Asia-Pacific	30 53%	12 21%	10 17%	5 9%	57
Latin America/ Caribbean	12 43%	7 25%	5 18%	4 14%	28

Source: Comprehensive Projects Review, April 1981.

ANALYSIS OF CURRENT PROJECT FUNDING\*

<u>Region</u>	<u>Total Amount Approved by CODEL</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Budget</u>	<u>High-Low Range Approved Per Project</u>	<u>Average Approved Per Project</u>	<u>Percentage Fully Funded</u>	<u>Number in CPR Portfolios</u>
Africa (n=31)	1,203,998	37%	3000 - 160,110	\$38,839	23%	51
Asia/Pacific (n=37)	1,670,581	36%	2900 - 167,500	\$39,776	7%	57
Latin America/ Caribbean (n=24)	1,207,385	32%	2800 - 210,000	\$50,308	4%	28
TOTAL (n=92) (68% of total)	4,081,964	35%	-----	\$42,974	11%	136

\*Projects listed in the Comprehensive Projects Review and the Project Fund Status Report, June 30, 1981 (fewer than in Review list).

\*\*Multi-year.

Source: Project Fund Status Report, June 30, 1981

SMALL GRANTS FUNDS  
APRIL 1981 PORTFOLIO

<u>Country</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Project Holder/Use</u>
1. Botswana CD/J146-IVS	\$15,000	Botswana Christian Council \$10,000 for school fees and uniforms \$ 5,000 for water scheme (ending)
2. Malawi CD/J148-WF	\$15,000	Christian Service Committee 2 Vocational Training Centers - materials, equipment, salaries, etc. (ending)
3. Tanzania CD/J147-MM	\$20,000	Christian Council of Tanzania and Tanzania Episcopal Conference Joint Committee (not yet operational; no funds used)
4. Zaire CD/J144-MHM	\$15,000	Basankusu Area Cooperative Movement <u>Revolving Loan Fund</u> (no funds used yet - difficulty in transmittal)
-----		
5. Philippines CD/J192-SCFMS	\$50,000	Diocesan Sisters Multipurpose Center <u>Loan Fund</u> for small farmers, tenant farmers, agricultural workers, fish- ermen, small business, cottage industries (starting)
6. Philippines CD/J111(B)-SCFMC	\$65,000	Kapapaguria (Muslim-Christian Bro- therhood) Joint seminars and commu- nity development projects (continua- tion of 1978 project \$5,700 to hold Christian/Islam seminars)
7. Sri Lanka CD/J67-CCSC	\$26,250 \$20,000	SAMAGI (organization formed to admin- ister fund includes Buddhist, Muslim, Hindu, Protestant and Catholic repre- sentatives) <u>Mostly small loans</u> to income-generating projects (continuing)
-----		
8. Dominican Republic CD/J102-CRS	\$ 2,187 \$ 2,500	Caritas (Catholic) and Social Service of the Dominican Church (Protestant) <u>Joint Revolving Loan Fund</u> for far- mers along Haitian border. (Church World Service and Catholic Relief Services made direct contributions of \$50,000) NOTE: This is not called small grants or loans but has characteristics.

Source: Comprehensive Projects Review, April 1981 and project files.

PROJECTS PER COUNTRY  
JOINT AND SECOND GENERATION PROJECTS

## AFRICA REGION

<u>Country</u>	<u>Number of Projects</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Projects</u>	<u>Number of Joint Projects</u>	<u>Number of Second Generation Projects</u>
*Botswana	2	4	1	
*Cameroun	3	6	3	1
*Egypt	1	2	1	
Ethiopia	3	6	3	
*Ghana	3	6	3	
*Kenya	8	15	5	
Madagascar (Malagasy Republic)	1	2	1	
*Malawi	6	12	5	
*Nigeria	2	4	2	
South Africa	1	2	1	
*Sierra Leone	2	4	1	
*Sudan	5	10	4	
*Swaziland <sup>N</sup>	1	2	0	
*Tanzania	8	16	6	1
*Uganda	1	2	1	
*Zaire	1	2	1	
*Zambia	3	6	2	
TOTAL (17)	51		40	2
% TOTAL PROJECTS			78%	4

N

This is coded as Uganda project UG-MC/MMM-11; funds were transferred to Swaziland.

\*Listed as countries assisted FY 1980-81, page 7, AID Congressional Presentation, FY 1981, Main Volume.

Source: Comprehensive Projects Review, April 1981.

PROJECTS PER COUNTRY  
JOINT AND SECOND GENERATION PROJECTS

## ASIA/PACIFIC REGION

<u>Country</u>	<u>Number of Projects</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Projects</u>	<u>Number of Joint Projects</u>	<u>Number of 2nd Generation Projects</u>
*Bangladesh	3	5	3	0
*Burma	3	5	3	0
Fiji	1	1.8	1	1
*India	9	15.7	8	0
*Indonesia	1	1.8	1	0
*Nepal	1	1.8	1	0
*Pakistan	4	7	2	1
Papua New Guinea	2	3.5	2	0
*Philippines	20	3.5	18	35
Samoa, Western	1	1.8	1	0
Solomon Islands	2	3.5	1	0
Tonga	1	1.8	1	0
Hong Kong	1	1.8	1	0
*Sri Lanka	6	10.5	5	1
*Thailand	1	1.8	0	0
Vietnam	1	1.8	0	1.8
TOTAL (16)	57	99.6	49	7
PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PROJECTS			86%	12%

\*Listed as countries assisted FY 1980-81, page 7, AID  
Congressional Presentation, FY 1981, Main Volume.

Source: Comprehensive Projects Review, April 1981.

PROJECTS PER COUNTRY  
JOINT AND SECOND GENERATION PROJECTS

## LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN REGION

<u>Country</u>	<u>Number of Projects</u>	<u>Percentage of Regional Total</u>	<u>Number of Joint Projects</u>	<u>Number of 2nd Generation Projects</u>
*Bolivia	4	14	3	1
Brazil	6	21	6	1
Chile	1	3.5	0	0
Colombia	2	7	1	0
*Dominican Republic	2	7	2	0
*Ecuador	2	7	2	0
Grenada	1	3.5	1	0
*Guatemala	1	3.5	1	0
*Honduras	2	7	2	0
Mexico	4	14	3	1
*Nicaragua	1	3.5	0	0
*Paraguay	1	3.5	1	0
*Peru	1	3.5	1	0
TOTAL (13)	28	98	23	3
PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PROJECTS			82%	11%

\*Listed as countries assisted FY 1980-81, page 7, AID Congressional Presentation, FY 1981, Main Volume.

Source: Comprehensive Projects Review, April 1981.

NUMBER OF CURRENT PROJECTS  
SPONSORED BY MEMBER AGENCIES  
AFRICA REGION (TOTAL: 51)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Joint</u>	<u>Sole</u>
1. Maryknoll Fathers	7	5	2
2. Mill Hill Missionaries	7	5	2
3. White Fathers	5	5	0
4. Saint Patrick Fathers	5	3	2
5. Division of Overseas Ministries	4	4	0
6. Episcopal Church	3	3	0
7. International Voluntary Services	3	2	1
8. Society of the Holy Child Jesus	3	3	0
9. Congregational Christian Service Committee	2	2	0
10. Erie Diocesan Mission	2	2	0
11. United Methodist Committee on Relief	2	2	0
12. Meals for Millions/Freedom from Hunger	2	1	1
13. Medical Missionaries of Mary	2	1	1
14. Technoserve	1	1	0
15. Maryknoll Sisters	1	1	0
16. Capuchin Fathers	1	0	1
17. CPPS	1	1	0

Source: Comprehensive Projects Review, April 1981

NUMBER OF CURRENT PROJECTS  
SPONSORED BY MEMBER AGENCIES  
ASIA/PACIFIC REGION (TOTAL: 57)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Joint</u>	<u>Sole</u>
1. Congregational Christian Service Committee	11	11	0
2. St. Columbans Foreign Mission Society	8	7	1
3. Marist Missions	6	5	1
4. YMCA	5	4	1
5. Division of Overseas Ministries	5	5	0
6. Maryknoll Fathers	4	4	0
7. United Methodist Committee on Relief	4	2	2
8. Maryknoll Sisters	2	2	0
9. Mill Hill Missionaries	2	2	0
10. Lutheran World Relief	2	2	0
11. YWCA	2	2	0
12. American Leprosy Missions	1	1	0
13. Franciscan Missionaries of Mary	1	0	1
14. International Voluntary Services	1	1	0
15. Divine Word Missionaries	1	1	0
16. UPCUSA	1	1	0
17. CCSR (Holy Cross Fathers )	1	0	1

Source: Comprehensive Projects Review, April 1981

NUMBER OF CURRENT PROJECTS  
SPONSORED BY MEMBER AGENCIES  
LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN REGION (TOTAL: 28)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Joint</u>	<u>Sole</u>
1. Lutheran World Relief	3	3	0
2. Division of Overseas Ministries	3	2	1
3. Erie Diocesan Mission	3	2	1
4. Congregational Christian Service Committee	2	2	0
5. International Voluntary Services	2	2	0
6. Maryknoll Sisters	2	2	0
7. Meals for Millions/Freedom from Hunger	2	2	0
8. *CRS	2	2	0
9. Secretariat for Latin America	2	1	1
10. CCSR (Holy Cross Fathers)	1	1	0
11. FCC	1	1	0
12. Maryknoll Fathers	1	1	0
13. Marist Missions	1	1	0
14. Medical Mission Sisters	1	0	1
15. St. Patrick Fathers	1	1	0
16. Technoserve	1	0	1

Source: Comprehensive Projects Review, April 1981.

\*Not current member.

CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATION OF 10% SAMPLE OF ACTIVE CODEL PROJECTS

Project Number

Project Title

Project Holder

Duration 19\_\_ to 19\_\_

Amount: full, requested, CODEL, others.

1. RECEIPT (Evidence)

Date Received

How? From whom (member, proponent, other)?

Kind of information format (letter, proposal, application form)?

2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED (Evidence)

Letter - what kind of information?

Field trip - what results according to report?

Any prior knowledge of project evident?

3. PRESENTATION (Evidence - Project Summary and Committee Recommendation)

Date of presentation to Projects Committee

Recommendation:

a. Full or partial funding (and additional funding? Why?)

b. How many years (any time extension)?

c. Variance from request (why)?

d. Targeted to specific activities and/or line items?  
Or general support?

4. ANALYSIS (include supporting data)

## CODEL Criteria

- a. Disadvantaged, participation, community self-reliance
- b. Local priority needs according to those directly affected
- c. Potential of local resources to meet project needs
- d. Inclusion of women (What are the current roles of women with reference to project objectives?)
- e. Training of local personnel; use of indigenous resources; self-reliance
- f. Collaboration with local churches and development organizations: pre-planning, planning, implementation; consultative services, personnel, funds, buildings and equipment; joint participation in implementation.
- g. Environmental problems (potential harm; what measures need to be taken to avoid, to lessen)
- h. Socio-economic emphasis; not proselytizing or evangelical
- i. Not principally sectarian
- j. Not train foreign nationals or U.S. citizens for other than specific development
- k. No duplication of efforts
- l. Not principally building, unless no other way to meet socio-economic needs and operating costs can be borne locally

## Other Criteria

- a. Are objectives, as stated, clear, concrete, measurable, feasible? Do they relate to the solution of priority development problem? Is the target group specifically identified?
- b. Is implementation plan included which schedules activities and allocates project resources (personnel, financial, in-kind)?
- c. Is there evidence of managerial competence (in the degree to which the project is planned, in the relation between personnel and activities/objectives, in terms of quantity and quality; who is legally responsible?)

- d. Is budget realistic (are all costs included, ie. audit, evaluation; are costs reasonable; is there provision for inflation/contingency; are costs in line with local economy? Is total income noted?)
- e. Is there evidence of technical competence (in terms of personnel, sourcing of technical consultants, work with technically-equipped agencies?)
- f. What is the nature of participation? Did participants/beneficiaries design the project, formulate the goals? What mechanisms facilitate participation (community organizations, meetings of participants)? Do participants have a voice in decision making; control over allocation of resources?
- g. What impact is to be derived as a result of the project?
  - 1) What are the benefits? Economic? Social? Basic needs (food, water, health)? Group/community benefits?
  - 2) For whom are the benefits intended? How many? How will project ensure that they benefit?
  - 3) What change is envisioned as a result of the project activities? (From what to what, and how measured? ie. more and better nutrition - diet includes more calories, more variety, more protein than before the project?)
- h. How is the project to be evaluated? What are the objectives? What are the indicators to be used in measuring change over the life of the project?

