

PDAPP 709  
9320611

17 1AM-35807

AN EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE  
OF THE FUTURES GROUP, INC.  
IN PROMOTING AND DEVELOPING  
CRS PROJECTS WORLDWIDE

A Report Prepared By:  
THOMAS M. COOKE, PH.D.  
BERNARD FISKEN, M.P.A.

During The Period:  
JUNE 16, 1982 - AUGUST 10, 1982

Supported By The:  
U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
(ADSS) AID/DSPE-C-0053

AUTHORIZATION:  
Ltr. AID/DS/POP:  
Assgn. No. 582147

# C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . . .	v
ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	vii
I. INTRODUCTION: METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS . . . . .	1
II. SCOPE OF WORK FOR EVALUATION . . . . .	3
Allocation of Staff Time, Consultant Time, and Grants and Subcontracts . . . . .	3
A. Expenditures by Line Item . . . . .	4
B. Expenditures by Region . . . . .	4
C. Expenditures for Conferences, the Newsletter, and Studies . . . . .	7
Responsiveness to Statement of Work . . . . .	9
Communications between AID/W and the Futures Group . . . . .	16
The Contribution of the Futures Group to the Contraceptive Retail Sales Program . . . . .	16
Amendments to Statement of Work . . . . .	18
A. History of Cooperative Agreements . . . . .	18
B. Review of Documents . . . . .	19
C. Language in the Cooperative Agreement . . . . .	19
D. Tightening the Scope of Work . . . . .	22
E. Option to Terminate Agreement . . . . .	23
III. SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	25
Planning . . . . .	25
Budget . . . . .	25
Amendment to Statement of Work . . . . .	25
Evaluation . . . . .	25
Conferences . . . . .	26
Communications . . . . .	26

## **APPENDICES**

- Appendix A: Scope of Work for Evaluation of Project 0611:  
Contraceptive Retail Sales, the Futures Group,  
AID/DSPE-CA-0087**
- Appendix B: Evaluation Guide for Futures' CRS Projects**
- Appendix C: Memorandum, Washchuck to Fiskin, Re: Request  
for Financial Information**
- Appendix D: List of Documents Reviewed**
- Appendix E: List of Persons Contacted**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of the Office of Population, Agency for International Development, Washington (AID/W), an evaluation was conducted of the Cooperative Agreement (CA) with the Futures Group, Inc., the purpose of which is to promote and develop contraceptive retail sales (CRS) projects. The purposes of the evaluation were to "assess the quality of contractor performance"--the contractor's compliance with the Statement of Work-- and to recommend changes in the Statement of Work.

Interviews were conducted and documents were reviewed at the offices of AID/W and the Futures Group. No field visits were made. An oral debriefing by the evaluators was held on August 11, 1982, for the staff of the Offices of Population and Contracts Management.

The Futures Group, Inc. has directed and continues to direct the expenditure of resources to fulfill the primary objective specified in the Cooperative Agreement; that is, "initiating a number of new CRS projects in countries where no such projects currently exist." However, the volume of grant awards and subcontracts under the Federal Reserve Letter of Credit (FRLC) has not met expectations. Moreover, expenditures for consultants and salaries have exceeded those projected in the original plans.

The Futures Group, Inc. is complying with other requirements defined in the Statement of Work. However, the Statement of Work of the CA needs to be amended substantially.

Since the submission of the CRS Project Paper (PP) in 1978 and the award of the CA in November 1980, the demand for CRS projects has changed, knowledge about CRS has increased, and conditions in less developed countries (LDCs) have changed.

The evaluators recommend that the staff of the Office of Population, the regional bureaus, and other appropriate offices of AID/W together with the Futures Group and other CRS contractors, meet to design an assistance strategy for CRS which would include the Cooperative Agreement. This strategy could be used to develop an action plan for the CA and a budget. The Statement of Work of the Cooperative Agreement should be amended to reflect the conclusions of the persons who attend this meeting.

At this time, there is neither a strategy nor an action plan; the Futures Group has been responding, with AID/W's concurrence, to targets of opportunity. The evaluators recommend that the requests of the Futures Group for additional funding not be honored (except to support continuing operations) until a plan of action is developed and accepted.

## ABBREVIATIONS

AID	Agency for International Development
AID/W	Agency for International Development, Washington
APHA	American Public Health Association
CA	Cooperative Agreement
CEFPA	Center for Population Activities
CRS	Contraceptive Retail Sales
CTO	Chief Technical Officer
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
FPA	Family Planning Association
FRLC	Federal Reserve Letter of Credit
GOH	Government of Haiti
IPPF	International Planned Parenthood Federation
IUD	Intrauterine Device
LDC	Less Developed Country
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
ORS	Oral Rehydration Solution
PIACT	Program for the Introduction and Adaptation of Contraceptive Technology
PP	Project Paper
RAPID	Resources for Awareness of Population Impact on Development
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

## I. INTRODUCTION: METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS

The two investigators employed by the American Public Health Association (APHA) for this evaluation interviewed officials of the Futures Group and the Agency for international Development, Washington (AID/W), and reviewed documentation in the offices of the Futures Group, the Office of Population, AID, and the Office of Contracts and Management, AID/W. All interviews were conducted in the Washington area. No international travel was planned, nor were any sites visited for this evaluation.

The scope of work for the evaluation (see Appendix A) and the initial comments of Mr. Don Newman, Office of Population, AID/W guided the evaluators. For their interviews, the two investigators prepared a list of open-ended questions--the points of departure for interviews and document review. The list of questions is attached as Appendix B. The questions in the scope of work are:\*

1. Has the contractor followed the scope of work in the Cooperative Agreement?
  - a. What investment of the contractor's staff time and consultant resources has been made to fulfill the requirements of the scope of work?
  - b. Do these investments reflect the requirements of the scope of work?
2. Have instructions and suggestions from the technical office been communicated clearly to the Futures Organization and documented in Futures' files?
3. Has the Futures Group made a useful and necessary contribution to the development and management of contraceptive retail sales (CRS) activities?
4. Should the scope of work in the Agreement be amended? If so, what changes would the team recommend?

Interviews were particularly important while gathering data, because during the design of the Cooperative Agreement and the early stages of implementation, documentation was lacking. Since February 1982, this situation seems to have improved, at least as far as the Futures Group is concerned.

---

\* The scope of work has been edited for consistency and clarity.

The evaluators' oral history is incomplete, because they were unable to interview one of the former chief technical officers (CTOs), Mr. Tim Seims. A brief interview with Mr. Art Danart, USAID/Lima, was conducted while one of the evaluators was in Lima on another assignment.

Despite these shortcomings, the evaluators feel that they acquired a reasonably accurate picture of activities in the months preceding and following the award of the CA, of activities to date, and of plans for the future.

However, the brevity of the evaluation and the restriction on overseas travel limited the evaluators' ability to answer completely the third and fourth questions in the scope of work.

The evaluators, nonetheless, are confident in concluding that the Futures Group has made a number of contributions to CRS activities. But to answer completely the third question--Has the Futures Group made a useful and necessary contribution to the development of contraceptive retail sales (CRS) activities?--it would be necessary to conduct an investigation in several of the countries where the Futures Group has operated, and to compare the merits of the organization's work with that of other CRS contractors, as well as examine needs before and after the Future Group's intervention.

To answer the fourth question completely--Should the scope of work in the Agreement be amended? If so, what changes would the team recommend?--it would be necessary to elicit the opinion of legal counsel, to which the team did not have access at the time of the evaluation. Certain activities may have legal implications. For example, the Statement of Work in the Cooperative Agreement calls for the "introduction of new products, e.g., oral rehydration salts. . . ." But can population funds of the Agency for International Development (AID) be used to purchase or promote goods or services that would support a complementary product? Also, there is some question about whether or not the Futures Group can contract with a profit-making organization in a developing country to implement part of a country program. The evaluators could suggest some parameters of these questions, but because policy issues have not been resolved and the evaluators have no access to legal counsel, they cannot recommend changes in operational definitions at this time.

