

MID-TERM EVALUATION
OF CODEL, INC.

Prepared for

Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation
Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523

Contract # PDC-0100-C-00-3128-00

January, 1984

Terry Alliband, Ph. D.

1. Dev. impact - relative to what?
2. Rec. on spending # on CODEL.
3. Recommendations -

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to offer my sincere appreciation for the assistance provided me in carrying out this study by the following people:

At the A.I.D./P.V.C. Office: Paul Bisek, Tom McKay, Steve Bergen, and Ross Bigelow.

At CODEL: Rev. Boyd Lowry, Sr. Margaret Rogers, Ken E. Brown, Jr., and Lydia Rodriguez.

At various A.I.D. missions: Patricio Muldando (Ecuador), Danny Cruz-DePaula and Jerry Fouchet (Peru), Yvonne Johnson and John Jones (Jamaica), Arthur Valdez and Rudy Ellert-Beck (Dominican Republic), Bob Ritchie and Paul Gile (Togo), Jim Snell and Fred Perry (Zambia), and Dave Garms and Murl Baker (Malawi).

And, last but not least, to the many officers and staff members at the local institutions mentioned in the following report.

--Terry Alliband
Minneapolis, Minnesota
January 12, 1984

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

II. INTRODUCTION

This evaluation study examines the impacts and effectiveness of development projects funded by CODEL, Inc. CODEL (Coordination in Development) is a consortium of about forty American religious organizations that support development work with an ecumenical focus. A.I.D./P.V.C. has provided CODEL with a General Support Grant since 1982; that grant agreement calls for a mid-term evaluation of CODEL funded field projects.

The A.I.D./P.V.C. Statement of Work identified several objectives for this evaluation including close attention to these aspects of CODEL funded projects: beneficiary impacts, innovativeness, replicability, cost-effectiveness and cost-benefits, impacts on local institutions, and effects of ecumenical cooperation on development outcomes. The field questionnaire reflected these interests and concerns.

The evaluator visited ten CODEL funded projects: four in the Latin America and Caribbean region, six in the Africa Region.

III. SURVEY OF SELECTED CODEL PROJECTS

The ten sample projects were a generally representative cross-section of CODEL projects in those two regions. Sample projects were somewhat more highly budgeted than average, possibly because of a focus on those emphasizing economic development.

The sample projects, project-holders and countries included:

- § Social Promoters (FEPP)/Ecuador,
- § Lajas Community Bridge (SEPAS)/Peru,
- § Mandeville Trade Training (St. John Bosco)/Jamaica,
- § Bee Production by Women (MUDE)/Dominican Republic,
- § Agricultural Credit Fund (PTS)/Togo,
- § Cornmill and Livestock Project (Bui Food Coop)/Cameroon,
- § Homecraft and Medical Extension (St. Mary's Homecraft)/Cameroon,
- § School Leavers Carpentry (Archdiocese of Kasama)/Zambia,
- § Women's Training Program (Chilema Lay Training Center)/Malawi,
- § Malindi Boatyard (Malindi Rural Center)/Malawi.

IV. SPECIAL TOPICS

*A.I.D. Mission Interest--Many of the project-holders which CODEL funds were known to the respective A.I.D. mission although specific CODEL funded projects usually were not. Most C.D.S.S. development priorities included CODEL funded development activities. ~~_____~~

*Ecumenical Dimensions--Most inter-faith cooperation in the sample projects was (1) local religious organizations agreeing to co-sponsor a project, and (2) ecumenical--mixed faith--composition of beneficiaries or project staff. Few impacts of active cooperation at the local level were visible in these projects. CODEL regional representatives provided information concerning ecumenical cooperation in their regions.

*Beneficiary Impacts--The sample projects showed a high level of involvement, participation, and enthusiasm among project beneficiaries. CODEL projects concentrate resources on small numbers of needy people, a pattern that intensifies the development impact.

*Local Institution Impacts--Project-holder impacts of CODEL funded projects were generally positive. Some obscure and/or smaller project-holders were substantially benefitted by CODEL funds. For other project-holders, CODEL is one of many international donors. No major problems were reported by project-holders and most were very grateful to CODEL.

*Project Characteristics--Sample projects which most consistently manifested the development principles identified in CODEL's project selection criteria had the most powerful development impact.

*Generic P.V.O. Questions--CODEL project-holders tend to be pioneers in introducing a more-or-less proven, new technology into their areas. They do not innovate original approaches but often are the first to use a "state-of-the-art" approach in their region or nation. CODEL tends to replicate project models that have been successful elsewhere. National governments may model a project after one which CODEL introduced.

*Benefits/Cost Ratios--Three of four sample projects analyzed for benefits/cost impacts showed very respectable returns on investment. *_____*

V. ASSESSMENT OF CODEL'S STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESS AS A DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

CODEL's development approach is characterized by an emphasis on small-scale, community-based projects that develop local problem-solving capacity. These projects tend to reach poor and needy communities, often including members of "marginal" social groups. CODEL's approach is a unique effort to mobilize the many resources present in the Christian religious community. A major focus of CODEL's projects is stimulation of ecumenical cooperation through accomplishment of socio-economic development work.

The main strengths of CODEL's approach are that it has been fairly successful in accomplishing well-organized grassroots development work that has a high level of beneficiary impact.

The major weakness of CODEL's approach is that the quest for new venues to encourage ecumenical cooperation sometimes leads the organization to spread its resources too thinly. Some project-holders may not receive sufficient managerial assistance, especially when a key staff member is transferred.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

CODEL has basically a healthy and strong program that needs some minor adjustments. It should strongly consider a new system for project evaluation. Reduction of the number of projects being funded in the Africa and Asia regions might enhance the degree of local-level ecumenical cooperation. CODEL should consider preparation of a publication that documents the effects of ecumenicalism on development outcomes.

A.I.D./P.V.C. has a good investment of taxpayer money in CODEL. Its projects tend to reach needy populations in an effective manner both in terms of immediate benefits and long-term capacity-building. P.V.C. is encouraged to continue its assistance to CODEL.

*document
project
impact*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	i
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	ii
II. INTRODUCTION /Brief Overview of CODEL, Inc.....	1
A. Purpose of this Evaluation.....	2
B. Research Procedures.....	2
1. Sample Selection.....	2
2. Questionnaire Items.....	3
3. Field Trips and Research Methods.....	5
4. Written Materials.....	7
C. Study Limitations.....	7
III. SURVEY OF SELECTED CODEL PROJECTS.....	9
A. Overview of Codel Funded Projects and Survey Sample.....	9
B. Project Summaries, Analyses, and Assessments.....	15
1. Social Promoters/Ecuador.....	16
2. Lajas Community Bridge/Peru.....	21
3. Mandeville Trade Training/Jamaica.....	25
4. Bee Production by Women/Dominican Republic.....	30
5. Agricultural Credit Fund/Togo.....	34
6. Cornmill and Livestock Project/Cameroon.....	39
7. Homecraft and Medical Extension/Cameroon.....	45
8. School Leavers Carpentry Project/Zambia.....	50
9. Women's Training Program/Malawi.....	55
10. Malindi Boatyard/Malawi.....	60
C. Consistency of Projects with CODEL Selection Criteria.....	66
IV. SPECIAL TOPICS.....	68
A. Codel Projects in Relation to A.I.D. Mission Interests.....	68
B. Ecumenical Dimensions of CODEL Funded Projects.....	70
C. Beneficiary Impacts of CODEL Projects.....	74
D. Local Institution Impacts of CODEL Projects.....	75
E. Project Characteristics in Relation to Project Impacts.....	78
F. Generic P.V.O. Questions and CODEL Funded Projects.....	82
G. Review of Sample Project Benefits/Cost Ratios.....	85

V.	ASSESSMENT OF CODEL'S STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES AS A DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION.....	90
A.	Characteristics of CODEL's Development Approach.....	90
B.	Strengths of CODEL's Development Approach.....	93
C.	Weaknesses of CODEL's Development Approach.....	95
VI.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	98

ANNEXES

- A. CODEL Member Organizations
- B. A.I.D./P.V.C. Statement of Work
- C. CODEL Study Topics and Questions
- D. General Questions for CODEL Staff

LIST OF TABLES

1:	CODEL Funded Projects by Type and Region, October, 1983.....	9
2:	Number of CODEL Funded Projects with Economic or Social Development Emphasis.....	10
3:	Project Sponsorship by Region; October, 1983.....	12
4:	Average CODEL Approved Grant Amount by Region in 1981, 1983, and Sample.....	13
5:	Project Consistency with CODEL Criteria.....	67
6:	Relationship of CODEL Projects and Project-Holders to A.I.D. Mission Interests.....	68
7:	Types of Ecumenical Cooperation in Sample CODEL Funded Projects.....	71
8:	Development Impact Hierarchy of CODEL Sample Projects.....	78
9:	Consistency Index for Sample Projects.....	80
10:	Comparison of Cumulative Index Score Ranking of Sample Projects with Development Index Ranking Position....	81
11:	Ratios of Total Cost and Annualized Net Benefits for Four Sample CODEL Projects.....	85

1

I. INTRODUCTION

Brief Overview of CODEL, Inc.

CODEL--Coordination in Development--is a non-profit consortium of Roman Catholic, Protestant, and other church-related organizations involved in international development. The consortium, headquartered in New York City, is comprised of about forty member organizations (see Annex A for a recent list of CODEL members). CODEL is a non-operational development agency which funds ecumenically-based development projects involving community development, medical health, nonformal education, and agriculture in three geographic regions: Asia, Africa, and Latin America/Caribbean.

CODEL was organized in 1970 and first received public funds in 1975. CODEL uses matching funds from A.I.D. as a means to generate contributions and support from its member organizations. These combined monies are used toward total project costs which also include contributions by local institutions and project beneficiaries. As of August 31, 1983, CODEL had allocated \$1,299,029.42 of A.I.D. funds as part of CODEL's total allocation of \$2,844,060.14 since January 1, 1982. These A.I.D. and CODEL allocations were contributing to total project costs (in the three CODEL regions) of \$13,391,108.08, according to CODEL records.

On August 31, 1982, A.I.D. awarded CODEL a general support matching funds grant of \$1,620,000 for the period from July 1, 1982 to December 31, 1983. The grant, which expires June 30, 1985, is subject to a mid-term review by A.I.D./P.V.C. prior to continuation of funding past 1983. This mid-term evaluation report will be used by the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation in their assessment of CODEL's effectiveness as a development organization.

II. A. PURPOSE OF THIS EVALUATION.

The grant agreement between the A.I.D. Office of Contract Management and CODEL, Inc., dated September 23, 1982, states: "...between the twelfth and fifteenth months [of this agreement] a major mid-term evaluation will be undertaken jointly by CODEL and A.I.D. which, in addition to overall grant program performance, will specifically address the development impact of CODEL supported projects. This evaluation will be a major input to a mid-term progress report to A.I.D. due prior to any A.I.D. funding for the second half of the three-year grant period."

The A.I.D. Statement of Work for the CODEL mid-term evaluation further details its specific focus. The primary purpose of the proposed work is identified as an evaluation of "...the development value and impact of projects supported by Coordination in Development (CODEL), with special reference to the program interests and funding priorities of AID." Secondary purposes of the work include (1) an assessment of the impact of CODEL's program and operational style on local institutions, (2) identification of those characteristics and environmental variables that determine project results, and (3) analysis of issues related to CODEL's ecumenical orientation and organizational composition (see Annex A for complete Statement of Work).

The A.I.D. Statement of Work specifies that the evaluation will supplement existing information with field survey data from at least six CODEL sponsored projects in Africa and the Latin America/Caribbean region. Because of the work's focus on development impacts, "...projects to be reviewed will of necessity include projects underway long enough to have demonstrated impact. Thus, the sample may include projects funded prior to the current grant period."

II. B. RESEARCH PROCEDURES

1. Sample Selection

Field projects included in the survey sample provide a representative cross-section of CODEL supported work. These projects reflect:

--the larger proportion of Africa projects over those based in Latin America and the Caribbean (60% of the sample are from the former region,

40% from the latter);

--the larger percentage of CODEL sponsored projects focused on economic development activities (e.g., agriculture, water resources, trade training, and transportation projects) compared to those focused on social development (e.g., health and nutrition, adult education, organizational development, housing, and comprehensive community development): the sample included eight projects in the former category and two in the latter;

--the predominance of rural settings for CODEL funded projects;

--the emphasis placed by CODEL's project selection criteria on programs directly toward enhancing the social and economic status of women.

