

9380 134 DA 1501

DN- 26261

PD AAP-685

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Save The Children Federation/Community Development Foundation (SCF/CDF)	2. PROJECT NUMBER 938-0134	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE PDC/PVC
	4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY _____	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>81</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY _____	A. Total \$ <u>2,750,000</u>	B. U.S. \$ _____	From (month/yr.) <u>Jan. 1, 1979</u>	To (month/yr.) <u>Dec. 31, 1979</u>
					Date of Evaluation Review <u>Feb. 11, 1980</u>	

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
--	---	--------------------------------

ITEMS NEEDING FURTHER ACTION:

- 1) An issue pending is in regard to SCF's clarification of how the match was made in 1979. The response should include detailed information of all sources of income (MG, OPG, public and private, etc.), how these sources were applied to total program activities by country, and SCF's definition and rationale for applying Matching Grant funds in a country that has a grant simultaneously.
- 2) The above information should be presented in the context of the overall SCF development activities. PVC will assist SCF by preparing a financial reporting model.

BELOZ

April, 1980

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	A. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change	
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____	B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or	
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____	C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project	

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)		12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval	
James MacCracken, Vice President for Program, SCF/CDF Richard A. Redder, Director of Planning and Evaluation, SCF/CDF George Beloz, PDC/PVC/OPNS I. Austin Heyman, PDC/PVC		Signature <i>Thomas H. Fox</i>	
		Typed Name Thomas H. Fox	
		Date 2-22-80	

RESPONSES TO ISSUES MEETING FOR SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION/COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
FOUNDATION, (SCF/CDF), February 11, 1980

In reference to Issue Number 1, the SCF representatives responded by saying that priorities for program development were based on the needs of the communities in which they would be working. The Community Based Integrated Rural Development (CBIRD) model is based on the local target group being fully involved from the program concept, prioritization, implementation, development and into evaluation. SCF's field coordinators are third world people that have been trained to work under the CBIRD model. All SCF's efforts are directed toward training and encouraging the local people and government to assume responsibility for the program. Reaching this latter level takes a number of years with programs taking on their own variations but each being evaluable.

Questions Two and Three will be answered by SCF in the pending issues. The main purpose in raising the questions is to understand how SCF charges which program activity costs to the Matching Grant or an OPG when they exist simultaneously. Also, there is the need to be able to indicate clearly the private and public sources that support the expected match as opposed to using the Financial Status Report that is normally submitted. The Additional Question List was used as supplemental queries which were answered in part through the issues questions that were raised. Most of the questions can be self-answered by reviewing the Matching Grant first final report.

ISSUES MEETING
SAVE THE CHILDREN/COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION
FIRST YEAR EVALUATION OF THE MATCHING GRANT

February 11, 1980 - Room 3886 (NS)

1. How does SCF determine program priorities, and how are priority areas interrelated?
2. What are the criteria for charging Matching Grant funds to a program that has an OPG?
3. Clarify how the match was made in 1979.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS: SCF/CDF

1. What kinds of child/youth development programs does SCF have?
2. What kinds of "further systematic" support will be given to the sector related to child/youth development?
3. What kinds of non-formal education programs are being planned?
4. What kinds of activities currently exist in health and nutrition?
5. What kinds of income producing project activities are being carried out?
6. How are the community committees involved in the administration of program?
7. In which countries is solar food drying being practiced or introduced?
8. How important is the FORS in planning and reporting?
9. What is the importance of the case study, "Flanning From the Bottom Up."
10. What kind of revision and upgrading is still needed in SCF's internal evaluation?
11. Why is there an interest in development in urban impact areas?