As does any evaluation, this investigation raised more questions than it answered. It is apparent to the evaluators that the CRS program in general needs to be evaluated. Many of the assumptions and arguments on which the Project Paper was based need to be reconsidered now that five years of experience have accumulated.

## II. SCOPE OF WORK FOR EVALUATION

### Allocation of Staff Time, Consultant Time, and Grants and Subcontracts

The scope of work for the evaluation required the investigators to determine how much of the contractor's staff time and consultant resources have been invested to fulfill the requirements of the Cooperative Agreement. The Statement of Work in the Cooperative Agreement lists six tasks which the recipient is to accomplish. These tasks are to:

←

1. Establish project goals, strategies, and management systems.
2. Develop and implement mechanisms to inform AID missions, LDC host-country governments, and private organizations about CRS programming opportunities.
3. Establish criteria for the selection of subgrantees and sub-contractors and for the identification of appropriate organizations.
4. Establish assistance programs, including required funding for market research, advertising for product selection, marketing and market planning, logistics management, strategy development, host-country approval processes, and other activities as may be appropriate.
5. Create a CRS newsletter and an information-feedback system.
6. Conduct international conferences.

This is a long list of tasks. The Statement of Work is even more detailed, listing subtasks under each of the major headings. In fact, there may be as many as 15 distinct tasks in the Statement of Work.

The Futures Group does not require its staff to record the time they spend on the separate tasks. Nevertheless, the evaluators asked the Futures Group to prepare a number of schedules which describe staff activities under the Cooperative Agreement. The schedules are attached as Appendix C. The information from these schedules was analyzed and integrated with other financial data (e.g., data from vouchers) submitted by the Futures Group to AID/W. Vouchers, for example, provided information on expenses to date that could be compared with the budget in the original Cooperative Agreement. The evaluators used their analyses to develop two tables, a financial analysis by line item (see Table II-1) and a financial analysis by geographic region (see Table II-2).

#### A. Expenditures by Line Item

A comparison of expenditures by line item with the original budget indicates both the expectations of the pattern of activities and the actual pattern which emerged after nearly two years of operation. The data are provided in Table II-1.

To determine financial trends, percentage amounts rather than dollar figures were used. Thus, in the original budget in the Cooperative Agreement, 9.86 percent of the total budget was assigned to salaries; however, through June 30, 1982, actual expenditures for salaries totaled 19.86 percent of total expenditures. Indirect costs, which are a function of salaries in the Futures Group's accounting procedures, also have increased proportionally. Consultant fees have increased an even greater percentage than salaries.

Expenditures for personnel costs (salaries, overhead, and consultant fees) represented 27 percent of expected costs in the original budget, but actual costs for this category constituted 52 percent of the expenditures.

Expenditures for grants and subcontractors, however, have been substantially less. They comprised 67 percent of the original budget, but have amounted to only 21 percent.

#### B. Expenditures by Region

Table II-2 shows the pattern of expenditures for three line items: consultants, travel and per diem for staff and consultants, and subgrants and subcontracts. Because much of the primary documentation for these costs is located at the firm's headquarters in Connecticut, it was necessary to use some estimates of expenses and geographic overlapping. The category "Other" represents expenses that are either domestic or worldwide, and not assignable to a particular geographic region. (See Table II-2.)

Latin America has received by far the largest dollar investment for consultants and travel and per diem of any geographic region. The expenditures for subgrants and subcontracts are even more skewed in favor of Latin America and the Caribbean. Of the \$164,940 spend on subgrants and subcontracts, \$57,776 were channeled for country-specific awards, and all but \$21,194 (63 percent) of that amount was spent in Latin America and the Caribbean. All but one of the country-specific awards were spent in that region.

---

Table II-1  
FINANCIAL ANALYSIS BY LINE ITEM  
(As of June 30, 1982)

---

<u>Line Item</u>	<u>Percent Per Original CA</u>	<u>Percent Per June 1982 Voucher</u>	<u>Variance</u>
Salaries	9.86	19.86	10.00
Indirect Costs (Overhead)	14.60	29.39	14.79
Consultants (Fees Only) <sup>1</sup>	2.11	12.44	10.33
Travel/Per Diem	5.54	14.15	8.61
Materials	0.29	1.94	1.65
Subcontracts/Subgrants-FRLC <sup>1</sup>	67.38	20.90	(40.48)
Other Direct Costs	0.22	1.32	1.10
TOTAL	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>

---

<sup>1</sup> Percentages do not reflect CA; modification transferred dollars from FRLC line item to consultants line item.

---

Table II-2  
**FINANCIAL ANALYSIS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION**  
 (As of June 30, 1982)

Line Item	Total	Latin America/ Caribbean		Africa		Other		India/ Bangladesh	Indonesia	Egypt/ Tunisia	Asia
	(\$)	(\$)	(%)	(\$)	(%)	(\$)	(%)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)
Consultant* (Fee Portion Only)	79,865.75	36,076.25	45	17,851.50	22	15,793.50	20	3,840.00	--	6,304.50	--
Travel and Per Diem (for staff and consultants, both overseas and domestic) <sup>1, 2</sup>	98,052.77	49,660.16	51	20,870.22 <sup>2</sup>	21	6,146.88	6	6,380.65	--	2,802.86	12,192.00
FTEC - Subgrants/Subcontract.	164,940.49	36,580.77	22	--	--	107,164.78	65	--	21,194.94	--	--
Salary <sup>3</sup>	133,063.73	NA		NA		NA		NA	NA	NA	NA

<sup>1</sup> Estimated amounts.

<sup>2</sup> Includes some Near East travel.

<sup>3</sup> Costs are for all programmatic activities, including overseas conference.

<sup>4</sup> Salaries cannot be allocated regionally or by task, because timesheets do not provide such allocations.

### C. Expenditures for Conferences, the Newsletter, and Studies

The Statement of Work requires that the Futures Group hold one worldwide and two regional conferences. The organization also is to produce and distribute a newsletter. There is, in addition, a reference in the Statement of Work to the collection and analysis of "pertinent research data." To enable the organization to fulfill this mandate, AID/W has commissioned the Futures Group to conduct a number of special studies which will have applications in regions throughout the world. Most of the studies are under way at this time; none has been completed.

Table II-3 shows the allocation of expenditures for these three activities. Some of the funds come from the line item "Consultants" (in-house costs for the newsletter), but most come from the category "Subgrants and Subcontracts."

The expenditures do not include full-time staff who have worked on conferences or the newsletter, for example. Current accounting procedures of the Futures Group do not allow for allocation of staff time by task. Nevertheless, it is clear that fewer Federal Reserve Letter of Credit (FRLC) funds have been expended to develop specific country projects than was anticipated by many of the people who helped to design the Cooperative Agreement. Few expected that after nearly two years of operations more money from the FRLC would be spent for the newsletter and one regional conference than for grants and subcontracts to specific countries.

It would be unfair to the Futures Group to give the impression that money has been spent only on general activities, and not on the development of country projects. As is made clear elsewhere in this report, the evaluators believe that the Futures Group has focused its attention correctly on the development of projects. However, to date, it has not awarded large sums to develop these projects.

More than \$100,000 has been spent on consultant fees, travel, and per diem for consultants and staff who have provided technical assistance to countries that have requested the kind of services which the Cooperative Agreement was designed to provide. Between November 1, 1980, and June 30, 1982, approximately 22 person-months of assistance were provided. This figure does not include the time that consultants and staff spent in the United States to prepare responses to AID's requests for additional information and to plan for additional international trips.