5. COMMITTEE ACTION

Projects Committee; Executive Committee

Did committees follow Area Coordinator's recommendation? Ask for more information? Express doubts? Did they condition the grant? How?

6. FUNDING

When was the project approved (date)? Date of Grant Letter of Agreement? When was the first amount transmitted (date)?

What was the funding mix? (AID, member agencies; other - detail who and the amounts)

Note proponent, cooperants in the field, sponsor

How were the subsequent transmittals triggered? ie. receipt of report, fulfilment of conditions?

7. COMMUNICATION WITH PROJECT HOLDER

Grant Letter of Agreement - sent, signed, conditions clearly stated?

Were there any special conditions attached?

Are the responsibilities for reporting clearly stated? Standard/special? (Would it help to set forth a reporting schedule?)

8. REPORTS

Narrative progress report - when due; when sent; quality

Financial report - " " "

Audit - " " "

Evaluation - " " "  
(note whether coordinator participated in it)

9. INFORMATION SHARING/LEARNING

Reports, field trip reports - shared with sponsors, donors, others?

Any response? Reaction?

10. COMMENTS

Any special problems noted? How dealt with?

## NOTES ON PROJECT PROCESS

1. Initial Contact (may or may not be project specific)
  - Country Profile (conditions, problems/needs, resources)
  - Organizational Resources (member organizations, ecumenical efforts)
2. Presentation of Project to CODEL
  - Proposal
  - Project Application Form
  - Compare with Country Profile
3. Dialogue with Proponent
  - Write for additional information
  - Make field visit before presentation to Projects Committee (with qualifications) by staff, by correspondents, by member organization representatives (with checklist or issues paper)
  - Send proponent a copy of project summary and invite feedback
4. Preparation - Analysis (Project Summary)
  - Project Application Form and Other Criteria = Checklist for analysis
  - Attach Proposal to Project Summary (but consider negative effects: turn-off, language, raise questions, overload)
  - Use of Country Profiles in analysis
  - Area Coordinators prepare issues paper including history of experience with project holder in preparation for Staff critical review and recommendations
5. Committees' Action (Project and Executive Committees)
  - Project Committee Advisory to Executive Committee
  - Record in minutes 'concerns' of Project & Executive Committees
  - System for follow-up by Area Coordinators of concerns and issues raised by the Committees
6. Funding Action
  - Letter advising proponent of committees' action
  - Executive Committee decides commitment of undesignated funds on recommendation of Executive Director and Area Coordinator
  - Amount, Time - no expenditure until funds on hand
    - Maximum 1-year funding commitment
    - Member funders may pledge the whole amount, part; usually 1-year
  - Grant Letter of Agreement (GLOA) - when funds available (partial)\*
    - Funds sent upon receipt of GLOA signed by project holder
    - Include cost of audit and evaluation
    - Re-evaluate usefulness of the audit
    - Include minimum requirements of stewardship
    - Include 3-month funding cushion

7. Implementation - Monitoring of  
Need implementation plan, reporting outline tailored to project  
Need to notify project holder of dates reports are due
8. Further Funding and Responses to Progress Markers
9. Evaluation  
Reporting Outline  
Tailored to project  
Agreed to by the project holder  
Dates reports due
10. Learning - Recording of pertinent data  
Comprehensive Project Reviews  
Reports  
CODEL News

\*Change in procedure - GLOA now covers entire grant

NOTES ON GRANT LETTER OF AGREEMENT

Amount approved as grant (total)

No time period stated

Date Funds available (their signature)

In support of (Project Title) for approved project. Budget & Objectives

Submitted to CODEL (date)

May be date of submittal to Project Committee

Date received in New York by CODEL (date stamp governs)

Date of letter/proposal - latest correspondence

Amount of first transmittal

Sources of funding (for funds in hand)

Time limit 120 days - must start project (review; possibility of funds recall)

Reports - whatever project holder generates in course of business

1. Evaluation of Progress - semi-annual, mid-term and final (CODEL reserves right to participate in mid- and final evaluations)
2. Financial reports, records, audits - semi-annual

When does project start?

close?



7. Colombo Area, Sri Lanka (Nugegoda)

SRI-CD/J108-CCSC(AA)\* SMASH-Center for Development of Body, Mind, and Spirit (repeat of 1968 project for which \$31,840 granted; this project \$74,920 of \$107,140)

8. Meru Area (north of Nairobi), Kenya

KEN-AG/J94-UMCOR (PA) Meru Inter-Church Dry Areas Agriculture Program (\$6,098)

KEN-AG/TECH-06 Liliaba-Mula Ranching Group Water Supply Project

KEN-AG/J149-TECH (PA) Meru Irrigation Project  
(These two projects are really Phases I and II of the same scheme. \$111,700 of \$103,265 Phase II only)

9. San Juan de la Maguana Area (northwest of Santo Domingo), Dominican Republic

DR-CD/J172-CWS (PA) Rural Water Resource Development Program (\$40,000 of \$166,623)

Key: AA All AID funds  
PA Partial AID funds (Combined with member funds)  
NA No AID funds

RELATION OF SPONSOR TO PROJECT HOLDER  
OF CODEL PROJECTS VISITED

<u>Project Holder</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Relation</u>
1. Jeevaden Seva Samaj Life Giving Service Society	Mill Hill Missionaries	Working with
2. Christian Fellowship Hospital	American Leprosy Missions and Division of Overseas Ministries (DOM)	Working with and supporting; known to
3. Inter-Church Service Agency	Lutheran World Relief	Working with, supporting, using services
4. Palarivattom Community Development Trust (PCDT)	Franciscan Missionaries of Mary	Working with
5. SAMAGI (Security through Amity, Agri- culture and Industry)	Congregational Christian Service Committee (CCSC)	Working in same area, known to
6. YMCA of Sri Lanka	CCSC and YMCA	Known to and counterpart
7. SMASH (Center for Development of Body, Mind and Spirit)	CCSC	Known to
8. Development Office, Catholic Diocese of Meru	United Methodist Committee on Relief (UMCOR) and Technoserve	Working in same area; known to
9. Servicio Social de Iglesias Dominicanas (SSID) (Social Service of Dominican Churches)	Church World Service (DOM)	Counterpart

IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATIONS (PROJECT HOLDERS)  
OF CODEL PROJECTS VISITED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Unofficial Characterization</u>	<u>Scope</u>	
1. Jeevadan Seva Samaj (Life Giving Service Society)	Community Development organization started by Indian Catholic Missionary	L	R
2. Christian Fellowship Hospital	Facility with outreach service directed by Indian Protestant medical missionary	L	R
3. Inter-Church Service Agency (ICSA)	Interdenominational consulting services to churches and voluntary agencies	N	Service to U & R
4. Palarivattom Community Development Trust (PCDT)	Inter-religious community development organization started by Catholic diocese	L	U
5. SAMAGI (Security through Amity, Agriculture and Industry)	Inter-religious community development organization, started in response to CODEL	N	U & R
6. YMCA of Sri Lanka	Inter-faith service organization	N	U & R
7. SMASH (Center for Development of Body, Mind and Spirit)	Community development facility started by YMCA	L	U
8. Catholic Diocese of Meru, Development Office	Office within Catholic Church structure promoting development at diocesan level	L	R
9. Servicio Social de Iglesias Dominicanas (SSID)	Interdenominational social service and and development organization	N	U & R

NOTE: Interdenominational indicates organizational participation of Protestant denominations;  
Interfaith--Protestant, Catholic and Jewish (when applicable);  
Inter-religious--all religions, e.g. Buddhist, Hindu, Moslem, animist, etc.  
All organizations provide services to people regardless of their religious affiliation.

L = Local;    N = National;    R = Rural;    U = Urban

## CODEL'S FINANCIAL GROWTH BY SOURCE, AMOUNT, AND TOTAL INCOME PER YEAR

CODEL was founded in 1969. A compilation of annual total income for program, projects, and administration is listed below by year. The amounts of public income include the Development Program Grant succeeded by the General Support Grant plus three Operational Program Grants and the Environmental Development Program Grant.

<u>FISCAL</u> <u>YEAR</u>	<u>SOURCES</u>		<u>TOTAL INCOME</u> <u>PER YEAR</u>
	<u>PRIVATE</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	
1970	\$ 62,376	\$ -	\$ 62,376
1971	78,087	-	78,087
1972	111,338	-	111,338
1973	57,489	-	57,489
1974	73,966	-	73,966
1975	230,573	78,811	309,384
1975*	505,409	143,991	649,400
1977	658,361	205,666	864,027
1978	567,416	524,232	1,091,648
1979	715,397	849,117	1,564,514
1980	767,808	1,250,310	2,018,118
TOTALS	\$3,828,220	\$3,052,127	\$6,880,347

\*In the year 1976, the fiscal year was changed, and hence the total indicated is for a 10-months' period.

Source: CODEL Self-Evaluation, November 1980.

## EXPENSE DATA, FY 1980

<u>Categories</u>	<u>AID</u>	<u>CODEL Members/ Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Projects	539,349	675,710	1,215,059
Program Support	191,428*	-	-
Administrative Support	-	134,108*	-
Program and Administrative Support	-	-	325,536*
SUBTOTAL	730,777	809,818	1,540,595
OPGs	404,080	-	404,080
Environmental Development Program	77,926	-	77,926
TOTAL	1,212,783	809,818	2,022,601

\*NOTE: Per CODEL policy to pay 40% of program and administrative support from private sources, 60% from government. This year CODEL is paying 41%, AID 59%.

Source: Financial Statement, Annual Report FY 1980, and Financial Manager.

PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT  
AS PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL EXPENSES

Total Program and Administrative Support as Percent of Total Projects	27%
--	-----

Total Program and Administrative Support as Percent of Total Programs (total projects, OPGs, Environmental Development Program)	16%
---	-----

---

AID-Charged Program Support as Percent of AID-Funded Projects	35%
---	-----

AID-Charged Program Support as Percent of all AID-Funded Projects and Programs	19%
---	-----

AID-Charged Program Support as Percent of Total Projects	16%
--	-----

AID-Charged Program Support as Percent of Total Program	11%
---	-----

---

Source: Calculations based on Appendix 7, Figure 2 data.

ESTIMATED ANNUAL PROJECT LOAD  
OF AREA COORDINATORS

<u>Country</u>	<u>Monitor and Service</u> (Current Portfolio)	<u>Develop</u> (Replace 1/3 closed, plus 10% for rejects plus 5 growth)	<u>Total</u>
Africa	51	24	75
Asia/Pacific	57	26	83
Latin America/ Caribbean	28	16	44

Note: Compare with estimated load of Inter-American Foundation Field Representative with responsibility for one country: Portfolio of 30 projects; develop 10 new projects per year, for a total of 40 projects.

## ATTACHMENT A

### PROJECT PROFILES

The projects profiled in this section are those visited in the field by the evaluator. The information in the profile comes from the Project Summary and reports which may have been provided by the project holder, data in the April 1981 Comprehensive Projects Review, and field observations and interviews. The format was developed by the evaluator and the Asia Area Coordinator during the field visits and refined after the evaluator's return.

Background information includes the CODEL project code, the project title, the project holder, project duration dates, and the funding amount CODEL has approved for the project.

The CODEL code signifies the country (IND = India), the sector (ED = education), ecumenical collaboration (J = joint; absence of J indicates no ecumenical collaboration), and the member organization which has sponsored the project within CODEL (MHM = Mill Hill Missionaries). The project numbers run serially for all joint projects; for those in which only one agency is involved, they are serial for the agency (e.g. SRI-AG/UMCOR-02 = Sri Lanka, Agriculture, the second project sponsored by the United Methodist Committee on Relief; BRA-CD/J208-LWR = Brazil, Community Development, Joint, #208, Lutheran World Relief sponsored, but was more recently funded by CODEL than KEN-AG/J149--TECH = Kenya Agricultural, Joint, #149, sponsored by Technoserve.) The code also indicates projects where additional funds have been put into a project by (B) but does not indicate the project sequence of the subsequent allocation e.g. SRI-AG/J58 (B).