The survey sample included ten projects from eight countries: two each in South America, the Caribbean region, western Africa, and central Africa. The following projects were studied in this evaluation:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Country</u>	<u>Project-Holder</u>
Social Promoters	Ecuador	FEPP
Lajas Community Bridge	Peru	SEPAS
Butcher Training Program	Jamaica	St. John Bosco
Women's Beekeeping	Dominican Republic	MUDE
Agriculture Credit Fund	Togo	PTS
Cornmill and Livestock Program	Cameroon	Bui Food Coop
Homecraft & Medical Extension	Cameroon	Ndop Homecraft Centre
Carpentry Training Program	Zambia	Diocese of Kasama
Women's Training Program	Malawi	CSC
Ferro-cement Boatyard	Malawi	Malindi Rural Center

[Note: Organizational acronyms are explained in section III.]

2. Questionnaire Items

Selection of topics and specific questions for the field survey questionnaire was guided by the A.I.D. Statement of Work. This document called for special attention on these aspects of CODEL funded projects:

--concern with the effectiveness of CODEL grants in encouraging more self-reliance among local institutions, stimulating significant instances of replication, and providing seed money for small-scale projects that were later expanded to broad-scale programs by local governments and/or A.I.D. missions;

--questions concerning participation levels and modalities, degrees and types of innovativeness in project design, and frequency of replication to provide generalizations about those characteristics and environmental factors which contribute to positive project results;

--investigation of the effects of CODEL's ecumenical approach on the outcomes of its development program, with special emphasis on any unique development impacts that result from the collaboration of two or more different religious groups;

--estimates of the cost-benefit ratios present in CODEL funded projects as well as information on the methods used by project-holders to analyze the cost-effectiveness of those projects.

In keeping with these A.I.D. interests and concerns, the field questionnaire included eight major topics:

(1) Socio-Economic Context--Information on general social and economic characteristics in the project setting such as income levels, health conditions, population density, housing conditions, and educational facilities.

(2) Beneficiary Characteristics--General background on the beneficiary target group of the project including social status level, occupational patterns, age range, religious affiliation, ethnic identity, and other factors.

(3) Project Characteristics--Details concerning the objectives and implementation of the project such as project personnel, phases or stages of the project, total project funding sources, and origins of the design.

(4) Results, Outcomes, and Impacts--Information on the overall effects which the project had on those problems to which it was addressed: had it produced the intended social and economic changes? If not, why not? Will it be continued or replicated after CODEL funding ends? What were some ecumenical aspects of the project?

(5) Project-Holder Development Capacity and Potential--Questions on the characteristics of those local institutions with which CODEL collaborates in development projects: what is their history as development organizations? How large and well-trained are the staffs? What kinds of projects have they undertaken in the past? What methods do they use to calculate cost-effectiveness, encourage fiscal self-sufficiency, and encourage project participation by beneficiaries?

(6) CODEL's Relationship to Local Institutions--Information concerning the impact of CODEL's collaboration on the project-holders with a focus on such issues as the types of assistance offered by CODEL and requested by project-holders, frequency and type of communication with CODEL, evidence of expanded contact with other development organizations as a result of the CODEL funded project, and the project-holder's assessment of CODEL's strengths and weaknesses as a donor.

(7) Impacts on the Poor and Women--Is there evidence that CODEL funded projects are reaching the "poorest of the poor"? What are the social and economic impacts, if any, on poor men and women? Do they play any role in project design, implementation, or evaluation?

(8) Project Consistency with CODEL Funding Criteria--To what extent do specific projects reflect a high, moderate, or low consistency level with CODEL's self-defined funding criteria?

The complete questionnaire is in Annex C.

In addition, the evaluator prepared a list of general questions about CODEL's organization, operations, procedures, and relationships which were discussed with CODEL's executive director and two regional coordinators (see Annex D). The purpose of these questions was to provide the evaluator with the "inside view" of major CODEL policies.

3. Field Trips and Research Methods

The field study involved the following field trips:

--Sept. 22-23, 1983: Field visit to CODEL headquarters in New York City for purpose of introductions with staff, study orientation, and to collect written materials from CODEL files;

--Oct. 8-21, 1983: Field visits to Ecuador (Social Promoters projects in Salinas and Simiatug as well as FEPP headquarters and A.I.D. offices in Quito) and to Peru (Lajas Community Bridge project as well as SEPAS headquarters and A.I.D. offices in Lima);

--Oct. 30-Nov. 9, 1983: Field visits to Jamaica (Butcher Training Program at St. John Bosco School in Mandeville and A.I.D. offices in Kingston) and the Dominican Republic (Beekeeping Project for Women in La Vega Province as well as MUDE headquarters and A.I.D. offices in Santo Domingo);

--Nov. 21-Dec. 15, 1983: Field visits to Togo (PTS Agriculture Credit Fund at Hehiro and ECT headquarters and A.I.D. offices in Lome), to two projects in Cameroon (Cornmill and Livestock Project at the Bui Food Coop in Kumbo and the Homecraft and Medical Extension Project at the St. Mary's Homecraft Centre in Ndop), to one project in Zambia (the School Leaver's Carpentry Training project at Kasama as well as A.I.D. offices in Lusaka) and two projects in Malawi (Women's Training Program at Chilema and the Ferro-Cement Boatyard Project at Malindi as well as A.I.D. offices in Lilongwe).

During the Latin American and African phases of the field study, I was accompanied by the respective CODEL regional coordinators, Ken E. Brown, Jr., and Sister Margaret C. Rogers. At each of the project sites, I visited the project in the company of staff members and/or board members of the project-holder. A typical field site visit included (1) visiting the project site and interviewing project-holder staff, board members, and beneficiaries, (2) administering the questionnaire to at least one senior staff member (usually the project-holder director) and/or one board member, (3) casual observations and interaction with staff members, beneficiaries, and other local persons, and (4) discussions with A.I.D. mission project officers and/or program directors (depending on availability).

*Field site
visits
"PH"
Director
general?*

In addition to the questions posed on the formal questionnaire, I also gathered information from project-holder staff on the history of their organization and its involvement with CODEL. My visits to A.I.D. mission officers focused on their observations on the role and impact of PVO activities in their respective countries, the size and focus of any OPGs to in-country PVOs, and any assessments about the particular projects and/or project-holders funded by CODEL.

Without exception the staff and board members of project-holders were cordial, candid, and thorough in their discussions and questionnaire responses. In addition, the A.I.D. mission officers were generally helpful, interested in the research focus, and knowledgeable about PVO activities. At most missions, a Country Development Strategy Statement (CDSS) was provided to the evaluator. This document enabled him to gain a better understanding of broad socio-economic conditions and A.I.D. mission priorities in each country.

*Field site
CDSS?*

4. Written Materials

In addition to field interviews, observations, and questionnaire responses, this study uses information available from written materials:

- a 1981 comprehensive evaluation of CODEL prepared by Maryanne Dulancey for A.I.D.;
- project summaries and evaluation materials of all ten sample projects;
- project summaries and evaluation materials for a random sample of ten Latin American and ten African CODEL funded projects which were selected to provide supplementary information on projects in those regions;
- various materials from CODEL files dealing with its organizational relationships (especially with A.I.D.) including its present grant contract, CODEL annual reports and financial statements, CODELnews newsletters, the CODEL mid-term self-evaluation study, and portions of a 1977 evaluation of CODEL by Robert R. Nathan Associates for A.I.D.

II. C. STUDY LIMITATIONS

The information and findings in this report should be read with these limitations in mind:

--this study adheres closely to the work parameters provided in the A.I.D. Statement of Work. That is, this evaluation focuses central attention on the description, analysis, and assessment of the development impact of past CODEL funded projects in the Latin America and Africa regions;

--this study draws on a sample of CODEL funded projects, a method that produces inherent limitations on the generalizability of the findings. Ten projects received intensive scrutiny, yet this represents less than ten percent of CODEL funded projects as of October, 1983. Despite this constraint, the evaluator believes that the selected projects are a reasonably complete cross-section of the types of projects which CODEL has funded and is funding in those regions.

--projects which promote economic development are represented in higher proportion than the average for all CODEL funded projects. This bias was intentional on the evaluator's part to facilitate the study of cost-benefit factors, a topic of interest voiced by A.I.D./P.V.C. staff members in their discussion with the evaluator. Costs and benefits are

more measurable (because they are more visible) in economic development projects.

--the evaluator's lack of previous field experience in these regions was a potential handicap. However, any disadvantages have been neutralized by the use of interpreters, whenever necessary, and by the use of A.I.D. mission information on in-country conditions.

While the evaluator had extensive background experience evaluating rural development projects undertaken by religious-based PVOs, he had to learn about CODEL "from scratch": he had no prior knowledge of CODEL or any aspect of its operations.

*Recommendations:
- all evaluations should be given CDSS before final reports
RH*

III. SURVEY OF SELECTED CODEL PROJECTS.

A. OVERVIEW OF CODEL FUNDED PROJECTS AND SURVEY SAMPLE

Before discussing specific field projects, the information below provides comparative perspective on the survey sample. This overview focuses on (1) comparison of the types of projects CODEL funded in each region as of October, 1983, (2) a broad classification of these projects into either 'economic development' or 'social development' categories, (3) analysis of project sponsorship patterns by CODEL member organizations in the two regions and in the sample projects, and (4) summaries of average grant amounts by CODEL region in 1981, 1983, and in the sample. The purpose of this section is to place the survey projects in the context of CODEL's overall portfolio of projects.

1. CODEL Funded Projects by Type and Region as of October, 1983:

As indicated in Table 1 below, CODEL's Projects Committee had approved funding for a broad range of development activities as reported in "Comprehensive Project Review" (CPR) as of October, 1983. Table 1 assembles these projects into nine broad categories for analytical purposes:

Table 1
CODEL FUNDED PROJECTS BY TYPE AND REGION, OCTOBER 1983

Project Type/ Region:	Africa	Asia	LA/Carib.	Total
Nutrition/Health/ Medicine	7	3	5	15
Agriculture/Horti- culture/Livestock	13	13	5	31
Water Resources	7	1	0	8
Adult Ed./Home Economics/Soc. Dev.	1	2	3	6
Trade Training	5	11	4	20
Transportation	1	1	0	2
Organ. Develop.	10	2	4	16
Comprehen. C.D.	0	5	6	11
Housing	1	2	0	3

Source: CODEL CPR, October, 1983.

[N= 112]

Table 1 provides a more detailed, functional classification of CODEL funded projects than the four-part classification it uses in its annual report and other publications (agriculture, medical health, community development, and nonformal education programs). The more detailed system in Table 1 offers a more specific focus for those projects CODEL labels 'community development' and 'nonformal education'.

Given the functional categories of Table 1, it is possible to see the extent to which CODEL funded projects place emphasis on what may be broadly termed 'economic development' as opposed to 'social development' project activities. Such a dichotomy is an artificial distinction, to an extent, since economic development generates social impacts and social development is transitory without improved economic conditions: they are intertwined.

Historically, many religious-based PVOs have been involved in economic development activities intended to uplift the physical well-being and social status of "marginal" people, e.g., lepers, orphans, widows, criminal tribes. In addition, these PVOs often undertook social development projects (such as education) intended to have some economic payoffs. Table 2 demonstrates that this same trend continues today in the relatively equal emphasis on both economic and social development among CODEL funded projects:

Table 2
NUMBER OF CODEL FUNDED PROJECTS WITH
ECONOMIC OR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT EMPHASIS

Economic Development Emphasis	Social Development Emphasis
Agriculture/Livestock/ Horticulture/Fisheries.....31	Nutrition/Health/ Medical.....15
Water Resources.....8	Adult Education/Home Economics/Social Develop.....6
Trade Training.....20	Organizational Development.....16
Transportation.....2	Comprehensive Comm. Develop....11
	Housing.....3
Totals: [N= 112]	61 (54%)
	51 (46%)

*except
water
sanitation
for health*

Table 2 represents a conservative classification of the information on CODEL funded projects. That is, there could be a strong argument made for including 'comprehensive community development' projects in the column of Economic Development since such projects often involve some income-generation component. However, even without including these projects, it is clear that more than half of all CODEL funded projects in late 1983 had emphasized economic development impacts. Yet, at the same time, almost half focused on the other essential element of modernization, human growth via social development. Seen in perspective, the CODEL portfolio represents a good balance of development-impact emphasis.

2. Analysis of Sponsorship Patterns by CODEL Member Organizations: Table 3 details CODEL member organization sponsorship of projects listed in the CPR of October, 1983.

[See Table 3 on following page].

Table 3 demonstrates that about half of CODEL's member organizations were actively sponsoring field projects in the most recent report period. Each organization sponsored an average of 4.2 projects with a range of 1 to 14 sponsorships. In terms of ecumenical collaboration, a rough analysis of the religious affiliations of sponsors shows that about half of the projects (58) were sponsored by Catholic-affiliated members while the balance (56) had Protestant and other non-Catholic sponsors.