It is not possible to allocate consultant time among the 15 or more tasks and subtasks listed in the Statement of Work. From a reading of the trip reports, it is apparent that most of the early trips were devoted to assessments or feasibility studies and that subsequent visits to the same countries were made to complete the chores necessary to start a project.

---

Table II-3  
EXPENDITURES FOR CONFERENCE, NEWSLETTER, AND STUDIES  
(As of June 30, 1982)

---

---

<u>Total FRLC</u>	<u>Country- Specific</u>	<u>Newsletter</u>		<u>Conference</u>	<u>Studies</u>
		<u>CEFPA</u>	<u>In-House</u>		
\$164,940	57,774	32,200	12,371	41,354	25,770
Percent FRLC	35	20	8	25	16

---

## Responsiveness to Statement of Work

The evaluators were asked to determine whether the organization's investments reflect the requirements of the scope of work. To answer this question, the evaluators examined carefully the Statement of Work in the Cooperative Agreement to identify its objectives.\*

Section II, D, in the Statement of Work ("Expected End Results") contains the clearest statement of the objectives of the Cooperative Agreement. Here, it is stated that the highest priority objective of the CA is the "initiation of a number of new CRS projects in countries where no such projects currently exist." Two objectives were accorded second and third priority: "strengthening existing CRS projects. . ." and "increasing the awareness of CRS projects' potential among . . . leaders. . . ."

The evaluators believe that the Futures Group has directed and continues to direct its efforts to fulfill the highest priority objective of the Cooperative Agreement. As a result of its efforts, a CRS project is under way in Honduras, and another will begin soon in Ecuador. These are concrete accomplishments for which the Futures Group can take all or a good share of the credit. Awards are pending for four other countries where there are no CRS projects at this time: Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Panama, and Guatemala. In the English-speaking Caribbean and in El Salvador, where CRS projects have been initiated before, awards are also pending. In Indonesia, an award was made early in the Cooperative Agreement (February 1981) to design a marketing plan in anticipation of the development of a CRS project.

It is difficult to state with certainty that the Futures Group has strengthened existing CRS projects. The evaluators were not able to find documentation on the performance of these projects either preceding or following the intervention of the Futures Group. However, the evaluators can state with some confidence that the great majority of consultant visits have been directed to the development of new projects, and not to work with existing programs.

There are two explanations for this pattern. One, some AID/W staff question the ability of the Futures Group to provide technical or financial assistance to a country (e.g., Bangladesh, which has an AID-funded CRS project) that is currently receiving what some think is adequate financial support from other AID sources. Two, the number of AID graduate countries

---

\* The evaluators did not try to determine the relevancy of the objectives to the strategy to develop CRS programs in AID recipient states. To do this, a more profound study than was possible in the short time allotted for this evaluation would have been necessary. This is a most important issue that should be addressed at the strategy and planning meeting recommended by the evaluators.

has not met expectations. For example, Bangladesh and Nepal, which were thought to be on their way to achieving self-sufficiency as a result of technical support from AID, continue to employ U.S. contractors. Ghana's program has been terminated.

A more complete answer to the question about the responsiveness of the Futures Group to the Statement of Work can be obtained by categorizing the many tasks and subtasks in the scope of work. The evaluators' findings for each of the subtasks are given in the section that follows.

The tasks identified in the Statement of Work can be divided into six categories, each of which is described below.

### 1. Planning and Research

This category contains several subtasks, including:

- The development of histories and compilation of evaluations and other commentaries on all existing CRS projects. This task is the responsibility of the library staff of the Futures Group.
- The collection and analysis of all pertinent research data, questionnaires, the research design, and marketing plans. During consultations in-country, the Futures Group gathered information about ongoing CRS projects to which it has given assistance. In addition, it has been charged by the Office of Population to undertake a series of studies, most of which will be funded with FRLC monies, some of which will be done by consultants or Futures staff.
- Interviews with current and former CRS directors. The evaluators were not able to determine if interviews have been done systematically by the Futures Group. This would seem to be an important subtask, a part of a broader mandate to document the successes and failures of the CRS program and to record the lessons of current and past projects.
- Workshop to develop project strategies. Soon after the Cooperative Agreement was awarded, a workshop was held in Washington, D.C., on December 2-3, 1980. The organization invited to this meeting representatives of current CRS contractors, the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), the Center for Population Activities (CEPFA), and the Program for the Introduction and Adaptation of Contraceptive Technology (PIACT), and two representatives from the Office of Population, AID. The written report on the workshop cannot be used as a guide for "specific project strategies."

The evaluators feel that the lack of a requirement for a project strategy and an action plan is one of the most noteworthy weaknesses in the Cooperative Agreement. It is particularly interesting that the AID regional bureaus were not invited to attend the December meeting, even though the Cooperative Agreement is the principle vehicle for developing CRS projects in AID recipient countries.

The principle recommendation of the evaluators is that the Futures Group and the Office of Population should meet to prepare such a strategy and an action plan. Conditions have changed in two years, and the Statement of Work should be amended to reflect the changes. Moreover, the plan of action should reflect changes that have been made. Most important, the plan of action should reflect the needs and interests of all interested parties within and outside AID.

## 2. Information about CRS Program Opportunities

Measured by the number of requests for technical assistance, the Futures Group and the Office of Population have been successful in advertising and making people aware of their services. However, it is not possible to judge accurately their success in informing AID missions, LDC host-country personnel, and private organizations about the broader opportunities for CRS projects. There have been few requests for assistance from the Futures Group from countries covered by the Africa Bureau. No AID-funded CRS projects are currently under way, nor are any upcoming FRLC-funded projects to begin in that region.

There have been more requests for assistance from the Asia region than from Africa, but only one project development grant has been awarded in Asia under the Cooperative Agreement.

The Statement of Work specifies that the Futures Group will train RAPID\* staff as marketers of CRS projects in countries where no CRS projects now exist. Some RAPID staff have been given an orientation to CRS, but the Futures Group has not had the funds to employ them as marketers.

Also included in the Statement of Work is the requirement that the Futures Group will develop a "marketing" package to introduce CRS concepts to USAID missions, foreign governments, and others. The evaluators found no evidence

---

\* RAPID = Resources for Awareness of Population Impact on Development.

that such a "package" has been developed by the Futures Group. However, consultants who call on foreign governments, missions, and private organizations usually come armed with articles and newsletters. The slide presentation, prepared early in the CA, has not been used outside the office, except in Dacca, Bangladesh.

3. Criteria for Selection of Subcontractors and Subgrantees in LDCs

This task has been accomplished during on-site visits to countries throughout the world. All subgrants and contracts have been submitted to the Office of Population, AID, for approval prior to their award.

4. Assistance Programs, Including Funding for CRS Activities

The Statement of Work explains that "this task forms the major activities required to accomplish the purpose of this agreement. . . ." The assistance programs may include funding for such CRS activities as marketing research, advertising, product selection, marketing, marketing planning, distribution, strategy development, host-country government approval, commodity assistance, logistical management systems, and such other assistance as may be appropriate

The most significant omission from the list of subprojects is the indication that FRLC funds will be used for project operations. This may be among items in the category "Other," but it is not high on the list of priorities for use of FRLC funds.

It could be argued that, from the outset, the amount of FRLC money was not sufficient to fund more than one or two countries and the development work that is so important to the initiation of other projects.

Insufficient time remains to undertake the long-term support of CRS projects. If the Cooperative Agreement is not extended beyond its current expiration date of July 1983, projects which have been receiving long-term FRLC funding will be left without support in their early, crucial months.

The Futures Group has expended a considerable amount of consultant and staff time to provide assistance to individual countries to develop new CRS projects. At the time of this evaluation, only a small portion of total available subgrant funds

had been awarded, and only a portion of those funds had been allocated for individual country projects. However, six country activities, the development of which has been the focus of consultant and staff efforts, and which are to be funded with FRLC subgrant funds, are pending at this time.