## PROJECT PROFILE #1

### Background

IND-ED/J124-MHM

Community Health and Informal Education Center

Jeevadan Seva Samaj (Life Giving Service Society)

Nizamabad District, India

1979-1982

\$43,140

IND-CD/J198-MHM

Community Wells for Drinking Water

Same project holder and location as above

1980-1982

\$46,220

### Project Description

CODEL has committed a cluster of support to people in the Nizamabad District (Andhra Pradesh, near Hyderabad, India) through these two current projects and one earlier project (IND-AG/MHM-57 Jeevadan Landed Poor). The project holder for the current projects is Jeevadan Seva Samaj (Life Giving Service Society) through the Director of that organization, Father Remigi Nadackal.

Father Nadackal is an Indian Catholic priest who started a mission some ten years ago in this predominantly Hindu part of South India where recurring drought has made life extremely difficult for the harijans,

the lowest socio-economic group. His plan is to help people meet their needs for water, housing, health care, education, land and other means of earning a living. The mission is staffed by a number of Indian Catholic Sisters who run the educational and health programs as well as provide over-all management under Father Nadackal's direction. The mission has been able to fund the construction of a church, rectory, convent, clinic and some housing for resettled people, and currently has a school building under construction.

The goals of the first phase of the Community Health and Informal Education Center project are to build a center providing primary health care and to set up a mobile team of medical personnel to provide care in the villages. In the second phase, villagers will be selected for training in health care and occupational skills and then returned to their villages to work. CODEL is providing funds for a vehicle, equipment for the mobile team, and recurring expenses for three years.

The Community Wells for Drinking Water project plans to provide 40 hand-dug wells for drinking water based on a ground water feasibility survey conducted during the drought in 1979 by AFPRO for the (Catholic) Archdiocese of Hyderabad. The sites were identified as five public institutions and fifteen villages occupied by the underprivileged. CODEL agreed to fund approximately two-thirds of the costs of digging and constructing the sides and tops of the wells, the other third to be provided in the form of local donations of labor and materials. The cost of one well is estimated at \$1,740.

Results/Meeting Objectives (Stated Objectives)

Although all of the funds (\$43,140) for the health project had been transmitted and could be expected to have been used by the time of the

field visit, it was not possible to ascertain whether the mobile equipment had been purchased or whether the team was functioning. The time at the project site was limited to part of one day (approximately four hours), the remainder of the time being spent in travel to and from the site. According to the CODEL records, reports were furnished in 1980 and 1981; however these were not seen by the evaluator.

The wells project could not be expected to have been implemented since the first part of the funding (\$15,000) had been transmitted in February, and the field visit took place in April. The evaluator did observe wells constructed on the mission, clinic and school grounds.

In short, it is not known whether, or to what extent, the objectives of the two projects have been met on the basis of the field visit.

#### Managerial, Technical and Environmental Soundness

Management is in the hands of Father Nadackal, supported by the Sisters. Fr. Nadackal periodically visits Europe and North America to raise funds. He has been quite successful, but his absences place an additional burden on the Sisters. There is no indication of lay participation in the planning and implementation of the various facets of the program. Altogether, there is a question whether the project may not be too dependent on Fr. Nadackal for management.

Technical and environmental soundness must be judged on the basis of the technical studies undertaken by AFPRO which constitute part of the file and seem to meet professional standards. The project proposal indicates that a government hydrologist would be used to select the well sites. The impact on the environment of reclaiming land for farming in the first of the three projects in the cluster has not been addressed.

The normal considerations of area sanitation apply to the wells project as far as use is concerned. The technical and environmental considerations could be better addressed.

#### Leadership Capability

From the impressions gathered during the field visit, the project is being completely run by Father Nadackal. He is directly involved in all of the planning and implementation aspects of the total work which encompasses health, education, wells, and land development as well as some income-generating work which he has organized (stone breaking for construction and the collection and processing of leaves for a local type of smoking material). He is also responsible for all fund-raising and personnel functions. He delegates a certain amount of the day-to-day management to the Sisters working with him.

Thus the capability for the development of local leadership exists, but there is probably too much work for too few people. This is another matter which should be examined in subsequent communications regarding the wells project.

#### Working Relations and Style

The first of the three projects in the cluster was sponsored by the Mill Hill Missions, and the next two were jointly sponsored. The Church of South India is making buildings available and is probably kept informed of the projects' progress. The government is also participating, particularly through the education and hydrology offices, and there is community support including donations from non-Christians. This pattern indicates an open, collaborative style. Nevertheless, the danger exists that Fr. Nadackal's ability to succeed with this ambitious work will tend to be viewed as a personal accomplishment and that the

complex of projects and infrastructure will become an "empire" identified with outsiders.

#### Impact on the Poor

The provision of land, water, agricultural implements, animals, health care, education, skills training, jobs, and housing to the poor (harijan) will undoubtedly have an impact on them. That some of these planned activities have not yet been implemented and others only started in a small way is less important than the fact that some action has occurred.

The impact on the local populace of resettling people from other areas on previously unused Government land should be addressed. Do people react negatively--either the people who are better off or those who may be just as poor but are not included in the program? Do those in the program react with expectations of receiving assistance, or do they take the opportunity to become self-reliant? Is there any obligation on the part of the beneficiaries to adhere to the faith of those who provide assistance, even though the idea is not conveyed overtly or intentionally?

#### CODEL Criteria

1. Ecumenical collaboration--Church of South India (Protestant) is providing a building for the use of the Sisters;
2. Participation--low;
3. Learning through participation--low;
4. Sharing (appropriate level of) costs--labor contributed; and
5. Consonance with local and national priorities--high.

Comments

This was the first project seen by the evaluator in the field. That it happened to be the first was due to a combination of the CODEL Area Coordinator's travel schedule and the evaluator's availability. As such it became the "observation" project, providing information on how CODEL operates in a field visit to a project holder. This experience may be atypical of CODEL projects which receive periodic visits since this project had never been visited because of its inaccessibility, yet it demonstrated all too clearly the need for:

1. Spending more time on site (perhaps four days instead of four hours); and
2. Letting the project holder know in advance the objective and the agenda of the visit: the type of information needed, the documents to be reviewed, the places and people the evaluator wishes to visit, the procedures for working together, and other items of that nature.

Without such preparation, the project holder does not know exactly what is expected and tends to show the visitor the physical plant, introduce some of the implementors and beneficiaries as they are available, and provide hospitality. The occasion of the visit may be taken to honor the donor's part in the project and to reinforce the beneficiaries' and implementors' pride in their accomplishments.

These activities leave very little time, if any, to review transactions between the donor and project holder (e.g. reporting, funding transmittals), to gather missing report information, or to discuss underlying concepts and raise philosophical questions with both the implementors and beneficiaries. Time is needed to understand the context of a project, to think, to question, to observe. These processes

are valuable for all parties and are critical to learning from and improving project performance.

## PROJECT PROFILE #2

Background

IV-IND-MD/J53-ALM

Comprehensive Community Health and Rural Development Program

Christian Fellowship Hospital

Oddanchattram, India

Phase I Base-line Survey and Organizational Phase \$3,000

Phase II Drought Rehabilitation Scheme \$124,200

1977 to 1981 (Five Years)

Project Description

CODEL is participating in a long-range, broad-based health care and community development program centered at the Christian Fellowship Hospital in Oddanchattram, India. The medical program is both curative and preventive, with special emphasis on leprosy, tuberculosis and cancer treatment in the hospital and the training of village health workers who are also responsible for broader development needs such as water, food, housing and animal husbandry.

The area has suffered from drought for the last three years so supplies of water and food are short, especially for the poorest, lowest-caste harijans with whom the project seeks to work. They are in need of everything - land, water, farming and organizational skills, agricultural inputs, housing and opportunities to generate income through raising animals, small business and artisan activities. CODEL funding is currently being used for support of the repair and

construction of dams and wells to provide water, the highest priority identified by the people and local officials alike.

Results/Meeting Objectives (Stated Objectives)

The reduction of mortality and fertility and the increase in agricultural production and income through the provision of water, land, improved housing, health care, literacy training, primary education, loans/grants for animals and small business, and formation of community groups are among the objectives and interventions of this project. As stated by the Project Director, Dr. Jacob Cherian, the following progress has been made toward meeting objectives:

1. Project area infant mortality is 69.9 per 1000 compared to 128 per 1000 for the entire state of Tamil Nadu;
2. The fertility rate, formerly 3 per 1000, is now between 1.5 and 1.75 per 1000;
3. Water supply has been improved through conservation (tanks, and check dams) for approximately one-half of the population of the project area (150,000 people);
4. Agricultural production has increased over the last five years, and farmers, who constitute 90 percent of the population, are better off. More cereals, ground nuts, vegetables and cash crops (e.g. sugar cane) are being produced. Small and landless farmers have more work and income, as do the women.
5. The literacy rate is currently 35 percent in Tamil Nadu State, a 5 per cent increase since the institution of a government literacy program; four primary schools have been established in remote, inaccessible areas of the project.
6. Approximately 1,500 houses were provided to low-caste families

at an average cost of 5,000 rupees (3000 external funds, 2,000 people's contribution); the program is currently halted for lack of funding, but attempts are being made to continue the project with government and private funding from India.

7. Small-business grants and loans have been made, primarily for the acquisition of cows, buffaloes, some sheep and goats, but also for pig raising, basket making, weaving, tanning and small shops.

Note: As far as the portion supported by CODEL is concerned, it is not known how many dams were planned and built.

#### Managerial, Technical and Environmental Soundness

Management of the project is in the hands of the Chief Medical Officer of the hospital, assisted by the Development Officer and with the cooperation of community and government persons. From the field inspection, management appears to function well, despite the small number of people and their other duties, because it is well organized.

Technically, the project has tapped both technical and government assistance with the result that both dams and wells seem to be technically sound, and the project is not taking any action which has been untested for the area.

No specific consideration has been given to environmental impact, and no new land use schemes have been initiated except the reclamation of land previously untilled due to lack of water.

#### Leadership Capability

The project is working with people who have been indoctrinated with

their own worthlessness--the low-caste people; consequently they can be expected to take more time to arrive at a position of taking charge and leading. Nevertheless, there are individuals who have stepped forward to work with their communities. A notable case is the schoolteacher who was helped by Dr. Cherian, the Project Director, to attend school. He was the first from his group to do so and came back to work with his people. Perhaps the project could be assisted to think more about the means of fostering and developing leadership and/or provided with the financial means of holding training courses for community leaders (development/health workers and others).

#### Working Relations and Style

At first glance, the impression is one of a self-contained, paternalistic, well-organized and dynamic project which is accomplishing its goals with little participation in the planning and implementation by those being helped. Upon closer inspection, it can be said that perhaps there are not many people who want to cooperate with the medical missionaries from Kerala who have come to improve the lives of the Tamil Nadu Harijans except the government, and they are already cooperating. There is local resistance in two areas: one is religious since the State is strongly Hindu, and the missionaries are Christian; the other is socio-economic since the wealthier persons in the area do not wish to see the poorer caste freed from their socio-economic limitations. (The extent to which cooperation with the other churches in the area may be feasible has not been explored in conversations.)

There are signs that the project has moved closer to self-reliance in that there is resistance to give-aways and an inclination to arrange loans that can be paid back. External cooperation in support of this

project is high--through the American Leprosy Missions and European sources as well as the Indian organizations, CASA and AFPRO.

#### Impact on the Poor

This project reaches the poorest, most disadvantaged of the area. The extent to which it is feasible to effect a change in the attitudes of an oppressed class toward themselves is probably a function of the leadership of the project and of time. Although strong in technical and managerial aspects, the project leadership is not attuned to self-development. The fact that there are so many pressing basic needs to be met has prompted action on behalf of the people rather than preparing them for action on their own behalf.