This analysis provides insights into the high degree of representativeness of the sample project's sponsorship: six (60%) were sponsored by Catholic-affiliated CODEL members and four (40%) by Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, and Congregational Christian Service Committee. ✓

3. Average CODEL Grant Size by Region in 1981, 1983, and in Sample: As illustrated in Table 4 below, there is considerable difference between the average size of approved CODEL grants during the period which includes most of the sample projects (1981-1983). This difference is partly explained by the evaluator's concern with finding projects appropriate for cost-benefit analysis. Thus, the sample projects may include more costly economic development projects than typical of CODEL funding patterns.

Table 3
PROJECT SPONSORSHIP BY REGION; OCTOBER, 1983

Number Organization/Region:	Africa	Asia	LA & Carib.	Total
American Leprosy Missions	0	1	0	1
Christian Brothers	0	0	3	3
Church World Service	7	3	4	(14)
Congreg. Church Serv. Com.	5	8	0	(13)
Divine Word Missionaries	0	5	0	5
Episcopal Church	1	0	0	1
Found. for Comm. Creativity	0	0	1	1
Franciscan Miss. of Mary	2	1	1	4
Inter. Vol. Services (IVS)	0	0	1	1
✓Lutheran World Relief	0	0	4	4
Marist Missions	0	4	1	5
Maryknoll Fathers	2	2	2	(6)
Maryknoll Sisters	2	1	0	3
Meals for Millions/ Freedom from Hunger Found.	1	0	3	4
Mill Hill Missionaries	5	1	1	(7)
P.I.M.E. Fathers	0	1	0	1
St. Columbans For. Miss. Soc.	0	4	1	5
St. Patrick Fathers	3	0	0	3
Secretariat for Lat. Am.	0	0	2	2
Soc. of African Missions	2	0	0	2
Soc. of Holy Child Jesus	5	0	0	5
✓Technoserve	2	0	0	2
United Meth. Comm. on Rel.	1	3	0	4
United Presby. Ch. of USA -	0	2	0	2
White Fathers	6	0	0	(6)
YMCA--Int'l. Div.	3	4	2	(9)
YWCA	0	1	0	1
Totals:	47	41	26	114

Source: CODEL CPR, October, 1983.

Table 4
 AVERAGE CODEL APPROVED GRANT
 AMOUNT BY REGION IN 1981, 1983, AND SAMPLE.

CODEL Region/	Average Grant:	Oct. 1981	Oct. 1983	Sample
Africa		\$24,331 (N= 33)	\$50,839 (N= 49)	\$62,868 (N= 6)
Latin America & Caribbean		\$39,710 (N= 32)	\$88,134 (N= 26)	\$41,639 (N= 4)

Source: CODEL CPRs of Oct., 1981, and Oct., 1983, as well as project summaries of sample projects.

The following cautions should be kept in mind when interpreting the above average grant sums: (1) these figures represent the whole grant award for all projects listed in the respective CPRs--in numerous cases these were multi-year awards covering up to three years of project funding approval, (2) in the case of the 1981 average grant amounts, total approved funding was not always displayed in the CPR; consequently, only those projects awards were included for that year that had clearly specified CODEL grant amounts, and (3) it is not accurate to assume that the total number of Africa projects increased and the total number of Latin America & Caribbean projects decreased between 1981 and 1983. However, because these sums are averages of actual approved awards, it is safe to infer that the average amount of CODEL grants more than doubled in each region during this two-year period. *
- explain
- 1981

Table 4 indicates that the Latin America and Caribbean projects were roughly representative of average CODEL project funding for 1981; the Africa projects were more representative of funding levels in 1983. ✓

4. Overview Summary

In summary, CODEL funded projects as a group:

--are divided almost equally into projects promoting economic development and social development with an emphasis on the former;

--are presently sponsored by about half of CODEL's members in about equal proportions by Catholic and non-Catholic organizations;

--are about twice as large in terms of average approved grant in 1983 as compared with 1981; this increased average award size may be explained partly by increased numbers of multi-year grants.

Based on these summary characteristics of current and recent CODEL funded projects, these generalizations can be made about the survey sample projects:

--they are more representative of CODEL funded economic development projects;

--they are roughly equal in cost to most CODEL funded projects in the Latin American and Caribbean region in 1981 and more costly than the average Africa region grant in either 1981 or 1983;

--they are representative of project sponsorship patterns of CODEL member organizations.

B. PROJECT SUMMARIES, ANALYSES, AND ASSESSMENTS

The following format will be used in this section to provide a succinct but thorough synopsis of the field projects surveyed in this study:

A. PROJECT FACT SHEET

- Project Name
- Project Location
- Project-Holder (Local Institution)
- Project Time Period
- CODEL Member Sponsor
- Project Costs and Funding Sources
- Project Summary

B. PROJECT RESULTS ANALYSIS

- Proposed Project Outcome/Impacts
- Actual Project Outcome/Impacts
- Intervening Factors

C. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

- Project Strengths
- Project Weaknesses
- Lessons Learned

Information on the sample projects will be presented in the same chronological order as projects were visited.

B. 1: FEPP Social Promoters/Ecuador

a. PROJECT FACT SHEET

- Project Name: Social Promoters.
- Project Location: Ecuador (nation-wide).
- Project-Holder: FEPP (Ecuadorian Populorum Progressio Fund).
- Project Time Period: 1981-1983.
- Project Costs and Funding Sources: Total Cost--\$94,012.30;
Funding Sources--CODEL (\$83,781.54), FEPP (\$10,230.76).
- Project Summary: Project monies are to provide FEPP with resources to train and field extension agents ('Social Promoters') who will organize self-help groups. Specifically, Social Promoters will organize campesinos (both Latinos and Indians) into problem-solving associations; these groups will take the form of cooperatives wherever feasible and/or appropriate. The purpose of these associations will be income-generation activities by members such as purchasing dairy and draft animals, reforestation, fisheries, and cottage industries. Social Promoters have access to FEPP loan capital to provide seed money for association projects. In addition, the Social Promoters will assist association members to develop leadership abilities and other problem-solving skills.

b. PROJECT RESULTS ANALYSIS

--Proposed Project Outcome/Impacts:

The project proposal summary stated Social Promoters were to be trained and assigned to their field sites on a gradual basis between 1981 and 1983: four in 1981, two more in 1982, and the last two in 1983. They were expected to be most active in the job tasks of visiting campesino settlements and encouraging the formation of associations, providing or arranging for training of association officers, and arranging seed-money loans for income-generation projects.

There were no clear-cut targets for these workers mentioned in the proposal such as number of villages to be contacted, number of loans to be arranged, or number of training sessions to be organized.

--Actual Project Outcome/Impacts:

The evaluator visited two field sites at which Social Promoters are located (Salinas and Simiatug) and also spoke with senior FEPP staffers in their Quito offices. On the basis of those interviews and discussions, the actual impacts of the Social Promoters include the following points--

§ There are currently 12 Social Promoters in the field: three in Cuenca, four in Rio Bamba, three in Napo, and two in Esmeraldas provinces.

§ Social Promoter personnel and beneficiaries include members of Ecuador's "marginal" groups: blacks, women, and Indians.

§ Social Promoters are working out of FEPP regional offices where they have access to technical and administrative assistance from specialists such as accountants, foresters, vets, agronomists, and marketing advisers.

§ Social Promoters are selected by persons in those communities in which they work; however, at present, Social Promoters' salaries are provided almost entirely by CODEL funds through FEPP.

§ Social Promoters have loan-making discretionary powers up to 40,000 sucres (about \$500); above that amount, they must seek approval from the regional coordinator.

§ Social Promoters are principally engaged in those activities that were outlined in the CODEL project summary: granting loans, organizing campesino associations, providing or arranging training to association officers, providing technical assistance for problems that emerge for the associations.

§ Social Promoters receive frequent and regular training throughout their employment in social organizational and leadership training skills as well as technical subjects such as animal care.

§ Social Promoters communicate regularly with their regional offices and frequently with the central Quito office. They submit quarterly reports on their activities to the Social Promoter coordinator in Quito; he tries to visit them at least bimonthly at their field sites.

§ A successful Social Promoter can establish a lucrative income-generation project under certain conditions. The prime example of this enterprise is the Salinas cheese factory cooperative organized by a priest. This enterprise has had major economic benefits for the village and has been replicated, on a smaller scale, by several near-by coops.

§ FEPP expects and intends for the Social Promoters to reach the poorest campesinos. The number of campesino associations begun by Social Promoters ranges from 16 to 40.

§ FEPP assists the campesino associations by providing production storage and marketing facilities at their Quito offices. For instance, there is a large refrigeration unit in the basement of FEPP headquarters where surplus cheese can be stored until sale. A central sales facility in a main Quito shopping area is operated by FEPP and has a large clientele of expatriates and middle-class Ecuatorians.

--Intervening Factors:

Differences between the project as outlined in the proposal and the actual project can be attributed to these factors--

Δ The larger number of Social Promoters now in the field (12 compared to the projected 8) is due to two factors: (1) the refusal of many campesino communities to allow Social Promoters a high salary but only a modest one, and (2) the substantial increase in the U.S. dollar's value against the Ecuadorian sucre in the period since grant transmittal.

Δ Social Promoters have had more local impact than might be expected because (1) they are working within a well-organized and highly-resourced infrastructure [FEPP], (2) those individuals selected for the Social Promoter position have a high local acceptance level because they are selected by community members, and (3) Social Promoters have ready access to loan money which enables them to follow through quickly and effectively on campesino projects.

Δ In the case of some Social Promoters, encouragement and assistance has been available from European volunteers (Italian, French, Swiss) who are working in close cooperation with the priests in the area.

c. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

--Project Strengths:

This project appears to be meeting an important need in the lives of many Ecuadorian campesinos and is doing so in a manner which is likely to result in an enhanced self-help capacity for many rural communities. The particular development strategy which is being applied there is one that

has a good chance of establishing economically significant and viable income-generation projects and infrastructure among population segments which have previously only known subsistence economies. This economic development dimension is complemented by skills in local leadership for community problem-solving, another type of long-range tool for self-help.

The work being done by FEPP does not duplicate in any appreciable way the work of any other PVO or the national government. To a large extent the rural villages and campesinos of Ecuador are largely left to fend for themselves: there is a low level of government assistance. The Catholic Church provides one of the few sources of contact and assistance for those living in remote regions. In Salinas, for example, contact with the outside world by road was not established until a priest helped villagers persuade the government to build a road to the village in 1976. Since 1970 that same priest and several visiting European volunteers have helped initiate a number of community improvements built largely with income from a successful cheese factory. Because of these successful development efforts, several international development agencies as well as the Government of Ecuador have invested resources in Salinas.

In the Social Promoters approach, FEPP seeks to institutionalize the catalytic role of community developer in the person of trained local laypeople. It is even experimenting with a new variation on the extension theme: they have accepted small groups in the Social Promoter role (they are the officers of small coops). This group approach is a conscious experiment to put a local-level organization in the leadership position.

FEPP itself has played a very important leadership role in improving social and economic living conditions in rural Ecuador. Recognition of FEPP's competency and effectiveness comes in the form of financial contributions from about twenty international agencies. In addition, FEPP has been noticed with positive interest by the PVO liaison officer at the A.I.D./Ecuador mission.

--Project Weaknesses:

The Social Promoters project faces potential problems that can be avoided with forethought. The major challenge is for FEPP's administration and staff to avoid a paternalistic attitude toward the Social Promoters and

the campesino associations. This tendency is understandable when an organization has devoted so much time, attention, and money to nurturing the twelve Promoters and their campesino groups. Paternalism might also be ~~expectable~~ in that the role of Social Promoter is modeled on the efforts of a priest who has, without doubt, accomplished important gains in that village...not the least of which is developing a core coop group of about one dozen young people. One of these young coop members is now employed as the Social Promoter in Salinas and others work in various coop capacities. This group is the nucleus of the village's future development when the priest and his volunteer colleagues (presently two from Italy) leave Salinas.

Worries about FEPP "letting go" (when the time is right) arise when one realizes that this priest has worked in Salinas since 1970. Even though that village now has considerable development infrastructure, FEPP's executive director feels that Salinas won't be ready for self-sufficiency for another six years or so...and Salinas is the most developed village in which FEPP operates. Having voiced this concern, it must be noted that FEPP is working hard to initiate projects that will result in much higher levels of campesino self-sufficiency in the long run.

Is the priest the main reason why the village is the most developed?

--Lessons Learned:

The lesson which is taught by FEPP's Social Promoter project is that development projects can succeed if adequate and appropriate resources are applied competently.