The funding of projects in Latin America and the Caribbean will boost significantly the development of new CRS projects. But why has it taken so long to initiate such activities? Why have there not been more projects? Does this experience provide some lessons that can be applied in subsequent development of cooperative agreements that provide for technical and financial assistance to new and existing projects?

There are several answers to these questions. At the beginning of the Cooperative Agreement, Futures Group staff went wherever AID/W CTOs told them to go. They responded to requests from the field. The evaluators searched in vain for any plan, any set of priorities, that would have guided the Futures Group in selecting from among the requests or in directing attention to projects of more acceptable size.

Brazil was one of the first countries to which the Futures Group sent a consultant. John Hayes, one of the most respected people in the CRS field, spent three months there, developing a project for funding.

The cost of his work, approximately \$17,000 for consultant fees and expenses, took a major share (approximately 20 percent) of the funds set aside at the time of award for consultants' activities. After three months of work and the submission of a plan, the Futures Group was told that there were no funds--neither FRLC funds nor other monies--in Washington for a project of this magnitude.

Similarly, a FRLC-funded three-month consultancy in Indonesia to develop plans for a project also was frustrated when the USAID mission and AID/W decided that there were no funds for the project. Moreover, it was felt that the political repercussions of a CRS project in Indonesia in an election year would make the project too risky.

More fertile fields were found in Latin America and the Caribbean. However, even there, progress toward a fundable project was slowed because of legal and technical steps that had to be followed in formulating projects (e.g., selecting, or sometimes creating, an appropriate local institution; securing the approval of the local food and drug administration (FDA) to use proposed drugs; preparing the Project Paper; etc.).

During early visits to Ecuador, Honduras, and Panama, the Futures Group found receptive governments, local family planning agencies, and AID missions that would follow through the development of grant requests.

Nevertheless, the implementation of projects in Latin America has been delayed because of policy differences about the most appropriate CRS model to follow. Until these policy differences are resolved, the projects cannot move ahead quickly.

What can be done to ensure that the work proceeds more smoothly in the future? There are some lessons that can be applied in developing other AID cooperative agreements. For example:

- Do not worry about demand. There seems to have been a concern that no one would request the services provided under the CA. Instead of responding to the first countries that requested assistance, the Futures Group and AID/W should have defined their own priorities and proceeded accordingly.
- Design a strategy for CRS development against which requests for assistance and subsequent funding of projects can be judged. First-come/first-served is not an appropriate strategy.
- Design a strategy or plan for funding a country project at the time the Futures Group first responds to the request. This approach ensures that scarce resources are not used in countries such as Brazil and Indonesia, where need exists but resources are lacking.
- Consider contracting with local voluntary agencies rather than awarding grants. Such action would enable the Futures Group to hold the local agency accountable to a work plan. Because of the lack of accountability, the Futures Group is extremely cautious in granting funds to LDC groups.
- Formalize the process for approval of requests for grants (or subcontracts). It was difficult to get a consistent answer to the question: Who should clear the requests at each stage?

##### 5. CRS Newsletter and Information Feedback System

Three editions of the newsletter, "Social Marketing Update," have been published in both Spanish and English versions of 400 and 600 copies, respectively. Two editions of the newsletter were published by the CEFPA under its subgrant with

the Futures Group; and the third was published by the Futures Group itself. A fourth edition, soon to be published, also will be done in-house.

There is no formal "information feedback system." Few letters from readers of "Social Marketing Update" are on file. However, the Futures Group has successfully solicited articles from field practitioners which, in the opinion of the evaluators, are the most valuable and informative features of the newsletter.

## 6. International Conferences

The Statement of Work specifies that three international conferences shall be conducted by the Futures Group. One is to be worldwide in scope, and the other two are to be regional.

In June 1981, seven months after the award, the Futures Group subcontracted with the CEFPA to conduct a regional conference in Dacca, Bangladesh. However, the subcontract with the CEFPA was canceled, thus delaying the publication of the proceedings of the conference. At the time of the evaluation, the conference report was in final draft.

The cost of international conferences is very high. The Dacca conference cost approximately \$41,000; this figure does not include the time and travel of Futures staff and the travel and expenses of some of the participants.

Although most people feel that the conference in Dacca was a success, it is almost impossible to ascertain its long-term value.

Given the limited resources (especially staff time) of the Futures Group, the evaluation team recommends that any additional conferences be limited to workshops specifically designed to provide education or effect behavioral change. Such workshops should be run by trained professionals, aimed at a specific target group, and designed to provide specific benefits. The concept of "informing and motivating and exchanging information" at such a forum is too vague and insubstantial an objective to justify expenditures for costly international conferences. Unless the Futures Group has specific plans, the evaluators recommend that funds for additional international conferences be deleted from the budget.

Communications Between AID/W and  
The Futures Group

The evaluators examined the subject-matter files in the Futures offices for selected (not all) subjects. All incoming communications are filed by subject. The evaluators also reviewed all the outgoing files of the Futures Group. These files contain "memos to the files" which cover telephone or personal conversations that Futures staff have with AID and other officials.

The evaluators found that there were almost no written communications from the Office of Population to the Futures Group. Subject-matter files contain copies of inter-AID cables and correspondence with consultants and foreign officials.

The outgoing files contain repeated memoranda of telephone conversations and letters to AID/W requesting action on pending decisions. In tracing the requests, the evaluators often lost the trail, because AID did not respond in writing to communications from staff of the Futures Group.

Communication has been hampered considerably because AID has failed to provide guidance on strategies and priorities. The Cooperative Agreement requires "substantial involvement" by AID in the direction and decisions of the recipient. One of the most noteworthy failings has been the lack of strategic planning by both parties.

The profound failure to establish effective communication has had wide-ranging implications for actual and perceived performance of the Futures Group. There have been false starts and unnecessary expenditures of consultant and staff time in some countries. The lack of information on funding limitations that should have been made known before consultant visits were made, and on policies that also should have been communicated early in the contract, has hampered progress.

Documentation has improved measurably in the last six months. The Futures Group has been especially conscious of the need for adequate documentation on activities.

The Contribution of The Futures Group to the  
Contraceptive Retail Sales Program

The evaluators were asked to ascertain whether the Futures Group has made a useful and necessary contribution to the development and management of CRS activities. Their response is in two parts.

The evaluators believe that the Futures Group has made a useful and necessary contribution to the development of CRS activities. The efforts

in Ecuador and Honduras are noteworthy. Panama will probably develop a project shortly; the Dominican Republic and Guatemala may follow soon. Each country has received considerable assistance from the Futures Group in designing and developing projects.

Would the projects have been developed had there been no Cooperative Agreement? This is a difficult question. Even under quasi-experimental conditions it is difficult to evaluate impact. However, it should be pointed out that the projects which the Futures Group has helped to develop are the first new AID-funded CRS projects to appear in many years.

The organization's contribution to the improved management of CRS is especially difficult to measure. The results of the series of AID/W-commissioned studies on problems common to many CRS projects will contribute particularly to an understanding of how specific problems can be solved.

The evaluators could not judge the effect that any of the Futures Group's consultants may have had on the management of any particular CRS project. Because field visits were not conducted during this evaluation and because no studies exist on the management styles followed both before and after the award of the CA, the evaluators had few data on which to base an accurate assessment.

Certain activities, such as the collection of CRS program materials from countries around the world, are potentially beneficial to projects. But access to materials is lacking. This is a critical problem. The evaluators believe that as the Futures Group expands and completes its collection, it should send to all readers of "Social Marketing Update" a notice informing them of the library's holdings and offering to send them copies (at the cost of printing and postage).

The second part of the evaluators' answer concerns the phrase "necessary contribution." What AID/W needed in 1978 to further its population policy may not be needed in 1982, 1983, and 1984. What was needed in 1980 by CRS projects may not be needed in the future.