Such motivation is understandable, but now is the time for consideration of ways in which participation, self-help and self-reliance can be strengthened. The Inter-Church Service Agency in Madras could assist by organizing a seminar on participation of the poorest. Training in participatory techniques for project planners is also available from Kenya's Christian Development Education Services, which trains teams of church development workers in a modified Paulo Freire method and has some experience in India.

#### CODEL Criteria

1. Ecumenical collaboration--none with other churches; program directed to all poor, regardless of affiliation;
2. Participation--low, see above;
3. Learning through participation--low;
4. Sharing (appropriate level of) costs--labor contributed; and
5. Consonance with local and national priorities--high.

Comments

CODEL's participation in the over-all scheme is minimal from a financial point of view, but their relationships with the Project Director and the sponsoring organization are good and should be exploited to assist the project in moving toward a more participatory style of operation. It should be noted that the original project was approved before the formulation of the criteria.

## PROJECT PROFILE #3

Background

IND-ED/J171-LWR

Furnishings for Development Conference and Workshops Center

The Inter-Church Service Agency (ICSA)

Madras, India

1980

\$15,000

Project Description

The Inter-Church Service Agency constructed a new building to use as its office and conference center in Madras. CODEL assisted with a small amount of money for furnishings. The funds were used to purchase air conditioners for meeting rooms.

Although this is not the type of project CODEL usually considers for funding, the work of this agency was considered important enough to support, especially since assistance was needed at the time. ICSA, in addition to its original work of accounting services, has developed an impressive capability in development consulting, and now provides services ranging from technical assistance, feasibility studies and evaluations to inter-faith seminars.

Since the nature of the project does not lend itself to the analysis usually provided for development projects, the remainder of this profile will be devoted to an analysis of the ICSA ability to provide CODEL, its project holders and member agencies with field-side

support services for improved planning, management of implementation and evaluation of projects as well as for learning experiences. Special effort was made by the evaluator to review a selected sample of ICSA's work in an attempt to evaluate its capability to serve CODEL as an indigenous institutional resource for technical assistance.

A strong in-house capability in technical subjects such as agriculture, water projects, engineering, rural development and fisheries is matched by their over-all management capability. ICSA is developing a library and contacts in appropriate technology and is interested in learning more about women in development. Their personnel are retired civil servants who are highly experienced and who have contacts throughout the government. They can usually source expertise which they themselves may not possess. Their work shows evidence of having kept up-to-date with the technology and advances in their respective fields.

ICSA's development philosophy is compatible with CODEL's and is also rooted in Christianity. From the evidence available at headquarters, one of the best field meetings in which CODEL ever participated was a meeting sponsored with ICSA at which development issues and philosophy were given serious and thoughtful consideration. ICSA's services are underutilized because the churches and voluntary agencies which constitute its target clientele do not always fully appreciate their need for assistance, nor are they always in a position to pay for the service.

That this resource exists, but is being underutilized, presents CODEL with a perfect opportunity to simultaneously provide technical assistance, facilitate the learning process, and develop indigenous institutional capability. CODEL could help to fill this gap by providing an opportunity for its project holders in South India to meet with ICSA,

exchange experiences and develop a schedule for technical assistance  
which CODEL could support.

## PROJECT PROFILE #4

Background

IV-IND-CD/FMM-02

Palarivattom Community Development Trust (PCDT)

Cochin, India

1978 - 1981

\$143,941

Project Description

The PCDT was formed in 1976 as an inter-faith (Catholic, Protestant, Hindu) community organization to extend the use of the facilities and programs of the Pastoral Orientation Centre (POC - Catholic) to the surrounding community in Cochin. At that time, the POC was running a MCH program with foodstuffs (PL480) which was transferred to land arranged by the PCDT and operated under PCDT sponsorship by the Catholic Sisters.

A meeting of people from the community was held to determine the most pressing needs, and a field survey of 1808 families was conducted. The results showed that the people wanted improved housing, water, sanitation, health services, education and jobs. The PCDT formulated a program which attempted to meet all these needs and sought funds for land and building construction to house a clinic, offices and training/meeting space. The project was conceived by its designer, Fr. Joseph Kannath, to serve as a model/laboratory in community development.

A medical clinic was opened to offer services and medicines (including inoculations) free to poor families. Home visits were made,

latrines constructed, a course in sewing offered for young women, and a small savings scheme initiated. Fr. Kannath left the project to do advanced study abroad; his replacement as director of the POC assumed responsibility for the project.

#### Results/Meeting Objectives

The stated aims of the project follow:

1. To establish a model community development centre in the vicinity of the POC to improve the social, economic and health conditions of the people in the locality.
2. To organize the community and to help the people living in the community to help themselves.
3. To concentrate on adult education and literacy programs.
4. To organize educational programs on nutrition, health, hygiene, home management, budgeting and responsible parenthood.
5. To improve the health conditions of children under five in collaboration with other voluntary and governmental agencies.

The project had planned, within three years, to:

1. Build a center of 1950 square feet;
2. Build 344 houses at 300 square feet each;
3. Build 300 latrines with bath;
4. Build one water tap for each family;
5. Hold courses in health, literacy, nutrition and vocational training; and
6. Conduct a medical program.

These targets were revised to exclude the construction of houses and water systems, substituting a woodworking course and the construction of a building to house the shop.

Actual accomplishments to date include:

1. Construction of a centre (used for medical and MCH clinics, warehouse for PL 480 foodstuffs, and the sewing course);
2. Construction of a building for woodworking course (not being used);
3. Construction of approximately 100 latrines;
4. Medical clinic held regularly;
5. MCH clinic held regularly, 300 beneficiaries;
6. Home visits done;
7. Courses in sewing held; and
8. Small savings scheme running--participation dropped from 900 to 500.

It should be noted that the courses in sewing are paid for by the fees charged, and the latrine construction is done with Food for Work <sup>1</sup> so these have not incurred project expenditures. Some project funds were spent for medicines (the amount requested \$2,176), but currently medicines are either being purchased from other funds or foregone.

The project was unable to attain its original goals since the poorest would be unable to repay loans for improved housing, therefore rapidly decapitalizing the housing fund; therefore the Committee decided to cancel the housing and water supply components. The woodworking shop and training course proved unfeasible due to the current political climate.

#### Implementation Plan

As noted above, there have been several changes in the objectives of the project, resulting in a changed schedule of activities and therefore use of budget resources. The project is due to end shortly, but there

are still monies remaining in the budget.

The CODEL coordinator instructed the project holder to scale down the project so that there would be provision for gaining true participation by the people and an opportunity to show benefits in a modest way; this means stretching out the project over a longer time period and making it relevant to the needs of the people in ways that are conducive to self-help and self-reliance.

Managerial, Technical and Environmental Soundness

Management of the project is nominally in the hands of the Committee, but really remains the responsibility of the Sister(s) and Father who operate out of the POC. All are conscientious, but there is just too much to do, and it is too much to expect the volunteer Committee to take more responsibility. At the time of the field visit, there was only one Sister available to carry the full load, with the part-time back-up of the POC Director.

No salaries are included in the project for administration, which is also a limiting factor. The best the Committee could do was to suggest that another priest be sought to work on the project. The medical and MCH programs are technically sound, with volunteer doctors and MCH program supervision provided. If and when training for productive activities is undertaken on a large scale, care must be taken to conduct adequate feasibility studies, the lack of which has been a weak point of the project to date.

No information is available on whether environmental considerations were taken into account.

Leadership Capability

The community elected local leaders to sit on the Committee, but these persons do not come from the ranks of the poor and have not accurately transcribed the expressed needs of the poor into feasible programs. At least it can be said that the Committee has been able to prevent the implementation of unfeasible programs. Although an earlier report indicated that community leaders received training at the POC, the evaluator could not assess their capability, having elected not to visit the community so as to avoid raising expectations of a new wind-fall.

Nevertheless, at least one of the persons attending the MCH clinic remarked on the evaluator's presence in terms of hopes for houses. After a chat with the mothers at the clinic, it seemed feasible to consider identifying and capacitating some of them as community leaders. (It seems that the Women's Wing of the PCDT, which had done volunteer work in visiting homes, may also have consisted of the better-off members of the community; it collapsed when the leader left the area.)

Working Relations and Style

The collaboration of the Catholics with other faiths, members of the community, political leaders, government personnel and business people has been good. A question could be raised, however, concerning the image of the project. It appears that the people do not think of it as 'their' project--one to which they contribute time and effort expecting to benefit from a common venture. It appears that the people view it as a give-away, social welfare project run by a church which is in that business. They thought, when asked their needs, that they had only to articulate them, and they would be met. As one of the Committee

said, "It is not possible to satisfy people unless we give them money as charity."

#### Impact on the Poor

The project is trying to involve the socio-economically disadvantaged. So far it has not found a way to help people help themselves: there is a small fee charged for participation in the MCH program; labor is contributed in the latrine-building program; and a fee is charged for tuition in the sewing course.

Some consideration should be given to charging for the medical clinic or a way found to screen out people who may abuse the program. (I saw a chart of a person who received so many different medicines that he/she should have been referred to another facility.) The participants interviewed said they liked the clinic because the medicines were free, and the attention was better than in government clinics. In most cases, even very poor people find it worthwhile to pay for medical care.

The image that free treatment creates in this group should be explored. The project needs to avoid the temptation to become an employer, which is what was being considered in the two employment-generating schemes--woodworking and sewing. Not only would this exacerbate the image of paternalism, but the project is not technically, managerially, and financially competent to undertake such an enterprise.

#### CODEL Criteria

1. Ecumenical collaboration: none with other churches on a one-to-one basis, but the Trust is directed by an inter-faith board, and program benefits and participation are extended to everyone regardless of faith, "wealth, colour or caste;"
2. Participation: low;

3. Learning through participation: low;
4. Sharing (appropriate level of) costs: low; and
5. Local/national priorities: high.

Comments

The success of the project seems to have been dependent on the leadership of certain people, notably the designer, Fr. Kannath. When he left, the project began to show stress. It is probably just as well that a highly-motivated, dynamic, charismatic leader be absent in order that the people learn to depend more on themselves.

If this project is for the benefit of the whole community, is it desirable that the members of the community who are better off dominate the Committee?

---

1

Food for Work allows the sale of commodities and the use of the proceeds to purchase materials. Contribution plus sale of the containers pays transport costs.

## PROJECT PROFILE #5

Background

SRI-CD/J67-CCSC

Small Grants Fund

SAMAGI Fund Society (YMCA)

Sri Lanka

1976-1981

\$46,250

Project Description

This small grants fund is primarily a small loans fund administered by a Society composed of leaders from various religious organizations. The grants are made to community organizations (SAMAGI member and client groups who need assistance in their social welfare/social development activities). If repayment is thought remotely possible by the SAMAGI Society members, pressure is put on the organization to pay back the funds. For example, this is the case with the Buddhist agricultural and vocational training farm for destitute boys which is using the funds to install a water pump and irrigation system. By way of example, other grants include: training in agriculture, handicrafts and poultry raising by a girls' school; dairy and coconut farming by the National Youth Service Council; and a handloom project by a Mulsir girls' society.

As of May 1981 the SAMAGI Fund Society had a case load of 50.

Loans (at 3% interest per year) total \$491,861, grants \$70,525. Total repayments equalled \$83,966. <sup>1</sup> Twenty (of 44 active loan cases) have made repayments; three are fully paid. The Fund has been operating since 1977. The default rate has not been established since the members of the Society are most insistent that loans be repaid and have even voted to take legal action in some cases. In addition, the economic situation has wor

In the beginning, loans were made primarily to member organizations and their client groups (e.g. YMCAs throughout the country) which either invested in a project (e.g. agricultural production) or made sub-loans to individuals. In 1978 loans were made to individuals and their associates engaged in small business and agriculture. The array ranges from animal raising and production of cash crops (e.g. chilies) to manufacture (e.g. bricks, rope, paper bags and envelopes) to tailoring, electrical repair and welding.

There is a ceiling of Rs 25,000 per loan, although it is rare for the loans to individuals to exceed Rs 10,000. The smallest loan was Rs 750 for purchase of barber equipment.