This project stands a good chance of accomplishing its objectives. Its success will not be the result of chance or good luck but the fruit of careful work by a talented group of concerned professionals with an abundance of resources at their disposal (compared to many development organizations). Given this favorable combination of talent and resources situated in a socio-political context where they have a virtual free hand in their dealings with the target population, the odds for success are high.

*Why stay over here?
Fila table?*

B. 2: Lajas Community Bridge/Peru

a. PROJECT FACT SHEET

--Project Name: Lajas Community Bridge.

--Project Location: Lajas Community, Chota Province, Cajamarca Department, Peru.

--Project-Holder: SEPAS (Servicio Evangelico Peruano de Accion Social).

--CODEL Member Sponsor: Lutheran World Relief.

--Project Time Period: 1978 (one-time grant).

--Project Cost and Funding Sources: Total Cost--\$24,165;
Funding Sources--CODEL (\$16,515), Local Input (\$7,650).

--Project Summary: The Lajas Community Bridge project was intended to provide resources necessary for a poor, dispersed rural community to integrate itself commercially and territorially through a self-help effort. Lajas community members, led by a Protestant pastor, approached SEPAS (a development agency originally organized with the help of Church World Service) about securing resources to complete a bridge over the Chota River. A government grant provided to the Lajas mayor for the bridge in 1974 had been spent on other activities and the village still had no bridge. The need for it was felt by communities on the west bank of the river which lacked ready access to the main Lajas market area and major regional road. Villagers volunteered their labor and some construction materials, the Peruvian government would supply the services of a civil engineer, and CODEL (via SEPAS) was asked for a one-time grant to pay for construction materials and some miscellaneous expenses. In addition to the immediate economic benefits of the bridge, this project was intended to build local problem-solving capacity. Finally, SEPAS staff would assist the villagers in the areas of promotion, administration, supervision, and report-writing.

b. PROJECT RESULTS ANALYSIS

--Proposed Project Outcome/Impacts:

The most immediate project impact was to be construction of a concrete bridge linking the east and west banks of the "Greater Lajas" community (the main town with smaller hamlets and settlements in the surrounding hillsides). The bridge was to facilitate commerce and communications in the Lajas area and, secondarily, to open the western side to the larger outside world. A more indirect outcome was to increase local problem-solving capacity by encouraging a local development committee which had taken responsibility for completion of the project.

--Actual Project Outcome/Impacts:

The most direct, immediate anticipated outcomes of the Lajas bridge have been accomplished. With the help of CODEL funds, the village development committee (headed by the Protestant pastor) mobilized residents of twelve settlements in and around Lajas. They completed construction of the bridge in two years: June 1978-July, 1980. As a result of the bridge, the following impacts have occurred--

§ Pedestrian access to the Lajas market area has been improved for residents of the nine settlements (comprising about 2,000 people) who live in the extreme southern part of the province.

§ Since the bridge has been in place, area residents no longer fear crossing the river at any time of the year. Formerly, during the rainy months (October-April), lives were lost as people crossed the flooding river over an improvised bridge made of tree trunks.

§ Increased pedestrian access has had these major benefits:

- (1) greater commercial interaction between outlying villages and the main Lajas market, especially in the sale of vegetables and agricultural products, livestock, and handicrafts;
- (2) better access to educational and recreational facilities by children living on the river's west bank;
- (3) improved access to health facilities for persons living in outlying villages.

§ One unforeseen impact of the bridge has been increased concentration of rural families on the western outskirts of Lajas. Numerous houses have been constructed on the street leading up to the bridge since it was completed.

§ One potential but unrealized outcome of the bridge project is the lack of vehicular access to the bridge. So far, the local officials have not agreed upon the placement of a feeder road connecting the bridge and main Lajas market street.

§ Another unrealized possibility is the lack of any subsequent community-based projects since the bridge was finished in 1980. The community voluntarism that contributed to the bridge has not been transferred into additional community improvements.

--Intervening Factors:

Although the basic intention of this project was achieved--the bridge was built by local people using CODEL and SEPAS assistance--the broader objectives (e.g., encouragement of self-help projects by community members) has not been accomplished. SEPAS staff was spread too thinly to provide the promotion work necessary for more local problem-solving projects. [Lajas is an isolated community quite distant--more than 400 kilometers over very poor and hazardous roads--from the SEPAS regional office in Trujillo.] An effective community organization effort, even one as limited as facilitating construction of a feeder road to the bridge, would have required more follow-up work than available resources permitted.

c. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

--Project Strengths:

The major accomplishment of this project was to carry out a narrowly-defined task (construction of a bridge) while the larger challenge of setting up an effective, self-renewing method to meet other community needs (a strong community development organization) was not achieved. The bridge has produced most of the impacts assumed for it before its construction: both overall commerce and communication have been expanded significantly. [The evaluator was unable to obtain reliable information on the level of increased trade since the bridge was opened, but it was clear that there is now substantially more grain, potatoes, cattle, goats, and other products being brought to market from the western side of the river]. Even though a vehicular feeder road has not been built, the bridge itself is sufficient infrastructure to have encouraged more trade traffic.

Parents also told the evaluator that many more school children from homes on the western river bank are now attending classes in Lajas because their parents no longer fear for their safety when crossing the river.

There can be little doubt that the bridge had important impacts on the lives of many households although that impact cannot be readily measured without reliable baseline information.

--Project Weaknesses:

The greatest failing of this project is the wasted potential of the bridge-building task to stimulate an ongoing development committee in Lajas. The village and surrounding hinterland still have major unmet needs. For example, during the evaluator's visit, he and SEPAS staff members met on the bridge with a delegation of local leaders and public officials to discuss the bridge's impacts on their lives. During that meeting, these leaders expressed desire for more assistance from SEPAS to help build a medical clinic. One negative outcome of the bridge project may be that the idea was planted that outside organizations can be counted on to solve local problems. While the Lajas bridge was given birth, the formation of a Lajas community development group was stillborn.

--Lessons Learned:

The major lesson here is the need for project-holders to pay close attention to the process dimensions of the project. They need to make certain that a healthy, sustainable local organization will survive the completion of the immediate improvement task. In the present case, the local development committee was unable to use the success of the bridge completion as a rallying point for other development efforts.

B. 3: Mandeville Trade Training/Jamaica

a. PROJECT FACT SHEET

--Project Name: Trade Training Program.

--Project Location: Mandeville, Jamaica.

--Project-Holder: St. John Bosco School.

--Project Time Period: 1983 (one-time grant)

--CODEL Member Sponsor: The Christian Brothers.

--Project Cost and Funding Sources: Total Cost--\$812,175 (5 years);
Funding Sources--CODEL (\$69,000), A.I.D./Jamaica (\$10,000);
Local Inputs (\$733,175).

--Project Summary: This project is an outgrowth of two major concerns at St. John Bosco School near Mandeville: (1) to train young "pre-delinquent" boys in marketable occupational skills and (2) to help the school attain greater financial self-sufficiency. The Trade Training Project is one of several "work-study" programs at the school. The school is operated by the Sisters of Mercy and the training program is run by the Christian Brothers. There are two full-time Sisters and three full-time Brothers (all Americans) working at St. John Bosco as well as several expatriate volunteers. The school houses about 130 residential students who have been sent there under court order as juveniles coming from "unfit" homes. In addition to basic educational skills--reading, writing, mathematics--students are taught a variety of occupational skills. CODEL's contribution to this effort was money to establish a butcher shop for processing of livestock (pigs and chickens) raised on the school farm. This project was intended to give older students skills as butchers and to help the school gain greater economic security.

b. PROJECT RESULTS ANALYSIS

--Proposed Project Outcome/Impacts:

This project is the latest in a series of trade training activities at St. John Bosco school. Previous activities include training in such skills as gardening, poultry and pig raising, dairying, and small engine

repair. The CODEL funds in this grant were to finance most of the equipment needed to set up a butcher business (meat saws, packaging equipment, high-voltage electrical connections, a stand-by diesel generator, and costs of remodeling a former chapel into a meat-packaging facility). The project was intended to provide (1) training in meat-cutting and packaging to some of the older boys who could then find employment as butchers, and (2) packaging and sales facilities for the school's livestock production program.

--Actual Project Outcome/Impacts:

The evaluator visited the school where he interviewed the men in charge of the training program, the women who operate the school, and several temporary expatriate volunteers who help on various school farm projects. In addition he toured the butcher shop facilities and interviewed five of the boys who attend the school (including some involved in the butcher training project). He administered the field questionnaire to the program's acting supervisor.

To date the butcher training program has not produced any graduates who are employed in that occupation. In fact, the butcher shop facilities were not all completed at the time of the evaluator's visit although it has been operational on a small scale since 1982. The training program staff feel that once the students finish the program and enter the job-stream (present trainees are only 14-15 years old), they will have sufficient experience to gain a meat-cutting job paying J\$250-500 monthly. The present staff of the butcher shop includes five older students who help in actual meat-cutting and packaging as well as five younger boys who assist with package-labeling tasks.

The project has not operated long enough to evaluate the long-term feasibility of the employment training. Realistically, it may not be possible to evaluate this aspect of the project for several years. But the secondary purpose of the project--to provide a steady flow of income for the school's operations and to provide meat for the students' meals--is already doing very well. Although details on the butcher shop's contribution to the school's budget and food supply are provided in Section IV. G, it should be noted here that it earned some income for the school

budget in the past fiscal year and made substantial inputs to the school's food supply.

--Intervening Factors:

This project was conceived and designed by a priest who first set up the farm program at St. John Bosco School in the mid-1970s. This Brother was convinced that in the changable job market of Jamaica, the sensible job training approach was one which equipped young men with multiple skills. Unfortunately, this Brother was so successful in his efforts to build an effective job training program and school farm program that he was recently recruited to do a feasibility study in Antigua for a similar project there. Thus, the leadership of the butcher trade training project has changed hands since the CODEL grant was approved. Based on interviews with the acting superintendent, it appears that the same multi-skill approach will guide the training program in the future. Apparently this change of leadership will not result in any major deviations from the proposed project design.

Another intervening factor (one that is relevant to understanding CODEL's impact on local institutions) is that CODEL funding has attracted grants from other donors for the school. The Inter-American Fund and CADEC (Christian Action for Development in the Caribbean) have both provided loans and/or grants to St. John Bosco recently. The acting superintendent gave credit to CODEL's help in facilitating this assistance... albeit it was indirect help. In his view, the Inter-American fund representative had been partly influenced by the CODEL grant because, in his view, that meant that St. John Bosco was a good project-holder. CODEL has a close relationship with CADEC which may account for its assistance to the school. Finally, the A.I.D./Jamaica mission provided the butcher training program with a small grant (\$10,000) in order to purchase an American-built meat locker for the shop.

c. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

--Project Strengths:

This project appears to be meeting an important need in contemporary Jamaica--saving young boys from a life of street crime, unemployment, and

and broken homes. The basic development strategy of the school (trade training in multiple-skill areas) is sound because it anticipates the kind of variability that these students will need once they leave St. John Bosco and "hit the streets".

Another strength is that the school accepts major responsibility for its own financial support. Such an approach is realistic, according to the A.I.D. mission P.V.O. liaison officer who noted that numerous similar boarding schools had closed in recent years due to financial problems. The Government of Jamaica provides minimal assistance in the form of maintenance allowances for the boy's room and board but no money at all for education. In many ways, the school is in the same survival situation that the students will be in when they graduate: some sources of self-support must be identified and developed. The school must survive financially or its students will be forced back out on the streets or end up in a more crowded care facility without any educational program.

While the school's basic development strategy for its students--a strong general educational base with rudimentary skills in several trade areas--appears to be flexible and far-sighted, there are no statistics or hard evidence to show if this approach is successful or not.

--Project Weaknesses:

The school's trade training strategy may need further refinement in order for the school's graduates to make a successful transition upon graduation. This transition involves moving from the sheltered, highly structured, and supportive environment of the school out into the unstructured freedom of street life and the traumatic family situations some of them will encounter. Thus, some follow-up counseling might help the students adjust to being independent adults who are now the one responsible for their livelihood and physical survival. The need for this counseling as well as some placement assistance is indicated by the school's recent hiring of two or three of their former students to work on the full-time farm staff. They were hired partly because they had had difficulty finding employment in the world outside St. John Bosco despite their multiple trade skills. Also there is the danger that in providing students with skills that are helpful for the

school's financial survival (mostly ones related to farming and rural life), the long-range task of meeting the students' future employment needs may be overshadowed. For example, about half of the students are originally from urban areas and are likely to return there after their education is completed. Some of the skills they will learn at St. John Bosco will be transferrable to an urban context--such as meat-cutting--but other skills will not be.