AID/W and the Futures Group should reevaluate the needs to which the Cooperative Agreement was designed to respond. During the oral debriefing, the evaluators were left with the impression that because of the limitations of funds for new projects, the Futures Group would have to develop fewer new projects. What is AID/W's capacity to respond to a demand for new projects created as a result of the Futures Group's activities?

If funds are indeed limited and if the policy will be to maintain existing projects, what will be the role of the Futures Group? This question is particularly crucial if the Futures Group is to be prohibited from providing assistance to countries in which there is already a CRS contractor.

## Amendments to Statement of Work

The final question for the evaluators was: "Should the scope of work in the Agreement be amended? If so, what changes would the team recommend?" The answer to these questions is presented in five parts below.

### A. History of Cooperative Agreements

To understand fully the Cooperative Agreement, it is necessary to provide some historical background on cooperative agreements in general. In early 1978, Congress passed Public Law 95-224, known as the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act. This law enables U.S. Government agencies to enter into cooperative agreements; earlier, government agencies typically used grants and contracts. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) published Implementation Guidance for the Act (now part of AID Handbook 1, supplement B) in the Federal Register, on August 18, 1978. AID issued an "Implementation Memo" on the Act on June 15, 1979. Thus, when the Cooperative Agreement was signed with the Futures Group on September 20, 1980, the concept of the cooperative agreement was relatively new and still being defined by AID.

Some of the key elements of cooperative agreements are:

- They can be arranged with both non-profit and for-profit organizations. The Futures Group is a for-profit firm.
- They are intended to encourage competition for the award. The cooperative agreement examined in these pages was let out for competitive bidding.
- They are to be used when there is to be substantial involvement of a government agency in the project. Also, a cooperative agreement is appropriate when the intent of the award is not procurement, but the gaining of public support or stimulation. For a procurement, a contract, and not a cooperative agreement, is more appropriate.
- They do not have a profit factor. The OMB has not yet determined whether a profit factor or a fee can be included in an award of a cooperative agreement. It has been AID's policy not to allow a fee in a cooperative agreement; waiver of the fee is viewed as cost-sharing by the recipient.

## B. Review of Documents

The team reviewed numerous documents dealing with the Cooperative Agreement. A summary of some of the pertinent highlights of this review is given below.

- Prior to the award of the Cooperative Agreement, a written challenge was registered by a prospective bidder, who protested the use of a cooperative agreement and suggested that a contract with a fee would be more appropriate. AID responded that a cooperative agreement was appropriate, because a large amount of money was to pass through the recipient (presumably to groups in developing countries).
- To finance the Cooperative Agreement, a mixture of methods--cost reimbursement and the Federal Reserve Letter of Credit--was used. Cost reimbursement was established for budget line items (salaries, indirect costs, consultants, travel and per diem, materials, and other direct costs). In cost reimbursement the recipient bills the government for costs itemized on a voucher after the expenses have been incurred; this is the traditional method used by the U.S. Government to finance agreements with for-profit organizations. However, for subcontracts and subgrants, the Federal Reserve Letter of Credit is used. The FRLC method is typically used to finance non-profit organizations. The assumption here may have been that much of this line item would be spent for subgrants to non-profit host-country institutions, which would, therefore, have justified a FRLC arrangement with a for-profit recipient.
- Before the award of the Cooperative Agreement, the Futures Group was formally asked why it had assigned so large an amount in its cost proposal to the line item "Consultant." In its best and final offer, the Futures Group significantly reduced the amount for consultants' expenses. However, since the Cooperative Agreement was awarded, the Futures Group has been spending considerably more funds for consultants than was established in the budget of the CA.

## C. Language in the Cooperative Agreement

The evaluators recommend that the Statement of Work be amended. As part of that process, selected operational definitions should be clarified. In providing clarification, it may be necessary to seek AID's legal counsel and define AID's policy decisions. Some of the operational definitions that should be reviewed are described below.

1. Non-Family Planning Products

The original Statement of Work, Article II, Section B2, lists one of the purposes of the Cooperative Agreement: "The introduction of new products, e.g., foaming tablets, IUDs, mini-dose pills, oral rehydration solution [ORS], new types of condoms in AID and non-AID CRS programs." Oral rehydration salts are suggested because they are a natural and complementary product that can be carried in the same commercial line as family planning products.

The issue is whether or not CA funds can be used to promote non-family planning products, such as infant food and deworming medicines. It is assumed that funds from other programs will be used to buy ORS and other non-family planning products and that Cooperative Agreement funds will be used only to promote a complementary line of products.

Although the Statement of Work allows and encourages such projects, a decision on a grant proposal for a project in Bangladesh to be supported with FRLC funds has been delayed until this issue is resolved.

The decision will have important implications for many CRS projects. A strong argument in support of CRS is that high efficiency is achieved because existing channels of commercial distribution are used. A detail person or other intermediary might have a complete line of drugs, infant formula, condoms, and other products sold from pharmacies. These kinds of efficiencies might be encouraged because of the availability of funds for common promotion of complementary items. When the Office of Population considers some of the basic issues about CRS, it should place this matter high on its agenda.

2. AID Graduate and Non-AID CRS Programs and In-Country Contractors

The original Statement of Work, Article II, Sections B2 and B3, mentions only activities in "AID graduate and non-AID countries." This phrase apparently limits the Futures Group to providing assistance to these countries only. But this is not entirely clear.

During interviews with the evaluators, many AID officials expressed some confusion about what was meant by an "AID-graduate country." At this time, AID is interpreting this phrase to mean that the Futures Group cannot give assistance where there is an existing AID/W-funded or mission-funded CRS contractor.

The evaluators recommend that the decision about whether or not to provide assistance to any one country be made case by case, before the Futures Group commits any resources to the development of a grant proposal.

### 3. Subcontracts and Subgrants

The words "subcontracts" and "subgrants" are used throughout the Statement of Work (e.g., in the opening paragraph of Section C3; in Section C3(b); in the opening paragraphs of Sections E2 and E3; and in Section E3(e)). The evaluation team determined that the meaning and application of these terms are ambiguous. Some of the key issues that need to be clarified are listed below.

- To what degree do subgrants and subcontracts preclude a recipient from bidding on any follow-on work (either prime-grant/prime-contract work or subgrant/subcontract work)?
- To what degree does the Futures Group exercise discretion in determining whether a subcontract or a subgrant is more appropriate? The Futures Group has expressed a preference for using subcontracts rather than subgrants.
- In providing operating monies to a host-country non-profit organization, can the Futures Group use a subcontract rather than a subgrant? The Futures Group feels that it could hold a non-profit organization more accountable under a subcontract than under a subgrant.
- Does the Futures Group have the authority to enter into subcontracting arrangements with U.S. non-profit organizations, U.S. for-profit organizations, and host-country for-profit organizations to operate programs? Or are operating funds only limited to host-country non-profit organizations?
- What kinds of expenditures should be charged to the subcontracts line item? As of June 30, 1982, no subgrants had been charged to this line item, although originally it had been assumed that a large portion of this line item would be for subgrants.

In its operational definition for FRLC-subcontracts and subgrants (see Appendix C), the Futures Group does not mention operating grants. Furthermore, some would argue that many of the items charged to the subcontracts and subgrants line item could be charged more appropriately to the consultant line item.

Because more than 67 percent of the original budget was allocated to subcontracts and subgrants, AID and the Futures Group should agree upon a mutually acceptable definition of the items that should be charged against this line item.

#### 4. FRLC Funds for Operations

In Article II, Section C4, the Statement of Work describes a series of CRS project activities that the Futures Group might undertake to "establish assistance programs, including required funding." Only because the evaluators had the opportunity to talk with many people and to read project files were they able to understand the meaning of the phrase "establish assistance programs." This phrase needs to be clarified and rewritten in plain English. To date, the Futures Group has only given contracts and grants to several organizations in LDCs to expedite project development. The Futures Group has not established an "assistance program," although the entire Cooperative Agreement might be called a program.