Results/Meeting Objectives (Stated Objectives)

The Society's objective is to improve the quality of life and relieve poverty by lending/granting funds to promote:

1. Food and crop production, processing, and distribution;
2. Job creation including small industry;
3. Practical education leading to employment including self-employment;
4. Programs of nutrition, home economics, public health and family planning; and

5. In addition, to provide technical assistance in business management and other fields by the projects assistant, members and a panel of advisers.

The grants and loans given to date fall within the categories listed above, primarily within the first two. The financial success of the clients can be judged by the repayment record which is difficult to quantify as data is lacking on the amounts due. It should be noted, however, that the repayment record of loan funds has not been good since Sri Lanka is a society accustomed to receiving many free handouts from government.

#### Managerial, Technical and Environmental Soundness

The success of this project is due to the volunteer management by the members of the SAMAGI Fund Society supported by the YMCA. The key person is Mr. Lionel da Silva, who is retired from a career in social welfare and development work. His last post was with the Freedom From Hunger national organization.

The Society has seen the need to hire a part-time projects officer to follow up on loans and to investigate applications as well as to require that Society members be personally responsible for applicants. All of these efforts seem to be having a positive impact on the quality of review, technical assistance and the repayment performance of clients. A further institutionalization of management is needed, however, as well as some consideration of how costs can be covered.

#### Leadership Capability

The same persons who founded the Society have taken an active role in running its business and providing leadership. Their relationship with clients is usually a personal one. It was observed during the

field visits that they have a good rapport with people as well as the ability to motivate them and connect them with other sources of assistance. In one case, the lender took the occasion of the visit to act in his capacity as community leader, calling a meeting to consider, with the SAMAGI Fund representatives, the larger problems of the community and how they might be tackled.

#### Working Relations and Style

The Society was formed in response to CODEL's call for ecumenical collaboration for development and includes leaders of religious organizations with social action goals (National Council of YMCAs of Sri Lanka, All-Ceylon Buddhist Congress, Hindu and Muslim organizations, the Catholics and Methodists, and the National Christian Council plus a few members who serve in an individual capacity).

It is interesting that the members of the Society have agreed to place the emphasis on loans rather than grants and on small business rather than on the training and production programs of their own institutions. They are to be commended, as is CODEL, for the way this organization has been developed.

#### Impact on the Poor

The very poor are not usually those persons in the society who are successfully engaged in small business. With that understanding, it must be stated that, with the exception of a civil servant or two engaged in an income-generating project on the side, the loan recipients visited were poor people trying to make a living in a precarious climate.

Many of the small businesses are located in the Colombo area, as might be expected, but there is a very good spread into other parts of the country. This is mostly due to networking among member organizations

and the personal contacts made by very active Society members during the course of their other duties. Some of the loan recipients are former insurgents who are being rehabilitated as productive members of society, thanks to SAMAGI. Again, there is the personal connection from the experience of the Projects Officer in counseling them in prison in his former capacity as a government employee. The SAMAGI Fund Society is playing not only an economic development role, but is instrumental in bringing elements of society into a more harmonious political and religious relationship.

#### CODEL Criteria

1. Ecumenical collaboration--high;
2. Participation--participation of sponsors high; not much participation of clientele (lenders);
3. Learning through participation--sponsors high, clientele low;
4. Sharing (appropriate level of) costs--costs of running SAMAGI paid by small fee levied on member organizations; and
5. Consonance with local and national priorities--high.

#### Comments

This is a highly innovative and interesting development vehicle which probably would not have developed without CODEL's intervention. Thus CODEL has a special duty to help the Society institutionalize its capability and secure its future. The sum granted to date, \$46,250, has been more than well used. It will be worth watching to see whether the Society is able to recoup enough of the funds to establish a revolving loan fund. If so, it will signal a major breakthrough in changing the consciousness of the population. If not, the effort was still worthwhile.

CODEL can further aid this project by providing some technical assistance in management and perhaps some additional funds for management.

---

<sup>1</sup>  
Exchange rate at time of visit was Rs 18.2 = \$1.00.

## PROJECT PROFILE #6

Background

SRI-AG/J58-CCSC YMCA Youth Training Center

SRI-AG/UMCOR-02 Water Development Scheme for Rural Youth Training  
Centre

SRI-AG/J58 (B) YMCA Youth Training Centre-Extension Service

YMCA

Paranthan, Sri Lanka

1976 - 1982

Total for the three projects: \$98,500

Project Description

The Paranthan area of Sri Lanka lies on the northern end of the island, on the opposite side from Colombo. The training center is in a rural area and is a farm with workshops used for the dual purpose of training youth in skills with which they can earn a living, either in rural or urban settings, and for generating income for the YMCA so that it can be self-supporting. Subsequently, the facility came to be viewed as a community facility and extension service to the surrounding (resettled) residents.

The facility was built by the Germans who came to the area to provide disaster relief assistance after a storm which severely damaged the area some years ago. The facility was subsequently made available to the Y and was developed as a farm with the assistance of CODEL and other

donors, primarily German and Canadian.

Funds in the first grant were used to purchase seven and one-half acres of land, a tractor with accessories, assorted agricultural inputs, and a revolving loan fund with which the graduates could be set up in farming. About 160 were trained, of which 40% returned to their villages to farm. In the course of developing the farm, water was needed to irrigate the fields so wells had to be constructed; CODEL assisted with the second project. The Center then realized that the improved livestock and agricultural practices which it was using on the farm could be useful to persons resettled nearby on land which the government made available for residential and small farm use but which was not being exploited, primarily due to lack of water.

In the latest project, CODEL approved \$72,000 over three years for a project which totals \$131,542 and which includes line items for dairy and animal husbandry, agriculture, pasture lands, irrigation, building and equipping a community development center, equipment and materials for the center workshop, and administrative and personnel costs.

Results/Meeting Objectives (Stated Objectives)

In brief, this project has not been able to achieve its objectives of (1) providing training which leads to income for boys in either agriculture or urban trades, or (2) making the farm an income-generating business which can provide the facility with a means of self-support.

It has been difficult for the YMCA to get trainees since boys from the capital (primarily) are not willing to go to Paranthan for a resident training program which lasts an average of nine months. In addition, there is some difficulty with placement. The farm trainees did not return in very high numbers to farming. The second objective is

probably not feasible because of the poor land and lack of good ground-water and rainfall. The marketing aspect may also be a factor as the major population center is at the opposite end of the island.

The main reason that these difficulties occurred is that the YMCA was provided with a facility by the Germans and then attempted to put it to uses for which it was not really suited. Thus the center has turned to other uses as a community facility and for extension of agricultural training coupled with the provision of inputs. The feasibility of this scheme is not adequately established since the resettled population is not primarily oriented toward farming. The first phase, the provision of wells, is proceeding, and the water is being used for drinking purposes and for small gardens dedicated to consumption and cash crops (chilies).

Before additional investments are made, the Y needs to reassess the possibility of reaching all its goals on this project site, and look at the alternatives. The job training aspect should be studied for feasibility on another site closer to the population centers and industry (Colombo), and the income-generating aspect will either need to be relocated to a better agricultural site or the operating budget decreased to an amount which the revenue can sustain. Another alternative is to decide whether the operation has developmental benefits which the other Ys wish to subsidize.

#### Managerial, Technical and Environmental Soundness

The director and staff of the center are well trained, highly motivated and dedicated to making the center a success. That they have not been able to make it function as expected is due to their having to proceed without extensive preplanning because they were provided with

the facility. They would be able to use technical assistance in planning and in reassessing their position and making decisions about resource allocation. It may be that the benefits of the extension program will be judged worthwhile and a decision taken to carry out the program. It may be that the resources can be used in other ways which will benefit more people for the cost involved.

#### Leadership Capability

The leadership of the center personnel is quite good; coupled with the support of community and religious leaders it has sparked the community around the center to a new sense of purpose. This may be indicative that the program has finally found a purpose which is validated by community response. The time spent at the center was too short to fully assess the extent of community involvement and the potential for promotion of self-reliant development.

#### Working Relations and Style

The participation of community leaders on the board of the center and of the church leaders in its activities attests to a collaborative style which forms a good basis for continuing community development.

#### Impact on the Poor

The extension program is mainly reaching people who have been motivated to resettle on poor land. One assumes that their former conditions were not as favorable. They are not necessarily the poorest, but they are not very well off either.

The training program was mainly reaching boys who could not afford formal schooling or vocational education.

CODEL Criteria

1. Ecumenical collaboration--good cooperation with the Protestant and Catholic churches of the area;
2. Participation--increasing;
3. Learning through participation--incipient;
4. Sharing (appropriate level of) costs--probably not as high as it could be; and
5. Consonance with local and national priorities--high.

Comments

This is a classic case of building a project on available resources without an adequate feasibility study. This project could well benefit from technical assistance which CODEL might help to provide.

## PROJECT PROFILE #7

Background

SRI-CD/J108-CCSC

SMASH--Center for Development of Body, Mind and Spirit

Nugegoda, Sri Lanka

Repeat of 1968 project for which \$31,840 granted; this project is from 1978 - 1983 (five years)

\$74,920

Project Description

SMASH is a facility, primarily a day care and vocational training center, in the densely populated and primarily poorer fringe area of Colombo called Nugegoda. It is run under the auspices of the YMCA and was begun by one of the members who had contact with people in the area and saw that they lacked a means of helping their children prepare themselves for a better life. In addition to day care for pre-school children of working parents and training in office, health, sewing and artisan skills, the SMASH program offers primary health care using volunteer and library facilities, including a mobile unit which serves adjacent areas.

The classes are full in the day care operation, and the small house used as the facility is being enlarged so that more children can be accommodated. A small fee per student is charged, and nutritional snacks are provided at the same time that parents and children are taught the nutritional value of the various foods available to their families. The

day care facility is providing high-quality instruction in motor skills, socialization, and other subjects usually taught in kindergarten. The vocational training was not observed.

CODEL is supporting the salaries of day care, library and vocational training personnel, furniture, rent, books, equipment (including a van for the mobile library) and administrative costs.

Results/Meeting Objectives (Stated Objectives)

The stated objectives include:

1. Sensitizing the poor of Nugegoda to the possibilities of attaining a higher quality of life through their own "self-help" methods;
2. Upgrading the techniques of child care and mothercraft, thus lifting the health standards of the poorest of the poor in Nugegoda; and
3. Aiding in the provision of facilities for the care of pre-kindergarten children in order that the parents may have an opportunity to work, thereby upgrading their socio-economic status.

The brief observation (2 hours) devoted to this project did not allow sufficient time to measure the achievement of the above objectives. In order to carry out such an evaluation, it would be necessary to devise indicators with the participation of the staff. Since this project has not been providing written reports, it can be assumed that they require assistance in thinking through a means of evaluating their impact on the community.

Managerial, Technical and Environmental Soundness

The staff on hand at the day care operation seemed to be quite

competent, both managerially and technically. The head of the local YMCA and other community leaders on hand for the visit spoke knowledgeably about the operation of the center, which leads one to believe that they are involved on a continuing basis. The provision of volunteer professional assistance (medical and other) helps to keep the quality of services provided at a high level.

#### Leadership Capability

This project is one sponsored by the better-off members of the community for the not-so-well-off. CODEL intervened to suggest that the beneficiaries be brought into participation in the planning and management of the center, and this has apparently been done with great success and much to the satisfaction of the sponsors. During the visit the evaluator spoke with several mothers and one father who had taken an interest in the operation of the facility, and they were enthusiastic and knowledgeable. Since the adult training portion of the project was not observed, it may be that the leadership skills are included as part of that curricula.

#### Working Relations and Style

In spite of the fact that beneficiaries are participating more than in the past, it would be useful for the project holder to explore ways in which the quality of participation as well as the quantity could be increased. The project has a feeling similar to that of a standard educational facility in which people are accustomed to receiving services without putting much effort into it themselves. In other words, the top-down, rather than the bottom-up, type of development seems to be the style. Some questions could be raised about the degree to which this project, for all its worth, meets the CODEL criteria for self-reliance

and participation.

#### Impact on the Poor

More information is needed before a judgment can be made on this factor. It is fairly safe to guess that the facility is providing poor people in the neighborhood who are motivated to improve their lives with the opportunity to receive help for themselves and their children.