Hopefully the task of finding viable economic support projects for the school will not overwhelm the staff. At the time of the evaluator's visit, the staff was still adjusting to the departure of the brother who established the school farm program. There will need to be adjustments to fill the void left by his leaving and to realign staff responsibilities and roles. One external development that may assist in this transition is management training assistance to be offered to about 30 Jamaican P.V.O.s (including St. John Bosco) by an A.I.D./Jamaica OPG titled "Voluntary Sector Development Project".

--Lessons Learned:

This is one of the projects visited by the evaluator which raised questions about the practicality of one project director carrying out the design developed by a preceding director. It will be informative to look at this project in future years for changes in the approach and structure of the trade training program now that it has new leadership.

B. 4: Bee Production by Women/Dominican Republic

a. PROJECT FACT SHEET

--Project Name: Bee Production by Women.

--Project Location: La Vega Province, Dominican Republic.

--Project-Holder: MUDE (Mujeres en Desarrollo Dominicana, Inc.)

--Project Time Period: 1981 (one-time grant).

--CODEL Member Sponsor: Church World Service.

Project Cost and Funding Sources: Total Cost--\$18,578;

Funding Sources--CODEL (\$4,775), MUDE (\$13,543), Local
Inputs (\$260).

--Project Summary: MUDE's rural development program includes multi-purpose female extension workers who promote, help organize, and provide various types of training to women's associations in poor, rural regions. These associations are located in the three most economically-depressed areas of the nation. Among the activities of these associations are income-generation projects such as fisheries, crafts production, small industries, agriculture, and livestock production. The latter includes work with pigs, goats, and cows. The bee production project was undertaken to provide seed money for a beekeeping revolving loan fund. Interested women's associations would have access to money for start-up costs to buy necessary bee production equipment. CODEL funds also helped pay for training and technical assistance.

b. PROJECT RESULTS ANALYSIS

--Proposed Project Outcome/Impacts:

The specific application of the CODEL grant was to finance a revolving loan fund for construction and maintenance of fifty beehives. The women's associations which took the loans were expected to repay them by the end of the first year so that other groups could finance similar projects from the same source. Beyond the immediate economic benefits, the project was expected to develop local capacity to define and control solutions to beneficiary's collective problems and to increase the women's personal dignity.

No specific projections were made in the CODEL project summary concerning the number of potential beneficiaries nor the likely economic return from the bee production for the associations or their members.

--Actual Project Outcome/Impacts:

The evaluator met the MUDE executive director and field staff director at their headquarters in Santo Domingo. He also visited two of the three beekeeping projects where he met the extension worker (termed a 'delegate') as well as officers and members of women's associations. These observations plus comments in MUDE's report on the project indicate these actual results:

§ The beekeeping projects began in April, 1981. At the time of the evaluator's visit in November, 1983, only one of the three projects had fully repaid its start-up loan. One of the other projects was up-to-date in its loan repayment schedule and one was in arrears since March, 1983. Slow loan repayment was attributed to poor rainfall that had caused a flower shortage and resulted in some bee deaths.

§ When rainfall is sufficient, honey production is adequate to produce about eight jars of honey from a typical hive cluster (about 15 units) twice annually. Since each jar sells for about \$2.00, this income represents a small but significant income supplement for the women's association balance sheet. [For details on cost-benefits factors of honey production, see Section IV. G].

§ When rainfall permits, bee production occurs rapidly. For example, the first beekeeping group increased from 10 to 18 hive units in less than two years; the second project grew from 24 beehives to 34 during the same period.

§ Participation levels of individuals in bee production groups is directly related to the longevity of the project. Participation in the projects is 86% in the oldest, 70% in the second project, and only 18% in the most recent. This differential participation level is due partly to initial anxieties (that are gradually overcome) about handling beehives.

--Intervening Factors:

The major constraint on the overall growth of beekeeping projects has been lack of rainfall. Lack of flowers for pollination has forced one of the project groups to miss payments on its loan, thus slowing the replenishment of the revolving fund.

c. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

--Project Strengths:

This project is a good example of appropriate technology in action... in these respects--

(1) Start-up capital was a modest amount that will, weather permitting, be recycled through numerous beekeeping projects;

(2) The basic project activity is a low-energy, low-maintenance, naturally-occurring process that has a reasonable return on investment;

(3) It is the type of project which builds individual and group self-confidence by (a) encouraging these women to overcome their fear of an insect that they--as well as many men--have traditionally feared, and (b) by providing them with another economic resource for their associational and individual advancement.

All of these factors combine to make a beekeeping project a good income-generation activity for a rural women's association. Not only do they gain income but they also gain community respect for having the courage and shrewdness to turn the work of a "fearful" animal to their advantage. [It is pertinent to note here that the only OPG presently funded by the A.I.D./Zambia mission is a bee production project...for men.]

One of the strongest points of the overall MUDE rural development program is the work of extension agents ('delegates'). These young women visit each women's association in their area about twice monthly; each delegate supervises from 10-15 groups. As part of their involvement in the beekeeping project, several delegates had to learn how to handle bees without sustaining injury. The success of the delegates in learning this skill was crucial to the overall project. The delegate with whom the evaluator visited the beehive projects was very competent in not only getting close to the bees but also in lifting trays from the hives without being stung. This competency allows the delegates to be

good role-models for their peers (young women of about the same social standing and educational background) in the women's associations.

--Project Weaknesses:

There are two principal weaknesses to this project. The first problem is the technical one noted above: without sufficient rain, honey production will decline and loan repayment will suffer. This is an unavoidable aspect of appropriate technologies: they depend on Nature.

The second weakness of this project (with respect to CODEL) is the lack of any ecumenical dimension. MUDE is a secular development agency that has no past or current association with any religious body or organization. This lack of sectarian affiliation is noted in the CODEL project summary which points out that, despite this deficiency, "MUDE's Board of Directors and target groups are made up of individuals from Evangelical, Episcopal and Catholic Churches." [This subject is discussed further in Section IV. B].

--Lessons Learned:

This project is an illustration of the principle that a development project need not be large or costly in order to have positive benefits. While this is a small-scale endeavor, it is having social and economic payoffs for about 50 rural women: those directly responsible for the beekeeping work.

MUDE's approach to development projects is of general interest because the beekeeping project is typical of their organizational style. Each women's association can choose from among numerous income-generation activities. This development strategy is incremental in impact, involves participants in project selection, and offers many low-risk opportunities to take risks. Such a strategy offers these women the chance to gain confidence through trial-and-error experiences that do not incur major penalties if they fail. Such opportunities are ideal learning laboratories about how to become modern and provide many chances for low-cost confidence-building. An example of the socio-political impact of this self-confidence building is that one of the beekeeping groups successfully pressured the government to build a school and improve the roads in their remote area.

B. 5: Agricultural Credit Fund/Togo

a. PROJECT FACT SHEET

- Project Name: Agricultural Credit for Small Farmers.
- Project Location: Togo (primarily Central Plateau area).
- Project-Holder: PTS (Projets Techniques et Sociaux) of ECT
(Evangelical Church of Togo).
- Project Time Period: 1982-1984.
- CODEL Member Sponsor: Congregational Christian Service Committee.
- Project Costs and Funding Sources: Total Cost--\$156,140;
Funding Sources--CODEL (\$83,692), CCSC and ECT (\$72,448).
- Project Summary: This project establishes a revolving loan fund to finance crop production expenses for farmers participating in an ongoing agricultural mechanization scheme. Since its beginning in 1977, this project has sold small tractors and a set of matching implements to selected small farmers as well as some institutional purchasers. The small farmer purchasers are followed closely by the PTS staff to (1) introduce them to mechanized agriculture practices, (2) provide regular maintenance and repair services, and (3) deliver necessary production inputs such as hybrid seeds, fertilizer, diesel fuel, etc.
CODEL's contribution to this scheme was to finance a revolving credit fund to help farmers acquire the inputs needed to put their crops into the ground.

b. PROJECT RESULTS ANALYSIS

--Proposed Project Outcome/Impacts:

The CODEL project summary identified these main anticipated impacts: (1) increased financial latitude for the PTS program which had had heavy credit demands from its small farmer clientele, (2) sufficient capital to cover anticipated price increases for fuel, oil, and fertilizer in the next five-year period, and (3) increased small farmer income due to the availability of adequate production-inputs loan capital.

This proposal did not specify the number of small farmers to be assisted, anticipated loan amounts, probable repayment periods, or other details of this nature.

--Actual Project Outcome/Impacts--

The evaluator visited three small farmers who participate in the PTS mechanization program. Two of these farmers are doing well financially (one has just purchased a second tractor after paying off the first) while the third farmer was having problems because of poor rainfall and an extended illness. In addition to these interviews, the evaluator reviewed the project account books and spoke extensively with the PTS staff. On the basis of this information, these generalizations can be made--

§ Given no uncontrollable factors (such as widespread, repeated drought), a mechanized small farmer can become a wealthy man in a few years. The inputs needed to maximize use of the small tractor and its implements are expensive for a small farmer, but when applied correctly, these can yield a handsome income [see Section IV. G for details].

§ CODEL's member sponsor has invested heavily in this program. Not only have they provided loan money for purchase of fifty small tractors (from an American firm) and implements, but they have supported expatriate supervisory staff, Togolese administrative and maintenance personnel, a large tractor parts inventory, and other costs. CODEL was asked to bear some of the financial burden so that the progress already achieved by the project--after several year's effort and considerable expenses--would be maximized. Without CODEL's help, it is unclear where the money would have come from to support the revolving fund.

§ Access to this combination of resources--the tractor, implements, and other production inputs--has had dramatic impacts in the fields of participating farmers (totally about 30 at present). From a previous pattern of planting 1-2 hectares of subsistence crops each season, these farmers now plant 10-12 hectares of subsistence and cash crops. Cash crops include maize, cotton, cowpeas, and sorghum, which can be sold at a premium price prior to the next harvest. Crops can be sold locally or exported to neighboring countries.

§ Participating farmers are using their new wealth to increase their arable acreage (by land-clearing), purchasing new equipment, sending their children (both sons and daughters) to school, and by purchasing modern status symbols (motorcycles, automobiles).

--Intervening Factors:

This project has largely achieved the ends outlined in the CODEL project summary. The revolving credit fund, as stated in the summary, is essential to the success of the overall mechanization program. Much of the successful accomplishment of the work is due to the dedicated efforts of the expatriate staff who have worked closely and persistently to assist the Togolese staff. Without the combined efforts of two talented and dedicated expatriates, it is not clear that the project would be as smoothly operating as it is, nor would there be sufficient managerial ability present for the project's long-term survival. The active role of these expatriates--particularly their patient skill in nurturing the Togolese staff--has been a major positive factor.

Another important element is the high level of successful farming among most project beneficiaries. When the mechanization project began, few farmers were willing to go into debt to purchase a tractor. Those few who took the risk have now become local objects of envy and prestige. One of the farmers interviewed by the evaluator stated that among changes in his life since mechanization are (1) his high demand among other farmers as a source of agricultural advice and (2) the need to sleep on a hut near his fields at night to prevent crop loss by theft.

c. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

--Project Strengths:

The overall mechanization program--of which CODEL's credit fund is an important component--is clearly having a significant impact on the crop production levels of these Togolese farmers. This project has been visited by a World Bank researcher who wanted information on the fiscal impacts of mechanization in the PTS scheme.

This project has the potential to not only demonstrate the advantages of mechanized farming, but also the importance of good farming practices. The present system for selecting recipients for small tractor sales is based partly on information concerning the farmer's agricultural skills. Priority is given to those farmers who--although they may only cultivate one hectare--farm with care and diligence. Potential tractor owners are thus screened for both farming aptitude and attitudes toward farming.

As noted above, this project is heavily reliant on the assistance of expatriate supervisors at present and has been since inception. But one major strength of these expatriates is their sincere commitment to train the Togolese administrative and maintenance staff so well that more expatriate assistance will be unnecessary in the future. A conscious effort is being made to achieve the oft-recited ambition of "working themselves out of a job". In this case, they may well achieve that goal.

--Project Weaknesses:

Although this is a well-run operation that has had dramatic impacts on the beneficiary's farms, there are these constraints on its future:

Δ One major constraint is the project's capital intensiveness combined with the complexity of the maintenance and support infrastructure. It is not clear that a similar project could be started and maintained elsewhere that did not have (1) access to extensive, long-term capital resources, and (2) highly motivated personnel who give extraordinary commitment to their work. It is unlikely that such a project could be successfully replicated by a government agency or any profit-making enterprise.

Δ Moreover, it is not clear that the PTS project will survive if expatriate donor organizations withdraw their support rapidly. For one thing, tractor loan repayment monies have not been set aside in a revolving fund as seed money for future tractor purchases. [The agricultural credit loan fund--in a separate account--is being repaid directly to that fund].