There is no mention of awarding grants or subcontracts to organizations for the purpose of operating local CRS programs. If this is an intention, the Statement of Work should state that purpose clearly.

#### D. Tightening the Scope of Work

The evaluation team strongly recommends that the Scope of Work be amended. In addition to rewriting the language to clarify certain items, more substantive changes should be made.

In the original Statement of work, a number of areas where the Futures Group could become involved are identified. The section reads like a shopping list, resembles chapters of a book, with no weights or priorities assigned. Whatever priorities may have been established are reflected not in the narrative but in the budget, where more dollars are assigned to subcontracts and subgrants than to in-house staff. A revised Statement of Work should reflect the consensus of AID and the Futures Group on the direction the CA should take.

To establish appropriate priorities, AID should meet with the Futures Group in a series of strategic planning sessions to define objectives and design a methodology to achieve those objectives (or the program). The program should then be costed out in the form of a revised CA budget, where monies may be reallocated among line items in a manner considerably different from the method used in the original

budget and its modifications. For example, if because of the program's emphasis, additional in-house staff and fewer operating subgrants for host-country organizations are needed, the budget should be adjusted accordingly.

The Statement of Work should be tightened so that the current needs of CRS programs can be met and subcontractors can be held more accountable, but the terminology should not be too restrictive. Both AID and the Futures Group are in the development business, which requires flexibility to deal with changing conditions and to take advantage of opportunities. Also, the legal instrument that ties the Futures Group to AID is a cooperative agreement, and not a contract. Therefore, care should be exercised in drafting a revision of the Statement of Work, so that it will be impossible to argue that the Cooperative Agreement has been converted into a contract.

#### E. Option to Terminate Agreement

AID has the option to terminate the Cooperative Agreement. If this option is exercised, a contract probably will be issued. Approximately one year would be needed to prepare, solicit, and award a contract. Moreover, time would have to be allowed to close satisfactorily work in progress.

### III. SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

### III. SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Planning

The Futures Group, the regional bureaus, and the Office of Population, AID/W, and representatives of other CRS contractors should meet to discuss a CRS strategy for the coming years. From this should emerge a clear definition of the function of the Cooperative Agreement.

At a subsequent meeting, the Statement of Work should be amended to reflect the decisions about the broader strategy. Also at this time, a decision should be made to extend the Cooperative Agreement. Finally, a budget should be prepared that responds to these new directions.

#### Budget

Additional funds should be provided to the Futures Group only for maintenance of operations until decisions are made about the future of the Cooperative Agreement.

#### Amendment to Statement of Work

The Statement of Work should be amended after AID and the Futures Group have decided what the function of the Cooperative Agreement should be in the coming years. Although the language should not be as restrictive as the language in a contract, it should define clearly the priorities for the many tasks currently listed in the Statement of Work.

In addition, the Statement of Work should be amended so that the ambiguities and imprecisions in the current document are clarified. Some of the changes will require policy decisions and legal counsel.

#### Evaluation

The entire CRS project, which has been operating for five years, should be evaluated. Many of the assumptions on which the project paper was based should be reexamined. Independent evaluations have been done of many of the individual CRS projects, and the Futures Group has been asked to study many of the important issues about the approach. However, other issues remain unsolved. At the least, an independent team ought to be recruited to review the findings of the evaluations to date and the relevance of the studies to the evaluation issues.

### Conferences

Subsequent conferences should aim to effect specific behavioral changes (e.g., providing training to improve skills). The Futures Group has already proposed sales training in the Caribbean. Funds set aside for conferences should be used only for this and other similar workshops.

### Communications

The confidence with which the Futures Group operates would be greatly increased if AID/W's decisions were put into writing. Currently, the Futures Group can rely on oral agreements only, and, consequently, it is cautious in proceeding with plans. Because it will be held accountable by auditors for the expenditure of funds, agreements should be put into writing.

Similarly, communications with AID would improve if the Futures Group would submit clearer requests for action. Sometimes, the requests seem to be buried among other issues. An effort should be made to ensure that requests are clear and explicit.

**Appendix A**

**SCOPE OF WORK  
FOR EVALUATION OF PROJECT 0611:  
CONTRACEPTIVE RETAIL SALES,  
THE FUTURES GROUP, AID/DSPE-CA-0087**

## Appendix A

### SCOPE OF WORK FOR EVALUATION OF PROJECT 0611: CONTRACEPTIVE RETAIL SALES, THE FUTURES GROUP, AID/DSPE-CA-0087

#### Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

The purpose to this evaluation is to assess the quality of the contractor's performance, to determine if the contractor has performed in compliance with the scope of work in the Cooperative Agreement, and to determine if there is adequate documentation of technical-office inputs into the contractor's activities.

#### Questions to be Answered by the Team

The evaluation team should attempt to answer the following questions:

1. Has the contractor followed the scope of work in the Cooperative Agreement?
  - a. What investment of the contractor's staff time and consultant resources has been made to fulfill the requirements of the scope of work?
  - b. Do these investments reflect the requirements of the scope of work?
2. Have instructions and suggestions from the technical office been clearly communicated to the Futures organization and documented in Futures' files?
3. Has the Futures Group made a useful and necessary contribution to the development and management of CRS activities?
4. Should the scope of work in the Agreement be amended? Is so, what changes would the team recommend?

#### Evaluation Procedure

The evaluation is planned for a three-week period, to begin as soon as possible. The evaluation will consist of interviews by Futures staff and consultants, a review of consultant reports (samples), a review of

21

22

other appropriate records, and interviews with USAID staff. A report will be submitted within one week of completion of the evaluation.

The expenditures of contract staff and consultant time, as related to the requirements of the scope of work, should be particularly interesting. Briefings will include staff of the Contracts Office of AID and technical staff.

Because one purpose of this evaluation is to assess performance against the scope of work, the scope of work in the Cooperative Agreement has been incorporated into the scope of work for this evaluation.

### Team Composition

This evaluation requires one consultant with experience in social marketing and, if possible, Agency CRS activities, and one consultant with strong business, accounting, or government contracting experience. There should be a large cadre of consultants with the above qualifications. APHA will be invited to submit a list of suggested consultants from which a final selection will be made.

### Estimated Cost

The estimated cost for approximately 20 person-days per consultant (15 days for data collection and 5 days for report-writing and debriefing), including consultant fees, per diem, and U.S. transportation, is \$11,000.

**Appendix B**  
**EVALUATION GUIDE FOR FUTURES' CRS PROJECTS**

Appendix B  
EVALUATION GUIDE FOR FUTURES' CRS PROJECTS

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

PERSON(S) \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE \_\_\_\_\_

1. What is the history of the project?
  - a. What was the need?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  - b. What is the need?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
2. What has been the value of Futures' contribution?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
3. What has been the role of this project in terms of the overall CRS program?

4. What changes in the scope would be recommended?

a. Language

b. Substance

5. Who else should be interviewed?

Appendix C

MEMORANDUM, WASHCHUCK TO FISKIN,  
RE: REQUEST FOR FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Appendix C

MEMORANDUM, WASHCHUCK TO FISKIN  
RE: REQUEST FOR FINANCIAL INFORMATION



International  
Contraceptive  
Social  
Marketing  
Project

August 6, 1982

TO: Bernie Fiskin  
FROM: Gail A. Washchuck *GAW*  
RE: Financial Information as Requested

---

Attached are the four documents which you requested from our office to assist you in your evaluation of the cooperative agreement. Enclosed please find:

- (A) Consultant Use Report - this report lists the use of consultants for country-specific assignments supported by dates of assignment and associated costs.
- (B) Federal Reserve Letter of Credit Expenditures - this report lists the use of purchase orders and other grant/contract mechanisms which have been used by country, contractor, purpose, date and cost as well as grants/contracts which are in the process of development and implementation in the immediate future.
- (C) Cooperative Agreement Project Status, August 6, 1982 - This summary document combines both documents A and B above. It notes both consultant activities (identified with a "(C)") and FRIC funded activities (identified with a "(FRIC)") for each country assignment.
- (D) Guidelines for Consultant and FRIC Use - this document summarizes the procedures for use of each type of funding mechanism.