#### CODEL Criteria

1. Ecumenical collaboration--good with Christians and non-Christian groups affiliated with the YMCA as well as with government bureaus;
2. Participation--good beginning, can be improved;
3. Learning from participation--evident in the day care center on the part of participating parents;
4. Sharing (appropriate level of) costs--this aspect needs more attention than could be given during the visit. Perhaps the beneficiary community could do more to provide staff time at the center even if they cannot pay fees; and
5. Consonance with local and national priorities--probably high, including as it does health, job training, education and day care.

#### Comments

It does not look as though this project will ever be self-supporting. CODEL has been the primary outside donor, and some thought should be given to the possibility that dependence is being reinforced--dependence of the project holder on CODEL and dependence of the beneficiaries on SMASH. This project needs a careful and thoughtful look by a group with representatives from all three parties.

## PROJECT PROFILE #8

Background

KEN-AG/J94-UMCOR Meru Inter-Church Dry Areas Agricultural Program  
(Catholic) Diocese of Meru

Meru, Kenya

1978

1979-1981

\$21,000

\$6,098

KEN-AG/TECH-06 Liliaba-Mula Ranching Group Water Supply Project  
KEN-AG/J149-TECH Meru Irrigation Project (Phase II of above)

Consolata Fathers

Kenya

\$111,700

Project Description

The cluster is for two different types of interventions, in the same zone but not in the same location, brought on by the same problem (lack of water) and responded to by the same group of people (Catholic church) although represented by two different project holders: the Consolata Fathers working as missionaries in the area on the water project and the development office of the Diocese of Meru on the agricultural project.

The two responses to a lack of water illustrate two different approaches to development--one which is heavily based on the provision of infrastructure (a water system) to the needy community and the other

which is predicated on tailoring an intervention which had been tried successfully elsewhere (Kitui-Machakos). This intervention was the provision of seeds in a post-drought situation to get agriculture started again. Neither was participatory at the beginning, but the agricultural project has become so.

If the two projects are compared for development cost/benefit, the result clearly gives the agricultural project investment of \$6,000 the edge over the water project (\$111,700 total). It should be noted, however, that the \$27,000 is a portion of the (unknown) total.

#### Agricultural Project

This project was a "replication" of a project in the neighboring district where, after drought relief operations were phased out, the churches decided to help farmers start their crops again, but in a better way using improved (drought-resistant) seeds and growing more diversified and nutritious crops, hopefully with an improvement in agricultural practices. The farmers were to reimburse the "seed bank" by returning twice the amount they had received; this was to be used the following season by additional farmers and to cover the costs of inputs such as fertilizer.

#### Water Project

The Consolata Fathers are Italian missionaries working throughout Kenya. The fathers in the Meru Diocese had the assistance of a Brother who is a "wizard" at construction of all sorts, including water systems, although he has never had formal training.

One of the main problems of this area is lack of sufficient rainfall, aggravated by a long drought in the late 70's. Lack of water

prevented use of a beautiful valley as grazing and crop land, keeping it the preserve of wild animals. People did not settle there because of the lack of water and a fear of lions. CODEL helped Brother Argesi construct a water system which tapped a stream faather up in the hills, conducted the water into a silting tank so that the worst sediment would settle out, and delivered the water to a series of outlets.

The second project was designed to pipe the water to outlets at the various valley sites where use-points were established. The local authorities were to participate with a sum of money for the outlet system which they agreed would be feasible and a small way to assure the provision of water where none was previously available. They were also to organize a water-use fee-collection system and maintain the service. The water was primarily for agricultural purposes, although people were beginning to think of settling in the area after seeing that the first established outlet permitted the Fathers to grow fruit trees and a full range of crops.

#### Results/Meeting Objectives

Neither project has yet been able to achieve its objectives. The agricultural project was not able to attain the number of demonstration plots originally projected (90 projects in three locations), nor was it possible to get the seed returned as projected. The 79-80 season was low in rainfall, and there was a major problem with timely planting and weeding, not to mention predation from animals.

Nevertheless, the field visit showed that the level of awareness of the people in one of the groups (Njuruta) was high concerning both cooperation and participation. The evaluator spent about 3 hours with the group at their communal field; the group consisted of the sub-chief and

approximately six women and five men from the committee. The British technician from the project accompanied the evaluator. The group, approximately 200 members, had an average of 15 acres allotted to each of them and were farming from 5 to 10 acres each. In addition, they had the two communal plots we were visiting where they were growing maize, sorghum, beans (green and black), sunflowers (not doing well), green gramme and lentils.

When asked what they had learned from the experience of the group shamba (plot), the women said they had learned how to plant in rows and how to work together. The group then asked the evaluator for a tractor which they said would enable them to farm more land.

The water project has been held up in the last phase of construction--that of constructing the piping from the silting tank and providing outlets. The local authorities did not come up with their share of the money, and there was a problem between the priest and the local chief. It was deemed wise not to try to do anything further until after the elections. Elections have been held, and there is a new chief. Now it may be possible to continue the project. The evaluator paid a courtesy call to the town council offices with the development coordinator from the Meru Diocese. The council indicated a willingness to participate.

#### Managerial, Technical and Environmental Soundness

Both the agricultural project and the water project have foreign technicians assigned to them and are reasonably well assisted by local governmental technical personnel. The agricultural project has recently been successful in having an extension officer seconded from the government to work in the project, and it is envisioned that

managerial and technical responsibility will shortly be fully in the hands of the Kenyans. The water project continues under the management and technical direction of the Consolata Fathers.

The agricultural project is understaffed; the lack of field personnel is a limiting factor in extending the project to the number of groups originally targeted, but there is no prospect in sight for alleviating this shortage. Organizing and training the farmer groups took more work than planned. The water project has not provided comparable group formation.

Although it may be gathered from the above that environmental considerations were generally considered by both projects, there is no indication that an in-depth study was conducted.

#### Leadership Capability

It is rather difficult to judge whether the projects have had any impact on the formation of leaders. If persons have emerged as leaders in the projects, they are very likely individuals who were already leaders in the community and church. The agricultural project is offering more scope to local persons to exercise leadership than the water project.

#### Working Relations and Style

The agricultural project was intended as an ecumenical project with the leadership in implementation provided by the Catholics with the participation of the Methodists. This plan seems to have been unsuccessful, probably due to a combination of factors. On the one hand, it was easier to effect Catholic-Methodist collaboration in the Kitui project upon which this was modeled because Nairobi, where joint meetings were held, was easily accessible from the project site. This

is not the case with Meru, which is too far from Nairobi to make an easy return trip in one day. In addition, some misunderstanding seems to have arisen between the two groups at the diocesan level. The project implementors report that they are eager to have Methodist collaboration, but have not been able to find a way to involve appropriate personnel or to participate in the joint meetings that the Kitui project holds.

The water project has worked with the community at large, as has the agricultural project, but it has not really been working in a collaborative style with other religious institutions. Participation of the beneficiaries has been minimal in the planning and control of the water project and may be the basis for some of the difficulties which have caused this project to be suspended for over a year.

Both projects would very likely benefit from CODEL's good offices in helping to improve the degree and kind of collaboration of both institutions and participants. This would also help alleviate the aura of the church doing and providing things to help the people, thus improving the likelihood of fostering self-reliance.

#### Impact on the Poor

No hard data can be presented in support of the observation that both projects are working with people who are not the poorest in the area. The situation that both projects are trying to improve is one of scarcity of rainfall and water supply. This is chronic to the project areas and was brought to the attention of the implementors by a severe drought several years ago. Helping people to better cope with such important resource constraints is well within CODEL's guidelines.

CODEL Criteria

1. Ecumenical collaboration--needs quite a bit of work in both projects;
2. Participation--fairly good in the agricultural project; not good in the water project. Limitations to even better participation are imposed by the lack of trained field personnel in the agricultural project;
3. Learning through participation--the agricultural project produced evidence of such learning. One of the women farmers said that her group had learned several things from their experience in the project, the most important being to work together and to plant in rows. Such learning was missing from the water project;
4. Sharing (appropriate level of) costs--the agricultural project rates fairly well, but has had difficulties in recouping the seeds which were supposed to be returned to the project by participant farmers. The water project is quite different; an expensive (compared to local resources) infrastructure was provided from outside sources with very little sharing of costs by the beneficiaries. Government was supposed to contribute a certain amount to finish the system, but has not yet done so. The reasons for this stalemate go beyond those given (personalities and political difficulties) and may be related to the (non-participatory) way in which the project was planned and implemented; and
5. Consonance with local and national priorities--high.

Comments

The relationship between CODEL and the project holders of both projects seems to be difficult. Reports are not provided as agreed to in the Grant Letter of Agreement, and there seems to be some misunderstanding on the part of the project holders as to the reason for reporting even though no progress may have taken place. The perception of the evaluator is that the church organizations in Kenya are relatively developed organizationally and may be exhibiting a desire common to more experienced groups to receive funds without any strings attached. At the same time, a desire was expressed on the part of the Meru Diocesan Development Office for cooperation with CODEL on a much deeper level.

## PROJECT PROFILE #9

Background

DR-CD/J172-CWS

Rural Water Resource Development Program

Social Service of Dominican Churches (SSID)

San Juan de la Maguana, Dominican Republic

1979 - 1981

\$40,000

Project Description

The Protestant Churches in the Dominican Republic jointly engage in development activities through the Servicio Social de Iglesias Dominicanas (SSID--Social Service of Dominican Churches). This organization is a counterpart to the Church World Service/Division of Overseas Ministries in the United States, a member of CODEL.

Aridity is a chronic problem for the valley of San Juan de la Maguana, which lies near the border with Haiti; many water-borne diseases contribute to the poor health and nutrition which is prevalent among the people of this area. Government programs to provide water supplies never were made available to the people of this area. In their work in the San Juan area, the SSID determined that lack of safe water sources was a health problem, and the lack of water for agriculture was a limiting factor in production.

In 1977 Church World Service provided a well-digging rig and other

equipment to speed the provision of water to the area. According to the CWS Project Update (undated, but probably the beginning of 1979), the project had not met its goals "due to the lack of awareness of the complexity and requirements of a successful well-digging program (in terms of administration, equipment purchases, personnel and promotion). What has been achieved is a thorough awareness of the program's needs through trial by fire." In 1978 Church World Service provided a technical advisor who administered the project and trained a Dominican driller and three technicians.

At the time CODEL was approached, CWS provided equipment at a cost of \$25,000, had trained the Dominicans to do the work, and were turning over the project to the full control of SSID. The operating budget was quite high, and although attempts were made to interest the AID Mission in Santo Domingo, the hoped-for OPG support did not develop.

This budget, which was set at approximately \$67,000 for 1979, included salaries and per diem for four full-time persons, a truck and miscellaneous equipment, construction materials, pumps, and fuel and maintenance for the equipment. The project activity includes site selection (hydro-geologic and human needs surveys), villager conscientization and organization, well-drilling, installation of handmill or windmill powered pumps, and maintenance. A new budget was drawn up for three years, and the construction of a maintenance facility was added in lieu of the truck, for a total cost of \$166,623.

The staff recommendation to the committee was to fund half of the request, or \$83,312, over three years with the condition that the SSID fund the other half from other sources before CODEL funding would be given. The Project Summary prepared by CODEL staff noted that "in terms of just the installation of water systems, the project will not have a

substantial development impact," but that one might hope for the strengthening of community organization, a matter which should be discussed with the project holder and made the "constant concern of evaluation."

The Grant Letter of Agreement (dated August 21, 1980) granted "the sum of US\$14,000 of a total of US\$40,000." In a letter dated June 10, 1981, SSID sent a project report and requested that CODEL send the rest of the grant, \$26,000, which they had budgeted for project operations in 1981. SSID had understood that the \$40 000 was for one year, while CODEL had intended the \$40,000 to be spread over three years. SSID noted that they were preparing a new project for the years 1982, 1983 and 1984, which they hoped "can be financed in combination by CODEL, the Inter-American Foundation and the Church World Service."

Results/Meeting Objectives (Stated Objectives)

The objectives set by the project are unclear. A CWS staff person prepared the proposal which listed the following objective:

To improve the health and nutritional status of village populations through the installation of well-drilled water systems.