Δ Unfortunately, some of the limited number of tractors available for sale to small farmers were sold to large farmers and institutional purchasers. These sales occurred to raise cash quickly or to repay a favor. Thus, the number of tractors available for sale to small farmers is less than the number anticipated in the CODEL proposal. With only about 30 tractors owned by small farmers (and only they are eligible for production credit loans), it will be a long time before PTS needs enough money to loan to as many as fifty farmers.

--Lessons Learned:

The PTS mechanization project is the type of development program that one would expect to succeed. That is, it has many advantages that other rural development projects lack:

- * It has a financially sound and relatively generous funding source in the United States;

- * It has had a series of competent and well-qualified expatriate advisers and technicians;

- * It has several intelligent and dedicated Togolese administrators who have worked hard for the project's success;

- * It is offering services which are now highly desired by farmers;

- * It is a program without direct competitors (a government tractor rental program closed recently);

- * Those farmers selected as project beneficiaries are put at little appreciable financial risk and stand to achieve considerable monetary gain;

- * The project is willing to renegotiate loans, if necessary, for those farmers who use their tractors unwisely or infrequently (as was the case with some of the earliest purchasers).

Given these conditions, it would be unusual if this project had not achieved a high degree of success. Most of the ingredients needed for development to take root are assured in this project: there is a "felt need" for the service among beneficiaries, all major resources are available, and beneficiaries receive abundant attention from the project staff.

B. 6: Cornmill and Livestock Project/Cameroon

a. PROJECT FACT SHEET

--Project Name: Bui Food Cooperative Extension

--Project Location: Kumbo Township, Bui Division, Northwest Province, Cameroon.

--Project-Holder: Bui Food Marketing Cooperative Society (A.K.A. Sum Nyuy Self-Help Project).

--Project Time Period: 1978 (one-time grant).

--CODEL Member Sponsor: Mill Hill Mission.

--Project Cost and Funding Sources: Total Cost--\$47,508.50;
Funding Sources--CODEL (\$44,160), Local Input (\$3,348.50).

--Project Summary: At the time of the grant, the Bui Food Marketing Cooperative was an active, multi-purpose women's organization engaged in a variety of economic and social development projects in more than one hundred villages. This CODEL grant was approved for the purchase of corn-grinding mills and for construction of a poultry and a pig production units. The twelve corn mills were intended to decentralize the facilities of the coop by setting up multiple grinding units in some of the larger villages. The poultry and piggery units were expected to make use of waste grains (for livestock feed) from the coop warehouse. The pigs and chickens were to be sold as another coop income-generation method.

b. PROJECT RESULTS ANALYSIS

--Proposed Project Outcome/Impacts:

The rationale given in the CODEL project summary for grinding mills was that they would solve the problem of village women being forced to carry corn on their heads long distances to be ground at expensive commercial facilities. The reasons for the piggery and poultry facilities included more efficient use of surplus and spoiled grain and the objective of introducing small animal production to young women school leavers.

The detailed proposal, prepared by a priest who had been instrumental in organizing and encouraging the coop's formation, noted that at that time (1977), surplus and spoiled grain as well as unsold maize and beans

were being fed to some pigs kept in an abandoned schoolhouse. This makeshift piggery, built of sundried bricks, had collapsed recently and needed to be replaced by a more permanent structure. In addition, he noted that interest in poultry production had risen in the area because of increased egg consumption.

Some of the income from the corn-grinding mills was to be used to finance a planned domestic care and services program aimed at over 4,000 women in the Bui Division.

--Actual Project Outcome/Impacts:

The evaluator visited the coop's offices where he interviewed the officers and staff. In addition, he made field visits to two coop branches with corn-grinding mills. He observed the poultry unit at the coop headquarters and the piggery facility in the countryside about ten kilometers from Kumbo.

Based on those observations and interviews, this project can be best described as a partial success at present. The corn-milling units have had a major positive impact, the poultry unit is doing moderately well, and the piggery unit is defunct at this point. Each of these components of the CODEL grant are reviewed separately:

¶ Corn-Grinding Mills--These units provide a literal "engine of development" for the numerous women in and around a dozen villages. Because of this facility, women are saved the former drudgery of frequent hauling of heavy buckets filled with maize to faraway large market towns. Instead, the women need only walk a short distance to the nearest coop grinding mill which is operated by a coop member. This seemingly minor change has had important economic impacts on these women and their families. For instance, the time spent grinding maize--one of the essential and time-consuming tasks of the women's work day--can now be put to more productive use by raising poultry, working in her garden, or attending domestic care training courses offered occasionally by the coop. Moreover, the mills have become a point of social interaction for all village women thus bringing together coop members as well as those women who (in some cases) were forbidden by their husbands from joining the coop. This interaction exposes all village women to information from the coop's programs

in handicraft production, leadership skills development, and home science.

¶ Poultry Unit--The main poultry unit at the coop is located in two small buildings on the grounds of the headquarters near Kumbo. The coop maintains a large chicken feeding facility there in which chicks purchased from the diocese offices in Bamenda are raised to layer age. At the time of the evaluator's visit, there were 230 Rhode Island Red birds aged about 4½ months. These will begin laying at 5½-6 months and will produce eggs until they are sold as stewing hens at 18 months of age. In another building were 43 older layers which were now low producers; they were being sold off as stewers. The poultry operation had a regular employee in charge of poultry and egg production. It was not clear whether this project extends beyond the headquarters office to branch coops, partly due to the lack of an incubator for hatching starter chicks.

¶ Piggery Unit--Although a solid, well-built piggery facility has been constructed with CODEL funds, the operation is not functioning. The high-roofed metal and concrete building has about a dozen pig stalls but now sits empty and unused at the bottom of a hill quite far from the coop headquarters or any branch coop. The building was constructed on land donated to the coop when the land parcel owned by the coop for a piggery on the edge of Kumbo was appropriated by the township government for another use. Two other factors (beside the remoteness of the site) have contributed to the defunct condition of the piggery: (1) the original herd of six imported pigs died due to disease and the coop could not afford to replace them, and (2) a priest who had provided technical assistance to the piggery had been transferred.

--Intervening Factors:

This project more than any other visited illustrated the handicap on projects when key personnel are removed from the scene. In this case, the main architect of the coop worked closely with a local Women's Christian Association from the early 1970s until the early 1980s. This priest was successful in helping the cooperative become organized, gain a large membership, establish numerous branch organizations, secure seed money from international donor agencies, make use of local mission resources for training and technical assistance, and identify income-generation as

well as organizational development projects. But, when this priest was transferred after his long service in the Kumbo area, no surrogate came forward to take over his role. [One priest has taken over a few types of technical assistance such as training the coop accountant in bookkeeping]. The coop officers, at the time of the evaluator's visit, had not come to grips with the reality that the coop and its future were now in their hands.

These coop officers are willing and able women who have successfully maintained, for the most part, the coop projects begun in the past. But the organization has lost a valuable resource with the priest's transfer and, unfortunately, it is unclear that all of his functions can now be performed. Hopefully the officers will realize that they now are the coops managers and they will put their own stamp of identity on it.

c. PROJECT ASSESSMENT:

--Project Strengths:

With the glaring exception of the vacant piggery building, this project has accomplished most of those objectives noted in the project proposal. The corn-grinding mills--which accounted for 80% of the CODEL grant award--have been a major boon to the coop membership and are slowly being paid off. These mills have, in addition, given the coop a tangible symbol of modernity and progress in a dozen villages. That is, in most of the branch villages, the corn mill is the only motor at all; its ownership by a women's group is a powerful symbol of changing power relationships. Village women report that coop membership is a source of local prestige because it is hard evidence that that individual belongs, as one put it, to a "civilized group". The coop is raising self-esteem among coop members in other ways as well:

‡ Women now feed their children more eggs--due to their home economics training by the coop--despite the superstition that egg-eating turns children into thieves.

‡ Women are now gaining more respect from their husbands because their nutritional and health knowledge has reduced the incidence of infant mortality. Men now listen to their wife's advice about proper children's diets.

§ Because of their increased income from egg-raising and other income-generation projects, coop women have gained respect from their children: they can now buy them clothing and pay for their school fees. This is especially important in polygamous households where the mother must take care of her own children's welfare.

Another important dimension of this project has been the increased economic flexibility and potential which it has provided. The fact that the coop has only realized part of this potential should not detract from the significant progress that has been made. This progress is not only financial but also institutional. Several of the branch coops (but by no means all) have almost paid off their corn-grinding mill loans; this is no small accomplishment considering that the only source of income is a small grinding fee and, the branches pay for mill repair costs. The coop itself has a strong organizational infrastructure that has survived and continues to operate the coops numerous economic and educational projects despite the departure of its founder.

--Project Weaknesses:

The main weakness of the coop today has been noted already. In brief, the coop leadership is presently stymied about how to follow up on the impressive and expansive program which they have inherited. While they were active and involved participants in implementing projects begun during the priest's tenure, they must grow in self-confidence before they will feel capable of taking charge completely. Eventually they will see, one can hope, that they need not "follow in the footsteps" left by the priest but can take their own initiatives: the coop now belongs solely to them and the membership.

This process of "taking ownership" will be hastened by the decentralization of coop decision-making and management to branch leaders. While the present coop president is a very capable person, she has many other organizational commitments. Hopefully she will see the need for a broader leadership and decision-making base.

--Lessons Learned:

The lesson of this project is that even the most well-organized approach cannot neglect one essential aspect of successful development programming: the need for gradual but steady transfer of leadership responsibilities to the organization's indigenous members. Even with the best of intentions, an expatriate cannot know for certain when he will have to leave. The time for that person to start "working themself out" of the leadership role is on the first day of the project, not the day that they learn of their transfer.

B. 7: Homecraft and Medical Extension/Cameroon

a. PROJECT FACT SHEET

--Project Name: Homecraft Center Extension.

--Project Location: Ndop, Northwest Province, Cameroon.

--Project-Holder: St. Mary's Home Craft Center and Diocese of Bamenda.

--Project Time Period: 1980-1984.

--CODEL Member Sponsor: Mill Hill Mission.

--Project Cost and Funding Sources: Total Cost--\$182,334.00;
Funding Sources--CODEL (\$93,297), Local Inputs (\$89,037).

--Project Summary: This project will establish a network of village extension agents who can instruct village women in sixteen villages on modern hygiene and health practices as well as teach them better nutritional methods. The CODEL grant is a follow-up (extension) of an earlier pilot grant to pre-test this project approach with two extension agents. This present grant expands the number of agents and types of services they offer. Services now provided focus on health care and nutrition. The extension agents are all graduates of the St. Mary's homecraft program; they have three year's training in health and first aid, child care, home management, agriculture, cookery, nutrition, dress-making, and other subjects. The center is directed by an expatriate with home extension training and teaching experience.

b. PROJECT RESULTS ANALYSIS

--Proposed Project Outcome/Impacts:

As described in the CODEL project summary, this project was scheduled to field six extension agents in 1980, four more in 1981, and a final group of four in 1982. There would be a total field staff of fourteen workers from 1982 until project termination in 1984. At that time, the beneficiary villages were intended to assume financial responsibility for maintaining the extension workers. The CODEL grant called for money to be spent on (1) training field personnel, (2) refresher courses for field personnel and supervisory training near the end of the project period, and (3) the purchase of necessary equipment and materials. In addition, some CODEL money was earmarked for transportation expenses.

--Actual Project Outcome/Impacts:

The evaluator visited two beneficiary villages where he interviewed four extension agents (two beginners and two experienced ones), village health council and women's association members, first-aid post and health center clients, and local community leaders (including both Catholic and Protestant congregation members). In addition, the evaluator toured the homecraft training center and interviewed some students as well as the project director.

The project presently has extension workers serving 16 villages. As they begin their village work, extension agents are encouraged to explore the "felt needs" of the village by consulting with the local chief, village council members, and religious leaders. Gaining the confidence and approval of these local power figures has been important for the acceptance of these workers who, in most cases, are newcomers to the village.

Of the services which the extension workers offer, health care and nutritional advice have received the largest response. At the two health centers which the evaluator visited, the extension workers had large and growing clienteles for their medical care (simple medicines and vitamins, hospital transportation arrangements for serious cases, appointments with the visiting nurse) and health advice (proper nutritional practices, preventative health care practices). One extension worker, for example, holds a well-baby clinic four times monthly that draws 200-300 clients each month. According to this worker's log, she had seen 1,097 cases from February-November, 1983. At another village, community members have joined together to construct a first-aid post building for the extension worker. That worker had dealt with 734 health cases in the preceding six-month period.