Should you have further questions regarding these activities or require clarification on any of the enclosed documents, please do not hesitate to call me.

SCHEMULE A (REVISION 1)

CONSULTANT TRAVEL

COUNTRY	CONSULTANT	DATES	EXPENSES	CONS. FEE
Brazil, Guatemala, Honduras	John Hayes	1/10-3/30/81	2,852.76	4,042.50
Caribbean Barbados	Don Levy	5/25-27/82	548.83 133.00	500.00
Barbados	Carl Lehlandt	3/14-27/82	1,474.29	2,340.00
Barbados, Antigua, St. Kitts	Don Levy	8/20-9/4/81	550.08	1,875.00
Colombia	Steven Samuel	1/24-2/2/82	1,125.25 34.51	2,775.00
Costa Rica	Steven Samuel	6/12-13/82	662.00 336.00	2,035.00
Dominican Republic	Steven Samuel Joseph Muniz	5/3-9/81 5/1-7/81	758.89 656.76	1,850.00 1,480.00
Ecuador & Panama	Steven Samuel	3/2-20/82	1,093.63	2,035.00
Egypt	Layca Ramadan Sohair Sukhary Sohair Sukhary	11/3-12/7/81 11/11-12/81 (Briefing) 12/9-31/82	 80.00 963.29 5.10	3,500.00 84.50 2,720.00
Ghana & Kenya	Ralph Susman	2/27-3/28/82	19.35 4,455.92 188.07	7,824.00
Ghana & Nigeria	Michael Thomas	(Briefing) 5/12-5/26/81	181.25 1,813.25	135.00 2,632.50
Ghana, Liberia & Senegal	Ralph Susman	4/29-5/2/81 (Briefing) 5/7-28/81 (Trip) 5/31-6/9/81 (Debriefing)	549.49 2,372.50 969.78	5,760.00
		Fudd.	21,864.00	41,588.50

C-2

35

COUNTRY	CONSULTANT	DATES	EXPENSES	CONS. FEE	
			Fwdd. 21,864.00	41,588.50	
Guatemala	Carl Lehlandt	6/82	425.56	2,470.00	
	William Novelli	3/27-4/2/81	810.25	960.00	
	John Hayes	4/2/82 (includes some D.C.)	121.50	1,155.00	
Haiti	Randi Thompson	12/15-9/81	1,340.48	2,127.50	
			480.90		
	Randi Thompson	9-10/81	444.06	1,850.00	
			376.75		
Honduras & Panama	Randi Thompson	6-8/81	459.53	1,295.00	
	Santiago Plata	1/25-30/81	339.00	975.00	
	Steven Samuel	11/12-23/80	896.67	3,011.25	
		(Debriefing)	247.25	165.00	
	Steven Samuel		(Briefing)	252.00	330.00
		1/28-2/10/81	1,076.45	2,805.00	
India	John Farley		(Briefing)	158.00	
		4/23-5/2/82	1,213.00	3,840.00	
Nigeria	J.O. Obetsebi-Lampley	5/10-23/82	758.75	1,500.00	
STAFF TRAVEL					
Bangladesh	Gail Washchuck	6/10-28/81	1,214.64		
	Betty Butler Howell	6/15-7/5/81	955.89		
	Betty Butler Howell	5/10-16/81	403.12		
Caribbean Barbados	Gail Washchuck	3/21-25/82	480.39		
Egypt & Tunisia	Henry Cole	1/26-2/10/82	724.00		
	Henry Cole	11/13-24/81	1,030.48		
Haiti	Betty Butler Ravenholt	4/4-7/82	298.63		
	Malcolm Donald	4/5-9/81	377.28		
	Malcolm Donald	1/25-30/81	809.05		
India	Robert Smith	4/23-5/12/82	2,436.00		
Jamaica	Betty Butler Howell	3/22-31/81	629.58		
Mexico	Robert Smith	11/13-19/80	410.35		
			<u>41,313.56</u>	<u>64,072.25</u>	

2/12

DOMESTIC CONSULTANT EXPENDITURES

NAME	DATE	EXPENSES	CONSULTANT FEE
		41,313.56	64,072.25
Diana Altman	1/19/81	26.98	
		247.30	225.00
Alan Andreasen	5/25-27/82	666.50	1,344.00
Christina Colven	1/12-15/82		280.00
Bonnie Derr	6/22/82	605.17	
	5/10/82		900.00
	4/21-23/82	195.40	
	4/13/82	92.21	1,225.00
	4/5-9/82	465.63	
	3/30/82		2,325.00
	3/8/82	164.00	
	2/22/82	2.30	600.00
	1/14-16/82	242.78	
John Farley	3/28-29/82	219.30	
	12/2/80	151.00	
Harald Pedersen	4/1/82	19.00	576.00
	1/15/82	37.00	960.00
Gordon Perlkin	1/13/81	707.00	384.00
Steven Samuel	7/16/82	207.28	
	7/8/82	230.00	
	6/18/82		370.00
	5/20/82	68.31	
	5/10/82		370.00
	5/10/82	91.95	
	4/13/82	86.77	
	4/5/82		185.00
	3/28-30/82	151.50	
	2/25/82		462.50
	1/20/82	34.41	
	1/5/82		277.50
	1/4/82	19.00	
	1/4/82	23.89	
		<u>46,068.24</u>	<u>74,556.25</u>

Fwdd.

162

NAME	DATE	Fwdd.	EXPENSES	CONSULTANT FEE
Steven Samuel	12/30/81		46,068.24	74,556.25
	12/29/81			555.00
	12/29/81			370.00
	12/6/81		44.55	185.00
	11/18/81			185.00
	9/23/81			105.00
	7/14/81			185.00
	6/2/81		146.82	1,432.50
	5/20/81		40.50	165.00
	2/28-3/1/81		223.64	330.00
	12/2/80		247.25	165.00
Soheir Sukkary	3/12/82		13.02	
Ralph Sisman	1/18/82		111.26	1,152.00
Randi Thompson	5/10/82		213.46	
Caram Turner	5/17/82			400.00
	5/13/82		351.70	
			<u>47,460.44</u>	<u>79,865.75</u>
	<u>COMPANY-PAID AIRFARE</u>			
	Asia		12,192.00	
	Africa & Near East		9,561.86	
	Latin America & Caribbean		28,838.47	
	TOTAL		50,592.33	98,052.77

*Handwritten mark*

SCHEDULE B

FEDERAL RESERVE LETTER OF CREDIT EXPENDITURES

COMPLETED OR IN PROGRESS

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>COMPACTOR</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Dominican Republic	PIA	Legal Research for CSM Programming	5/8/81	\$ 700.00
Ecuador	Porter, Novelli & Assoc.	Marketing Research Plan	7/14/81	5,617.00
El Salvador	De Aragon	Marketing Environment Assessment	7/12/82	861.00
Haiti	Porter, Novelli & Assoc.	Marketing Research Plan for Haiti	3/10/81	4,800.00
Haiti	Porter, Novelli & Assoc.	Translation Fee		300.00
Haiti	Porter, Novelli & Assoc.	Qualitative Research	5/15/81	5,992.00
Haiti	Corbin Advertising, Haiti	Contraceptive Brand Name Study	12/1/81	3,542.50
Haiti	Don Levy	Preliminary Marketing Plan	1/15/82	476.00
Haiti	Guy Malary, Attorney	Legal Research for CSM Programming		800.00
Indonesia	PIACT	Marketing Plan	2/13/81	21,196.94
Jamaica	Dunlop, Corbin, Compton	Foaming Tablets, Logo Survey	11/18/81	1,200.00
Mexico	PRIFAM	Audio Visual Presentation	1/17/81	7,000.00
Mexico	Porter, Novelli & Assoc.	Audio Visual Presentation	6/15/81	2,064.07
Panama	FPA	Report on Establishment of CRS Project-Preliminary Market Plan	1/21/81	2,700.00
Panama	Nector Castillo Rios, Attorney	Legal Research for CSM Programming	3/15/82	528.20
			<u>Fwd.</u>	<u>57,775.71</u>