The Project goals were listed as follows:

1. To construct water systems with the use of drilling equipment to provide an adequate supply of potable water to village populations;
2. To establish community support of construction activities and community responsibility for the maintenance of the water system;
3. To provide health education;
4. To evaluate the developmental and health impact of the water resources in the communities;
5. To transfer all program administration and implementation capability to SSID staff; and
6. To train Dominican technicians to become competent drillers.

In the only progress report furnished (progress to May, 1981), the following results are listed:

1. Three wells drilled and one in process; and
2. Four wells hand dug.

The financial information given is:

1. Detail and monthly total of salary and per diem for six personnel;
2. Average cost of materials and labor for each well drilled with the rig, including the community portion;
3. No difference between what was accomplished and what has been achieved;
4. No major problems; and
5. Project is ahead of schedule in terms of the numbers of wells completed. Original projections called for 8 - 10 wells to be completed by April 1981. In late February 1981, 24 wells had been completed.
6. Community groups participating in this project pay for 50% of the total cost of the installation and assume 100% of the responsibility for maintenance. The 50% community effort is not part of the written progress report, however. Total costs--\$6,620; community share--\$787. (It may be possible that the report refers to the cost of the pump only, but this is not evident from the documentation.)

#### Managerial, Technical and Environmental Soundness

The reporting did not cover these aspects, so the field visit of the evaluator was geared to examining them. The management is decentralized to a great extent, the team in San Juan having almost complete responsibility for planning and management and the SSID headquarters bearing responsibility for providing resources as needed and for reporting on the project. Team management is good, but the communications between the team and headquarters is somewhat limited, consisting primarily of data on numbers of wells projected and completed as well as the resources used. Thus headquarters is able to pass on

only these data to the donors.

The team seems to be technically competent with regard to the hydrologic and needs assessments. They are competent to do test drillings, to survey sites for the likelihood of finding water (only one hand-dug well visited was not yielding water at the projected depth). The technicians had counseled stopping the digging, but the local group wished to continue for a few more feet. The site had been chosen with regard to convenience and somewhat against the advice of the technicians.)

Environmental soundness is taken into account, especially with regard to sanitation.

#### Leadership Capability

The team has strong community promotion skills and has learned that it is necessary to spend a fair amount of time in developing community support for the well project before it is undertaken. Otherwise, the maintenance of the well and pump is not well managed by the community. There is a need for strengthening this aspect, as well as for follow-up on sanitation, health and nutrition education. This has not yet been organized, although the team seems to be aware of the improved impact that the provision of well water would have if follow-up were provided.

Community leadership has been strengthened and even, in some places, developed where none existed before. One community group said that they had never before worked together; they were following up the wells project with the building of a school (to be funded by the IAF grant) and were thinking of a clinic as the next project. It was this same community which indicated that the people had never before thought of the possibility of digging a well. This seemed at first incredible,

but after discussion and observation the evaluator came to see how this might very well be true.

People of this area had always gathered water from nearby streams which were periodically dry and almost always polluted both from human wastes and from the runoff of agricultural chemicals. Since people had always obtained water from these sources, it did not really occur to them that a well could be dug near the stream which would provide a steady supply of unpolluted water, even during the dry months. The government programs for provision of water had never reached this area, and there was no experience with wells--hence the lack of knowledge.

The SSID started the program after it became apparent that no amount of pressure was going to change the situation. SSID still hopes to get the government interested in taking over this responsibility. The field visit was made during preparations for an election, and some of the politicians representing the area in the legislature were attempting to claim credit for the wells. If their interest can be continued after the elections, some inroads may be made, but it seems doubtful that the situation which made the SSID intervention necessary in the first place will change greatly.

#### Working Relations and Style

In its 18 years of work with poor people in the Dominican Republic, the SSID is evolving from a position of providing people with assistance to assisting them to organize themselves, to develop skills and leadership, and to improve family and community life (nutrition/health/family planning, manual skills, literacy, agricultural production and fish culture, and community infrastructure projects such as wells, roads, canals and housing reconstruction after the hurricane.)

The past lingers on, with remnants of the old ways of providing people with assistance still evident in the wells program, but this reality is being noted and dealt with. The program was modified to include hand-dug wells because the team found that bringing in a well-drilling rig and quickly making a well seemed to hamper the formation of community commitment. More time is being spent on advance preparation of the community, and the need for follow-up work not currently being done is acknowledged by the team. In short, there is change and movement toward the kinds of development principles which CODEL aspires to support.

#### Impact on the Poor

SSID has chosen to work among the poor, and the region of San Juan de la Maguana is one of the areas which is neglected by many development programs at the same time that it is disfavored by nature. In addition, the existence of large landowners (rice and cattle) and the potential of an oil find do not favor the development of the poor.

As the CODEL Project Summary noted, the simple provision of water will not have much of a development impact unless it provides a starting point for integral human development. SSID has begun with the provision of water, which is the most basic of human needs, and wants to do more. CODEL has a role in helping SSID to think about how best to expand their efforts and then to provide some resources to do it.

#### CODEL Criteria

1. Ecumenical collaboration--in principle with Catholic Caritas, but in practice limited to Protestant churches. SSID as an agency is vocal and very committed to working with the Catholics, but there is resistance from the other side;

2. Participation--uneven, somewhat low, but improving;
3. Learning through participation--much improved through the hand-dug wells projects;
4. Sharing (appropriate level of) costs--this is ambiguous, and does not appear to be too high, but is probably being improved. Needs to be discussed with SSID; and
5. Consonance with local and national priorities--high.

#### Comments

Several learnings can be gleaned from this project, and several questions about development can be asked. For example:

1. Was it wise in the first place to send such expensive and highly technical equipment to this project? If this level of assistance was inappropriate to the levels of resources available to the poor in 1977, is it not still inappropriate and does it not still create dependence on outside sources of funding?
2. How could the combined investment of CWS, CODEL and IAF, which must amount to close to \$200,000 since 1977 (including personnel, shipping and other costs which may not be included in the project budget), have been used so as to achieve the same effect (the provision of potable water) in a way that would be more in keeping with CODEL principles (to which the other agencies also ascribe)?
3. Is there any way to diminish dependence under the present set of circumstances--the dependence of SSID on outside sources and the dependence of the people on SSID?
4. Is there any plan which SSID can undertake now to phase out of

this operation (machine-drilled wells) and turn it over to a more appropriate agency, e.g. government?

5. Do the funding agencies see their contributions as a stopgap measure, or are they committed to a long-term partnership? The existence of the project and its evident success is creating more demand than the present budget can meet. What will the situation be a year from now?
6. It was evident from the field visit that SSID requires technical assistance from its funding agencies on project reporting and evaluation as well as on management. How do the funding agencies see this, and what can they do to respond?

## ATTACHMENT B

### PROJECT EVALUATIONS

The project evaluations in this section are the result of an examination of project files for compliance with project management and documentation procedures set up by CODEL. A checklist (See Appendix 2 - Figure 7) was devised to collect and briefly note the presence/absence of basic data and analysis.

These four projects are part of a 10% sample chosen because they had been visited in the field by the evaluator (#1, #2 and #3) or because they met the following criteria: recently funded, in implementation, with reports due/received, "good" projects, and good documentation. The full 10% sample was not evaluated because the evaluator opted to review the entire portfolio for each project when it became apparent that many projects had failed to fully comply with the standards set for data collection, analysis and management.

Recommendations for improving the programmatic process are based on these general and specific project file reviews.

## PROJECT EVALUATION #1

Background

II-IND-CD-J198-MHM

Community Wells for Drinking Water

Jeevadeen Project, Fr. Remigi Nadackal, Director

1981 -1982 (2 years)

Total \$69,600

CODEL \$46,220 for 2 years (\$25,000 first, \$21,220 second) - Full  
Local \$23,380Evaluation Checklist

1. a. Application dated June 17, 1980 (written while proponent was visiting CODEL)
- b. From proponent (who had previous and other CODEL funding)
- c. Application form with technical study on wells
  
2. a. No additional information requested
- b. No field trip indicated
- c. Presume earlier knowledge since two other projects by CODEL to this project holder
  
3. Date of project summary September 4, 1980
  - " " Project Committee application September 10, 1980
  - " " Executive Committee application September 11, 1980
  - a. Full funding \$46,220; \$25,000 first year
  - b. Two years
  - c. Same as request
  - d. General support for well-digging project--labor and materials though budget does not break these down
  
4. CODEL Criteria
  - a. "Poorest of the poor" (application says "family income one dollar per day insufficient for food") 60% under-employment, caste victims of social injustice, malnutrition, 1 - 4 acres/family, illiteracy over 70% for towns, over 95% villages, no technical schools, hospital limited to 50 patients
  - b. Water "basic and essential need"
  - c. Application says people "have nothing to contribute but their

- labor"
- d. No mention of women
- e. Training local personnel--use indigenous resources and self-reliance
- f. Catholic and Protestant "smooth and harmonious relations," AFPRO did technical feasibility study; application says state of Hyderabad government gave legal sanction
- g. No mention of environmental concerns
- h. Not proselytizing
- i. Not sectarian
- j. Information unavailable on foreign national training
- k. No duplication
- l. No construction

#### Other Criteria

- a. Objectives are clear, concrete, measurable, and address a priority development problem. 40 wells "to provide sufficient drinking water to 1000 families and 5 institutions in 15 villages" assumes 30 persons per family. Selection of 15 villages from total population of 275,000 in the area was based on technical feasibility study identifying likely water sources.
  - b. No implementation plan; "can do 40 wells in 9 months," but project spans 2 years
  - c. Says Jeevadan can manage, but gives no details as to personnel
  - d. No provision for inflation, but targets 9 months to finish. Only materials and labor included--no costs for evaluation and audit.
  - e. Technical study recommended 40 wells and pumpsets at 27 sites at \$100,000--\$81,000 to drill wells and housing. Are the pumpsets coming from another source? Field visit did not cover talks with technical personnel, but government hydrologist was to assist the project.
  - f. No details available except that beneficiaries will contribute labor
  - g. Project summary does not state impact except to say "provide water for people and animals;" project application says impact is better health and the breaking up of caste and religious differences for 1,000 families
  - h. No evaluation plan
5. Full funding was granted, but over two years instead of one as requested by proposal. Staff recommendation that funding be contingent on receipt of evaluation for first year's work was approved by both the Project and Executive Committees

6. Approved 9/11/80  
No grant letter in file  
Transmitted \$15,000 AID money 2/9/81
7. Grant Letter of Agreement not in file. Cover letter (to transmittal) does not state requirement for evaluation report
8. Report due in July--not received (a little early perhaps)
9. No information in file on whether reports were shared with donors and sponsors
10. This project has fairly detailed application which was not fully used in the Project Summary, missing the opportunity to communicate with Projects Committee and potential funders. Catholic Archdiocese of Hyderabad got AFPRO to do a technical study for sites "to help about 350 small and marginal farmers in five districts to sink irrigation wells (cost \$100,000 in pumps)." This is not discussed in the application or Project Summary.