The next most widespread impact of the extension workers has been as home economics advisers to individuals and groups of women. The extension workers make home visitations to offer advice on nutrition, cooking, and child care. They also work closely in some villages with young women's associations which they helped organize. These groups are typically joined by women in their late teens and twenties who learn knitting and crocheting, childcare, cookery, and also improve their singing, dancing, and thespian skills.

Such groups provide occasional dramatic offerings to the whole village; they often charge admission fees from the spectators. Association members learn valuable homemaking skills (manufacture of baby clothes, hats, sweaters, and soap). Most of these young women have little formal education or income-generation skills. The types of handicrafts they are learning (sewing, knitting, crocheting) provides them with a means to supplement their household income. At the same time, these women are learning ways to save money by (1) learning how to make their childrens' clothes, and (2) avoiding medical expenses by feeding their children an improved diet and taking them to the health center.

--Intervening Factors:

This project has been implemented in a manner very consistent with the project proposal. There have been no major deviations with the possible exception that health care is becoming a dominant activity and may soon overshadow the home economics aspects of the extension worker's role.

The continuity between the project as proposed and as implemented is due largely to the continuity of project leadership. The person who today directs the extension project is the same person who began the pilot project in 1978. Moreover, the project director has kept the project within the parameters defined in the proposal. There have been no major "mid-course corrections" because the project was well-planned initially.

c. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

--Project Strengths:

This project has many of the key ingredients found in many successful grassroots development projects--

§ It is directed toward problems and needs that are clearly recognized by the beneficiary population;

§ The project helps large numbers of people from any community social and economic background;

§ Extension agents are people from basically the same social and cultural background as those they serve;

§ Extension agents are trained in a broad range of skills which will enable them to help beneficiaries in a multi-faceted manner;

§ Extension agents are encouraged to design their community program in a manner which fits their personality while, at the same time, shaping the program to suit local conditions;

The project is making significant progress toward full financial self-sufficiency for the extension agents. It is training workers who will contribute for years to the village's physical health and social development needs. Finally, these workers are being integrated into the fabric of the community's institutional life.

--Project Weaknesses:

The main weaknesses of this project are potential rather than actual problems:

Δ There is the possibility that the extension workers will become identified in villagers' eyes as health care workers. This would be a problem in two ways: (1) it will detract from their homecraft function, and (2) it is not clear that their current training fully prepares them as village health workers.

Δ The other potential flaw is that this project rests almost solely on the shoulders of the project director. While this person is very competent and committed to the project, a transfer of this individual would bring the project--for all intents and purposes--tumbling down. This problem is being addressed to some extent now by the training of a second expatriate; this person is slowly taking over some project responsibilities. A more appropriate and lasting solution would be to train a Cameroonian staff member...possibly one of the extension agents, to become project director.

--Lessons Learned:

This project reconfirms many generally accepted assumptions about the way in which successful grassroots programs are structured and operated. The strengths of this project reinforce one another in cumulative

manner. The fact that the extension workers are addressing urgent community problems and have some useful solutions gives them an important advantage in making themselves indispensable and essential to the community. The potential weakness of this project is probably an inevitable failing of many grassroots efforts: a dynamic, charismatic project director becomes--no matter how much they may try to avoid it--indispensable and essential to the project's success.

B. 8: School Leavers Carpentry Project/Zambia

a. PROJECT FACT SHEET

--Project Name: School Leavers Carpentry Project.

--Project Location: Kasama, Zambia.

--Project-Holder: Archdiocese of Kasama.

--Project Time Period: 1981-1983.

--CODEL Member Sponsor: White Fathers ("Missionaries of Africa").

--Project Cost and Funding Sources: Total Cost--\$20,426;

Funding Sources--CODEL (\$18,426), Local Input (\$1,852).

--Project Summary: This project focuses on the problem of high unemployment levels among Zambia's young people. The solution in this project is carpentry training for a small group of young men who have not been accepted into secondary school: "school leavers". The project makes use of a skilled expatriate volunteer who trains these men in marketable joiner skills. The training prepares them for furniture-making employment and, in addition, they receive some small business management skills. On completion of the 18-month course, students are expected to pass a proficiency test which will certify them as trained joiners. [A joiner is a carpenter that specializes on interior woodworking such as doors, windows, and stairways].

Take
0161
shy?
teacher?
18
2000?

b. PROJECT RESULTS ANALYSIS

--Proposed Project Outcome/Impacts:

The CODEL project summary identified the target group of trainees as school leavers from socio-economically deprived backgrounds. It noted that a Zambian would receive training in administrative and managerial skills in order to eventually become project director. This project is undertaken jointly, according to the proposal, by the United Church of Zambia and the Archdiocese of Kasama.

The proposal does not specify the number of trainees during the two-year program nor does it give any details on post-training employment opportunities for them.

--Actual Project Outcome/Impact:

The evaluator visited the project training site where he interviewed the project director/trainer and the Zambian assistant director. He also visited the first project graduates at their village-based furniture workshop and discussed their business experiences. He also interviewed the project's fiscal officer and the archdiocese secretary.

This project has had two trainers and two trainee classes since 1981. The first trainer worked with an initial class of five students. Together, the trainer and students helped build the classroom in which the second class of trainees now meets. The first class had four graduates; one of them is now the Assistant Director and the other three have joined together in a small furniture-making cooperative. This coop will be assisted by an advisory committee of interested adults (including some local religious leaders). They have received more than \$2,000 worth of tools and equipment from the Archdiocese as well as a small loan in order to get their business started.

Like the first trainer, the present instructor is an expatriate volunteer who has come to Kasama on a two-year contract. This instructor began work in February, 1983, just after a new intake of ten students in the second class. These students range in age from 17-20 and are all local Kasama youths with no chance of further academic education. These trainees were selected from among 20 applicants who took a written examination. The training syllabus includes basic instruction in the use and maintenance of carpentry tools, lumber preparation, basic joints, setting joints out, and assembling them.

The current class of students has been studying since January, 1983. They receive no financial assistance from the project; most live with their families during the training. As part of their class work, trainees have collectively manufactured several furniture items for sale including an eight-piece dining room suite, five typing desks, and several coffee tables. These are sold locally and the proceeds put back into the project accounts. They have also made tool boxes and burglar-resistant window casings for the classroom building.

The Assistant Manager is receiving managerial training so that he can assume leadership of the project when the expatriate leaves in 1985. Plans are also being made for post-training occupational counseling (small shop

management skills) for the present class upon their course completion.

--Intervening Factors:

Despite some setbacks, this project is largely accomplishing what was originally intended. The setbacks have included:

- the loss of the project's chief patron--the Archbishop of Kasama-- who has been serving "temporarily" as the Bishop of Lusaka for the past eighteen months;

- a major robbery of the project's carpentry tools in March, 1983. Replacing these tools not only cost the project considerable time but also required hard currency since the tools had to be ordered from South Africa;

- insufficient thought and support for the first project graduates when they began to set up their furniture-manufacturing business. They now have more assistance and may be able to develop a viable enterprise, but there was insufficient forethought to that aspect of the project.

Despite these setbacks, another intervening factor--the enthusiasm and competency of the present trainer--has been an important asset toward strengthening the project in important ways. Given this man's commitment to the project, it is now in good shape and shows considerable promise.

c. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

--Project Strengths:

This project is addressing a problem of major proportions in Zambia. Two recent studies by the International Labor Office (I.L.O.) have focused attention on the plight of school leavers for whom "...the future offers little more than joblessness, hopelessness, and helplessness." The area in which this project is located has been a traditional labor source for companies operating in the Copperbelt mining area to the west. Today, with copper prices depressed and many ancillary industries idled, there are few occupational options for young men in Kasama. The type of project which was started by the Archbishop is even recommended in an I.L.O. report: "...productive employment in units of as few as 2 or 3 persons is not to be underestimated [for its contribution to GDP] such as carpentry and furniture-making....".

shows fragility of such a project

One of the major strengths of this project, then, is that it offers a local solution to a problem of major proportions in Zambia. Although this project cannot solve the whole nation's unemployment situation, it can positively affect the futures of about one dozen young men. The employment potential for this type of work, once the project has fully developed, is considerable. There is a high demand for good quality furniture in the Kasama area including significant need within the Archdiocese itself for desks, chairs, doors, windows, etc.

--Project Weaknesses:

This project has had its share of problems getting started including stolen tools and missing leadership. Those problems have largely been solved now but there remain these weak points:

Δ The first class of trained joiners needs assistance (including supervision) in order that their training is not wasted. They do not appear adequately trained in business management skills at this point. Unfortunately, the present instructor does not have sufficient time to devote to this task nor is it clear that he is the most appropriate person for the role. Hopefully the advisory committee now being formed will be capable of performing this important task.

Δ To some extent this project is too reliant on external resources such as personnel and tools. The difficulty of securing replacements for the stolen workshop tools highlights this dependency. It is not clear that the graduates, once on their own, will have any means to secure replacements when needed: they have no access to foreign currency, cannot order items from South Africa, nor does it appear likely that any indigenous tool manufacturer will begin operations in Zambia soon.

Δ During the hiatus with the Archbishop in Lusaka, certain aspects of the project's administration have "fallen between the cracks". The nominal supervisor of the project is the Archdiocese treasurer who has many projects to supervise. This administrative burden was given as the reason why--contrary to the CODEL project summary--no audit or evaluation of the project has been undertaken.

Lesson:
input
↑
leadership

--Lessons Learned:

This project offers another instance in which the absence of one key figure has caused problems for proper project implementation. That is, a major reason why post-training follow-up for graduates has been inadequate is the Archbishop's absence. He was the effective "father" of this project and his uninvolvedness is an obstacle to its full maturation.

As things stand now, the Archbishop's absence has been counter-balanced by the presence of a committed and capable instructor...a turn of events that could not have been planned or foreseen.

B. 9: Women's Training Program/Malawi

a. PROJECT FACT SHEET

--Project Name: Women's Training Program.

--Project Location: Chilema, Malawi.

--Project-Holder: United Church Lay Training Center.

--Project Time Period: 1978-1980.

--CODEL Member Sponsor: White Fathers; Anglican Church of Malawi.

--Project Cost and Funding Sources: Total Cost--\$45,500;

Funding Sources--CODEL (\$28,500), Local Inputs (\$17,000).

Project Summary: A special women's leadership training program was initiated at the Lay Training Center in 1978. The program's purpose was to provide basic skills training in child care, nutrition, gardening, poultry keeping, general health care, hygiene, and other useful topics for wives and mothers. CODEL was approached to assist funding a five-year series of the program (three classes annually with twenty women in each class) offering this curriculum. Students were to be recruited from any religious background including Muslims and other non-Christians. A developmental aspect of this project was that students would be drawn primarily from illiterate and/or low education backgrounds.

b. PROJECT RESULTS ANALYSIS

--Proposed Project Outcome/Impacts:

The project was intended to train about sixty women per year for five years in skills and knowledge areas that would benefit them as wives, mothers, and citizens. The basic curriculum was comparable to one offered at the Lay Training Center for several years before this project. This earlier women's training was directed mainly toward the wives of clergy members as well as Christian lay leaders (both Protestants and Roman Catholics). The CODEL-funded project was an effort to extend this opportunity to other Malawian women regardless of their faith.

The end goal of the training included some income-generation skills but focused on homemaking and parenting instruction. Such skills are desired by many young Malawian women to make them more competent mothers and more desirable wives.

--Actual Project Outcome/Impacts:

The evaluator visited the Lay Training Center at Chilema where he interviewed the board members and last warden (director) of the training program. He also had an opportunity to meet three graduates of the program at their homes or workplaces.

CODEL funds were used for the operation of several training program classes in 1979, 1980, and part of 1981. This money contributed to the overall program costs such as board and lodging, teaching materials, travel, and staff salaries judging from partial records available on latter program classes. Although students paid a nominal admission fee of 40 Kwacha (about \$23) for the three month course, the bulk of the costs were borne by the CODEL grant and contributions from the Christian Service Committee which operates the Lay Training Center.

Information was not available on the number of program participants during the period of CODEL funding (1979-1981). The only available records for that period provided the number of applicants to the classes: 103 in 1979, 131 in 1980, and 134 in 1981. Actual students trained in 1981 were 43. The Lay Training Center board members presented the evaluator and CODEL regional representative with a memo outlining the program's history as based on their records. This memo indicated that although CODEL funding for 1981 was only about 1,500 Kwacha, the program was still offered in that year as well as 1982 when there were 119 applicants and 31 students. The memo states that in those latter two years, "These courses had been conducted on deficit because of no grants from overseas." Although the program has been suspended since January, 1983, it still receives applications (46 so far) although it is not advertised.

A profile of past program participants is provided by applications information from 1980 and 1981 classes provided by the most recent warden. These applications indicate that the age range was 16-27 years (with an average of 20-21), many were married mothers, they came from both non-Christian and Christian backgrounds, and many were married to men who had low-to-middle echelon positions with private corporations or government agencies.