C-6

129

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Rev Sampson Logos	David Pesanelli	Universal Logo Design & Production for Foaming Tablets	5/12/81	57,775.71 \$ 3,366.74
SOP Manual	Porter, Novelli & Assoc.	Marketing Research Overview	5/18/81	2,740.00
Newsletter	Greensboro Printing	Two Issues of UPDATE		2,204.00
Newsletter	Village Graphics	Two Issues of UPDATE	3/19/82	3,352.00
Newsletter and Conference	Centre for Population Activities	2 Issues of UPDATE and Asian CSM Conference	11/1/80	75,735.04
Research Study	Porter, Novelli & Assoc.	Model for Market Research In Contraceptive Social Marketing	7/2/82	9,879.00
Research Study	Alan Andreassen	Marketing Audit Model for CSM Project		9,890.00
Research Study	Farley, Samuel	CSM Project Indicator	7/82	
				164,940.49
<u>UPCOMING PROJECTS</u> (In the immediate future; see also "Cooperative Agreement Project Status, August 6, 1982")				
Costa Rica	Grants for FPA	Market Research for Program Development	9/82 starts	15-20,000
Dominican Republic	Grants for FPA	Market Research for Program Development	9/82 starts	15-20,000
Panama	Grants for FPA	Market Research for Program Development	9/82 starts	15-20,000
Guatemala	Grants for FPA	Market Research for Program Development	9/82 starts	15-20,000
El Salvador	Interamerican	Market Research & Market Plan Development Refinement	9/82 starts	15-20,000
Barbados	Grants for FPA	Project Implementation	10/81 starts	100,000 first year

of

SCHEDULE C

Country	CA Ineligible Because Centrally Funded Contractor in Place	Grant Development Work Done by CA	COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT PROJECT STATUS - AUGUST 6, 1982		Current Status
			Grant Made by	Grant to be Made by	
Bangladesh	?	Proposed ORS adv. for test mkt.		CA	Awaiting AID/W resolution of CA eligibility (ref. PSI presence) and ORS eligibility for population funding.
Brazil		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation		AID	No funds available from AID
Caribbean (English Speaking)		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation		CA	Negotiating grant terms with sponsoring organization to be awarded September 1982
Colombia		Generic advertising test Status evaluation of Program (c)		CA	Awaiting AID/W approval to proceed with project design
Costa Rica		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation Marketing Research Grant (FRLC)**		AID CA	Under development To begin September 1982
Dominican Rep.		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation Marketing Research Grant (FRLC)		AID CA	Awaiting mission approval and future funding commitments To begin September 1982
Ecuador		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation		AID	RFP issued by AID/W
Egypt	x				
El Salvador		Proposed adv. for foaming tablets Development of new Marketing Strategy (FRLC)		CA CA	Notified by AID/W that mission itself has ample funds for project To begin September 1982
Ghana		Project reinitiation (c)		CA	Project cancelled by USAID/fccra
Guatemala		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation Marketing Research Grant (FRLC)		USAID CA	Awaiting USAID project paper approval To begin September 1982
Haiti		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation Marketing Research (FRLC)		USAID CA	GOH project structure not within AID/W acceptable parameters Completed June 1982
Honduras		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation	AID		CA now ineligible because centrally funded contractor in place

CO

(C) = consultant activity    \*\* (FRLC) = activity funded through Federal Reserve Letter of Credit

<u>Country</u>	<u>CA Ineligible Because Centrally Funded Contractor in Place</u>	<u>Grant Development Work Done by CA</u>	<u>Grant Made by</u>	<u>Grant to be Made by</u>	<u>Current Status</u>
India		Proposed Expansion (c)		USAID	Technical assistance in progress
Indonesia		Project Development (FRLC) New Project Implementation		AID	No funds available to fund project from AID
Jamaica		New Project (N-S) Introduction (FRLC) Development and Implementation of New Marketing Strategy (FRLC)		CA	Project refused by GOJ (reopening discussions re: US-made foaming tablet; offer of assistance under advisement by USAID/Kingston and JNFPB)
Kenya		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation		AID	Appropriate Kenyan sponsoring organization not yet in exist.
Liberia		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation		AID(?)	Judged too politically unstable at present
Mexico	x				
Nepal	x				
Nigeria		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation		AID	Judged too expensive and too tenuous to pursue
Panama		New Project Development (c) New Project Implementation Marketing Research Grant (FRLC)		CA CA	Resolving final customs and duty issues To begin September 1982
Sri Lanka		Proposed test market for colored condom introduction & MR re: pricing (FRLC)		CA	Awaiting AID/W commodity availability resolution

52

SCHEDULE D

GUIDELINES FOR CONSULTANT AND SUBGRANT/CONTRACT (FRLC) USE

As a "rule-of-thumb," project development work (e.g., feasibility studies) and short-term technical assistance (e.g., evaluating program advertising or program management) is accomplished through the use of consultants. This work encompasses assignments which one person can undertake with one or two weeks of in-country travel.

FRLC-funded activities generally fall into the following four categories:

- (1) Longer-term efforts for which a consultant cannot be found (e.g., the development of a marketing plan in Indonesia which required three months in-country);
- (2) Assignments which can be best accomplished using in-country specialists for a limited amount of time (e.g., legal research, advertising strategy development and implementation, other program-related component studies or efforts);
- (3) Assignments which require a specialist's skills (e.g., designing and supervising local marketing research or product logo designs); and
- (4) special efforts which are not necessarily CSM program-specific (e.g., newsletter production, special studies, and conference support).

4B

**Appendix D**  
**LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

Appendix D  
LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The Futures Group

Proceedings of the Manila Conference  
Outgoing files of the Futures Group, 1980-Present  
Trip Reports, 1980-Present  
Monthly Billing Vouchers by AID  
FRLC Subcontract and Subgrant Proposals  
Three Editions of the Newsletter and a Draft of the Fourth Edition  
Selected Incoming Correspondence  
Purchase Order File  
Project Timesheets  
Bimonthly Printouts of Project Costs  
Quarterly Forms Binder  
Approved Indirect Cost Rates Documentation

Agency for International Development

Technical and Cost Proposals of the Futures Group in Response  
to the Request for an Agreement, August 25, 1980  
Project Paper, CRS Project, May 1978  
Various Project Files, Office of Contract Management  
AID Implementation Memo for Cooperative Agreements (AID Handbook I,  
Supplement B)  
Best and Final Offer File

Other

Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act (Public Law 95-224)

OMB Implementation of Cooperative Agreement (Federal Register,  
August 18, 1978)

**Appendix E**  
**LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

47

Appendix E  
LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

The Futures Group

Robert H. Smith, Vice President  
Betty Ravenholdt, Project Director  
Gail Washchuck, Project Administrator  
Bonnie Durr, Newsletter Editor

Agency for International Development

Don Newman, Office of Population  
Tony Boni, Office of Population  
Johnni Pittenger, Contracts  
Patti Williams, Contracts  
Art Danart, Lima, Peru, Mission  
Richard Billig, Senior Auditor  
Judy Johnson, Contracts

Other

Hal Peterson, Office of Population (Ret.)