## PROJECT EVALUATION #2

Background

IV-SR-CD

SMASH Center for Development of Body, Mind and Spirit

YMCA - Nugegoda, Sri Lanka

1981 - 83 inclusive (Grant Letter of Agreement for 2 years starting  
July 7, 1981)

Requested \$43,080

CODEL Grant \$43,080

Other (local) volunteer labor, dues, sales \$17,760 (two years)

Evaluation

1. General appeal dated 7 October 1980 received 23 October 1980
  - " " acknowledged 23 October 1980
  - " " response 15 October not in file
  - a. Received 17 November 80
  - b. YMCA - Nugegoda
  - c. Letter
2.
  - a. No additional information requested
  - b. Maybe field trip, but not indicated in file
  - c. Although the information is not in the file, the application letter indicates previous funding by CODEL-- \$10,000 (March 79), \$14,610 (December 1979), \$7,230 (July 1980). Project Summary says total funding since 1978 has been \$31,840.
3. Date of Project Summary - January 22, 1981  
March 26, 1981 (resubmitted)  
Letter of January 26th says January 22nd meeting of Projects Committee deferred, needing information on local contributions.  
Resubmitted March 26, Executive committee approved 4/1/81
  - a. Full funding - \$43,080
  - b. Two years (\$23,000 in first year)
  - c. No variance
  - d. General support

4. CODEL Criteria
- a. Poor, but no supporting data; statement that "all planning and implementation have been with the participation of those. . . benefitting. . ."; no evidence of community self-reliance
  - b. Local priority needs - no evidence
  - c. This project was supposed to be self-supporting after first two years; now running another two years
  - d. No reference to women
  - e. Training of local personnel - no available information
  - f. Y is "natural forum for ecumenical relations and collaborative programs." No details available on inter-faith coordination
  - g. Environmental - no information
  - h. Socio-economic, not proselytizing
  - i. Sectarian - no information
  - j. Train other than for development
  - k. Duplication of efforts - no information
  - l. Building - no evidence

Other Criteria

- a. No objectives stated, only services
  - b. No implementation plan stated, only services
  - c. No evidence of managerial competence stated in analysis
  - d. No budget for evaluation or audit; income noted
  - e. No evidence of technical competence except proposal says have qualified professionals
  - f. Beneficiaries plan and implement, but no specifics
  - g. Impact is to "raise the standard of living" (no specifics) for "the poor of Nugegoda" (no specifics)
  - h. No comment on evaluation
5. Recommended full funding for two years  
January 22, 1981 Committee asked for details on local contributions  
March 26, 1981 Resubmitted and approved
- a. Approved April 1, 1981 by Executive Committee  
Grant Letter of Agreement - June 26, 1981, signed 7 July 1981  
Funds transmitted June 24, 1981 (\$10,000)  
(Why so long to send GLOA? Why transmitted before receiving signed GLOA?)
  - b. Funding mix - information not in files
  - c. Proponent is YMCA, Sri Lanka local  
Cooperants are government and religious groups  
Sponsor is Congregational Christian Service Committee
  - d. No subsequent transmittals yet
7. a. GLOA sent and signed with conditions  
b. Year one - first installment; year two ?  
However, funds were transmitted before GLOA was signed  
c. Standard reporting
8. No reports due yet
9. Not applicable

10. This project is a re-funding at a relatively high level--\$20,000 a year--of a project that was supposed to be self-sufficient. Is this not against CODEL's development principles?

## PROJECT EVALUATION #3

Background

BRA-CD/J208-LWR

Agriculture and Community Development

FUNDIFRAN - Brazil

1981 - 1982

\$408,000 requested

CODEL \$168,000 for two years. Previous CODEL support for 1979-80 was \$210,000, of which \$150,000 has been transmitted as of 9/4/80--balance also has since been transferred.

LWR will fund balance of first year amounting to \$42,000 for total of \$84,000

Evaluation

1.
  - a. No date of receipt
  - b. FUNDIFRAN via Diaconia and LWR - on own form
  - c. Detailed proposal on FUNDIFRAN form
2.
  - a. No additional information requested
  - b. Field trip planned for fall, 1981
  - c. Funded previously by CODEL but no indication in file of lessons learned or of accomplishments except in summary
3. Project Summary - 9/4/80  
Presented to Projects Committee 9/10/80
  - a. \$168,000 approved of a total budget of \$408,000
  - b. Two years--January 1981 to December 1982
  - c. No variance from request
  - d. General support
4. CODEL Criteria (only supporting data is two-year project plan of FUNDIFRAN in Portuguese)
  - a. No base line data to verify general description of needs in target area
  - b. & c. If FUNDIFRAN's methodology is followed, local priorities will be paramount and local resources will have maximum use
  - d. No details on women; they are just part of the community groups

- e. Constant training, use of local resources, and self-reliance according to project file
- f. No collaboration
- g. No information, although probably will be considered in meetings and dialogue between teams/communities
- h. Socio-economic emphasis OK
- i. Non-sectarian emphasis OK--no longer "official" Catholic church organization
- j. Doesn't train foreign nationals for other than specific development
- k. No duplication of efforts
- l. Not principally building

## Other Criteria

- a. Objectives are clear and measurable in general terms; they do relate to priorities as jointly identified by teams/communities
  - b. Implementation is by process, not by dates
  - c. Managerial competence evidenced only by inference after reading the project. FUNDIFRAN is established as a legal entity
  - d. Budget very complete except for audits, evaluation and inflation
  - e. Technical competence appears satisfactory although there are no curriculum vitae for the staff
  - f. Over-all project does not involve participants/beneficiaries; however, sub-projects do, and in all aspects
  - g.
    - 1. Project covers all socio-economic aspects--qualitative and quantitative; benefits will be evident if proposed evaluation plan is followed
    - 2. 1500 families are directly involved through community groups. 7-10 villages, 21-30 communities; small farmers, landless peasants, fishermen
    - 3. Specific changes expected will be delivered at the sub-project level by teams/communities
  - h. Evaluated by joint sessions between teams/communities with very detailed methodology; also intensive evaluation at team and entity levels
5. a. Projects Committee - September 10, 1980  
Executive Committee - September 11, 1980 (\$84,000 1981, \$84,000 1982)
- b. Coordinator's recommendation followed
6. a. Approved 9/11/80; first tranche for \$42,000 3/24/81
- b. LWR (AID) \$90,000; UMCOR \$35,000
- c. Proponents, cooperants - no information
- d. Second tranche for \$42,000 on 6/19/81 by disbursement schedule of CODEL. No direct tie-in to reports, but donors will receive semi-annual reports. No financial reports yet received. Compliance should be obligatory before funds are transmitted
7. No information

8. First reports due September, 1981
9. Coordinator visited June 80 before approval and will visit again in September 1981
10. No comments.

## PROJECT EVALUATION #4

Background

DR-CD/J172 CWS

Rural Water Resource Development Program

Servicio Social de Iglesias Dominicanas (SSID - Social Service of Dominican Churches)

1979 to 1981

Requested \$83,312 over three years

Total amount: \$166,623 over three years  
CODEL approved \$40,000 over three years

Evaluation

1.
  - a. Received September 23, 1979
  - b. Direct from project holder (CWS counterpart)
  - c. Application form with covering letter. Previously some correspondence between CODEL/CWS/project holder. Proposal eventually sent to CODEL at suggestion of CWS
2.
  - a. No additional information requested
  - b. Received from Church World Service (CODEL member)
  - c. CWS has been involved since 1976. Also CODEL had funded a Revolving Loan Fund project with SSID, indicating prior knowledge of project
3. Submitted to Project Committee on 11/17/79
  - a. Partial funding approved - \$40,000, contingent on receipt of other funds
  - b. Three years
  - c. Coordinator recommends same sum (\$83,312) as requested by project holder
  - d. General support
4. CODEL Criteria (supporting data consists of project proposal and file on previous project with SSID)
  - a. No specific information on project group, just general country statistics. Target group is involved in decision making, ie. agrees to do a wells program, provides local resources (money and labor), and maintains the water systems. However,

communities do not participate in over-all project decision making. Apparently there is no networking between communities.

- b. Local priority needs
- c. Potential of local resources to meet project needs is verified before each individual project is initiated at the community level
- d. Women are just considered as part of community
- e. Training in management and maintenance of water systems is provided to well committee
- f. Various local churches and groups are involved in collaboration
- g. Water level potential is studied before implementation
- h. Definitely socio-economic in field
- i. Non-sectarian
- j. Training is only for nationals
- k. No duplication of efforts
- l. Complied with building limitation

#### Other Criteria

- a. Objectives are satisfactorily stated in general terms, but target group is not specifically identified, only as poor communities in one geographical area
  - b. No schedule in implementation plan except in general terms
  - c. Managerial competence evidenced by SSID
  - d. Budget realistic except no audit or evaluation costs are included nor are any contingency funds. Expected income from communities is not listed
  - e. Technical competence is evident, although some curriculum vita information on the technical personnel would be helpful
  - f. Participation is at sub-project level and, at this level, it is excellent. No participation at SSID level
  - g. Direct impact is in improved health for villagers because of potable water availability
    1. Benefits are improved health and less water-borne disease. Group participation and self-reliance enhanced
    2. 8-10 villages annually. Water systems only for organized community groups
    3. Improved health, stronger community organization
  - h. Activities will be evaluated. However, since there is no evidence of initial base line data, health improvement will be difficult to ascertain
5. a. Projects Committee approved November 27, 1979
  - b. Projects Committee reduced Coordinator's recommendation from \$83,312 to \$40,000. Also the Committee made approval contingent upon receipt of other funds from other donors
6. a. Executive Committee approved December 13, 1979  
GLOA dated August 21, 1980  
First transmittal September 16, 1980
  - b. Funding mix: DOM/UPC \$ 4,000  
AID \$10,000
  - c. Field cooperants - Peace Corps, INAPA, CWS, CARIAS  
U.S. sponsor - CWS
  - d. Subsequent transmittals will be triggered upon receipt of final narrative reports

7.
  - a. GLOA does not specify time frame of first transmittal or the special conditions, only standard conditions in GLOA
  - b. No special conditions, only GLOA standard ones
  - c. Standard reporting requirements
  
8.
  - a. General narrative report for January-June 1981 period received August 1981. This report can also be considered a very incomplete evaluation
  - b. First report due March 1981, received June 10. It covers period to May 20, 1981 and is just a financial report; it does not contain narrative on progress
  - c. Audit report for FY 1977 has been received. Plan for future audits requested by CODEL in April 1981; no reply in file
  - d. CODEL field evaluation conducted in February 1981. Field trip report on this visit very perfunctory and not really an evaluation
  
9. Field trip reports apparently shared with all board members and some donors; however nothing in file to verify this
  
10. Due to poor communication, project holder thought \$40,000 was approved for each year when actual approval was \$40,000 for three year period. CODEL dealt with problem by promising to obtain \$14,000 in September 1981 and asking project holder to submit a new project request for 1982 to 1984 in November of 1981

## ABOUT THE CONSULTANTS

MARYANNE DULANSEY, the principal author of this evaluation, heads Consultants in Development, a firm providing problem-solving services to U.S. and overseas development organizations, especially in programs of food and nutrition, rural employment (agriculture, crafts and small industries), and women's participation in development. Ms. Dulansey has worked with the private and voluntary organization community as a consultant and as a member of Catholic Relief Services on the design, funding and evaluation of programs in Asia, Africa and Latin America, organizational development and management consulting, market research and training. Maryanne is a native of Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

JACK MANSFIELD began his social service career as a minister in the United Methodist Church where his assignments included Director of the National Council of Churches North Carolina Migrant Ministry. He has served as director of program development for several foundations and on the faculty of New York University Graduate School of Social Work's Center for the Study of the Unemployed. He has served as the director of a large "people-owned" economic development corporation formed by a coalition of Indian, black and white poor persons in a depressed rural area. Consultancies have covered community organization, economic development, management systems, and employment training with government agencies, private organizations and community groups in the United States and overseas. Jack was born in Cumberland, Maryland.

JAMES D. NOEL JR. has 26 years experience in various private voluntary organizations working overseas. He served as Project Fund Director of PACT, Regional Director for Central America and the Caribbean for Catholic Relief Services, and as Assistant Mission Director for CARE in two Latin American countries. Mr. Noel served as the Social and Religious Affairs Adviser to the Presidential Mission to Latin America (Rockefeller Mission) in 1969 and is currently consultant to the Joint Committee on Agricultural Development of the Board on International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD). Born in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, Jim has been particularly interested in improving knowledge about the realities of people in developing countries and has worked to involve beneficiaries in the planning, implementation and evaluation of development projects.

BARBARA J. SIMS holds a Masters Degree in International Affairs from Columbia University and a doctorate in Comparative and International Education from Teachers College. Her interest in Third World development has been expressed in field work and business development as well as academic studies. Dr. Sims was Peace Corps Director in Mali, did research for her thesis on the Ruralization of Primary School Education in Dahomey (Benin) and Tanzania, and served as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Morocco. Overseas business development focus has been in West and Central Africa and the Caribbean. Barbara also worked as an Education Program Specialist for the Office of Education developing teacher training for desegregated schools. She was born in St. Louis, Missouri and spent her formative years in the Cleveland, Ohio area.