The evaluator had the opportunity to meet three program participants from the period during and just after CODEL funding. Each is described briefly below:

§ Mrs. C. is now a full-time nutrition educator to patients and their families at St. Luke's Hospital at Chilema. She instructs patients and any family members visiting them in home hygiene and nutritional practices. Her training has also prepared her to make handicrafts for her home and raise a kitchen garden.

§ Mrs. Y. is the widow of a deceased priest. She has used her program training skills to raise a small garden and make handicrafts and clothing for sale to help support herself and her five children.

§ Mrs. C. is a housewife and mother married to a secondary school teacher. Like some of the training participants, her formal educational level was considerably less than her husband (he encouraged her to take the training). She has benefitted from the training by learning home decoration skills and better child care practices.

--Intervening Factors:

This project has been plagued by administrative turnovers: there were three wardens between 1976-1982. This turnover plus other administrative problems have disrupted the available documentation on this project. The memo prepared by the Lay Training board states:

"It has been difficult administratively to follow up the correspondence that has been there between CODEL and ourselves. We only have letters from CODEL but we do not have any letters from our office to CODEL....We do not have a record of any communication from either side in 1980."

The lack of records for 1980 is particularly problematic with respect to CODEL funding for that time period; the memo continues:

"CODEL sent \$11,500 to Chilema in 1979 (Ref. CODEL's letter dated 4th January, 1979). In 1980 there is no record of any grant sent to Chilema but in the Audited Accounts of 1980 it shows that K6,807.22 had been sent to Chilema and in 1981 (ref. CODEL's letter dated 3rd August regarding the last grant CODEL pledged in support of the Women's Programme, but there is no indication of how much). There is also no knowledge whether the money was sent in 1980 or in 1981. Chilema 1981 Audited Accounts showed no grant from CODEL."

The CODEL project summary outlined the following payment plan to provide a total of \$28,500 to the Women's Program over three years: \$11,500 for 1979 and \$8,500 each for 1980 and 1981. According to the

CODEL project records, the following transmittals were made to Chilema: (1st) \$11,500 sent 1/9/79 and apparently acknowledged by Chilema although no dated is provided by CODEL, (2nd) \$8,500 sent 10/2/79 and acknowledged 3/25/80, and (3) \$8,500 sent 10/2/80 and acknowledged 12/24/80.

According to these CODEL records, the program received and acknowledged the full grant amount of \$28,500 between 1979 and late 1980. However, there does not seem to have been adequate bookkeeping or other forms of documentation to explain how this money was spent, how many participants were trained, or who the participants were during the years of CODEL funding.

c. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

--Project Strengths:

This would seem to be a very popular type of training from the large number of applicants over a four-year period. The training is premised, according to some program literature, on the concept that "in training the present and future mothers of Malawi, we are training the whole nation." One other dimension of the training is its impact to reduce the inequity between husband's and wife's educational background and overall social competency. As the CODEL regional coordinator pointed out, this training focuses attention on each woman for what may be the first time in her life. This increases her self-confidence and sense of self-worth. This program can improve the chances for marital success over the situation in which the husband is college (or at least, high school) educated and the wife (from a village background) has only completed primary school.

--Project Weaknesses:

The major weakness of this project has been poor and/or sloppy record-keeping. Based on the scanty documentation of the CODEL-funded portion of the women's program, it is difficult to assess how many women were trained, who they were, where they are now, and what specifically the funding was used for. This is, needless to say, a serious handicap to a full assessment of the project's impact.

While there is merit in this project's intention to aid young women in "becoming modern", it is not clear that such a project is one of great pressing importance in the larger scheme of things. The acquisition of social skills and homemaking abilities is beneficial to some extent on the individual household level, but it has no significant community impact. This program also appears to reinforce traditional women's roles rather than providing, for example, additional types of income-generation skills.

--Lessons Learned:

This project offers a prime example of the problems that can develop where there is insufficient administrative continuity. Record-keeping is a basic necessity of any organization and is all the more imperative where externally-accountable funds are involved. It would seem that this project-holder would benefit from some technical assistance by CODEL or a member organization in order to strengthen its administrative capacity. if CODEL funds another project through them.

B. 10: Malindi Boatyard/Malawi

a. PROJECT FACT SHEET

--Project Name(s): Malindi Boats Project-Phase III; Malindi Boats Project-Phase III Extension.

--Project Location: Malindi Rural Center, eastern Lake Malawi. Malawi.

--Project-Holder: Diocese of Southern Malawi.

--Project Time Period: 1980-1981.

--CODEL Member Sponsor: Congregational Christian Service Committee.

--Project Cost and Funding Sources: Total Costs (Phase III and Phase III Extension)--\$169,929; Funding Sources--CODEL (\$103,137), Local Inputs (\$66,792).

--Project Summary: These projects were intended to establish a functioning ferro-cement boatyard at the Malindi Rural Center on the eastern shore of Lake Malawi. The boatyard was expected to solve several problems simultaneously:

1. It would provide a means of livelihood for a sizable group of artisans who would be trained in the construction, maintenance, and sale of ferro-cement fishing boats;
2. It would produce an ecologically sound fishing boat with a new construction material that would lessen the pressure on Malawi's timber resources;
3. It would provide a source of fishing boats to substitute for the traditional wooden 'dug-out' canoe: the government was reported to be strongly considering a ban on logging for boat construction;
4. It would provide a source of income for the Malindi Rural Center program.

The boatyard construction and start-up phase of the boat construction and sales program was to be handled by a British firm that specialized in ferro-cement boats: McAllister, Elliot and Partners, Ltd. They would operate the boatyard until a suitable Malawian had been trained to take over management responsibilities.

b. PROJECT RESULTS ANALYSIS

--Proposed Project Outcome/Impacts:

According to the CODEL project summary (which was based largely on a feasibility study prepared by McAllister, Elliot and Partners-- hereafter, 'MEP'). The CODEL summary stated that anticipated results of Phase III would include these activities between June 1, 1980-May 31, 1981:

Phase III would continue the boat construction and sales programs begun during Phase I and II (funded by grants and loans from Barclay Bank's International Development Fund). Phase I, begun in June, 1979, had financed construction of six ferro-cement boats for demonstration use to Lake Malawi fishermen and other potential buyers. These first six boats were purchased by the beginning of Phase II in December, 1979, which financed production and sale of nine more boats plus orders for eight more.

Specifically, Phase III would focus on (1) production of 28-foot boats in addition to the 15-foot and 19-foot boats already being built, (2) training of a Malawian Assistant Manager who would eventually become the boatyard manager, (3) recruitment of a project leader and trainer from MEP, and (4) drawings and designs for larger boats in the event there was a request for them.

CODEL funds would be earmarked for costs associated with the project leader (for airfare, housing, car, salary, and expenses), for design drawings and consultancy fees to MEP, three visits by MEP senior staff to the boatyard, and a small revolving fund for raw materials.

The project summary provided these rationales for CODEL funding: the project was labor-intensive, encouraged the local fishing industry, transferred technical and managerial skills to Malawians, and built on the needs and resources of the local people.

Phase III Extension funds were allocated by CODEL to pay for a three-month extension of the managerial and training services of MEP while a suitable Malawian manager was located. Funds were designated for three more months of the MEP manager's housing, airfare, car, salary, expenses, and insurance as well as for another visit by an MEP senior staff member and associated airfare, fee, and expenses.

--Actual Project Outcome/Impacts:

According to a report prepared by a Dutch volunteer who was an adviser to the boatyard, the total boat production during the 32-month lifespan of Malindi Boatyard (up to the time of the report: February, 1982) was nine 15-foot boats, sixteen 19-foot boats, four 28-foot hulls, and one 32-foot hull. This report detailed the uses to which these boats had been put since their construction:

° Of the nine 15-foot boats produced, five had been sold to fishermen, one each sold for patrolling and as a pleasure boat, and two were unsold stock in the yard;

° Of the sixteen 19-foot boats produced, five had been sold to fishermen, one sold for patrolling, three for pleasure boats, one for use as a transport boat, one as a passenger vessel, two were being used for demonstration purposes, one had been given as replacement for a damaged boat, and two were unsold stock in the yard;

° No information was provided on the uses to which the four 28-foot and one 32-foot hulls had been put;

° Of the ten boats sold for fishing purposes, five of these were sold to local fishermen and five to businessmen.

The evaluator visited the boatyard, observed the three remaining boats in stock (two 15-footers and one 28 [or 32?]-foot hull), and interviewed members of the Boat Project Committee of the Malindi Rural Center board of directors. Based on this information as well as discussions with the Bishop, Treasurer, and Secretary of the Diocese of Southern Malawi, these points can be stated concerning the impacts of these projects:

§ The project closed down officially on June 30, 1982;

§ The Archdiocese has an outstanding loan of several thousand pounds sterling with Barclay Bank;

§ Approximately 95% of the CODEL grant went to payment of consulting fees, design costs, and expenses of MEP. Only about \$4,840 reached the boatyard account books directly in the form of a revolving loan fund for boat construction materials;

§ MEP has recently begun a consulting arrangement with the Government of Malawi to build a ferro-cement boatyard on the western shore of Lake Malawi.

--Intervening Factors:

On paper, the boatyard project offered many positive benefits for the eastern Lake Malawi region, an underdeveloped part of the nation. (A previous CODEL funded feasibility study had explored development alternatives for this region). Several factors contributed to the great difference between the anticipated and actual outcomes of these projects:

1. A major problem inherent in the Phase III scheme was that most of the ready market for ferro-cement boats had been tapped by Phases I and II. By the time Phase III got underway, most of the fishermen and other parties who intended to purchase a ferro-cement boat had already done so...so it would seem from the sales record. The potential customer pool may not have been so large as suggested by MEP's feasibility study because the government never banned logging for dugout canoe construction.

2. Another factor was the eagerness and persuasiveness of the Malindi Rural Center's secretary--who was also the Bishop's wife*--with respect to this project. She was apparently convinced of the feasibility and worthiness of this scheme and conveyed her enthusiasm to the CODEL regional representative and the Rural Center board members.

3. A third factor was the polished, professional presentation style of the MEP senior staff. Their feasibility study (in reality, a sales brochure for their consulting services) presented the Malindi Boatyard Project in a very appealing light. In hindsight, a review of the MEP study reveals the lack of attention to crucial details: one major flaw was the absence of a strong sales promotion and marketing program. Another weakness was MEP's unrealistic cost estimates and potential profit margin. Finally, MEP did not seriously consider how to counteract customer sales resistance to this new technology and the high price of these boats compared to dug-outs.

c. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

--Project Strengths:

Unfortunately, it is not possible to identify any lasting, positive impacts connected with these impacts except for (1) some additional boats on Lake Malawi which may last up to 100 years, and (2) greater wariness at Malindi Rural Center about expatriate consulting firms.

[* The wife of the former Bishop, not the present Bishop]

--Project Weaknesses:

This project was the result of good intentions on the part of CODEL and the Malindi Rural Center board. They were led to believe that they could set up a major income-generation production facility which would provide a new type of commercial fishing and transportation technology--not only new to Lake Malawi but to neighboring countries also.

What was not apparent to these parties were the design flaws in the project proposal. The point here is that it cannot be assumed that the failure of this project means either (1) the CODEL regional representative or the Malindi Rural Center board were irresponsible or exceptionally gullible, or (2) that ferro-cement boat technology does not command respect among international development agencies.

The proof of the first point is that this same British consulting firm has been hired by other development organizations (including a Malawian government agency) to establish comparable facilities. The proof of the second point--concerning the attractiveness of ferro-cement boat technology--is illustrated by this quote from the A.I.D./Malawi C.D.S.S. for FY85: "One example of new promising technology is the development of ferro-cement boats by a fishing cooperative in Karonga with the assistance of Appropriate Technology International. These ferro-cement boats allow fishermen to fish longer and in deeper water, thereby increasing their catch" (p. 47).

While the above points may soften the harshness with which the end result of this project might be viewed, the undeniable fact is that this project had almost no redeeming qualities:

Δ Virtually all of the CODEL funds went directly to MEP; the Malindi Rural Center board received only a small percentage of the grant and even that money was under the control of the MEP manager;

Δ The Diocese of Southern Malawi not only did not make any money from the project but now has an outstanding debt for which payment in hard currency is expected.

Δ There was little significant administrative or managerial training provided to or learned by members of the Center's board or boatyard employees. Boat construction skills learned by the artisans are now being used very little except for an occasional repair job;

Δ Not only is MEP building another ferro-cement boatyard across Lake Malawi from Malindi (which would have competed with the Center's business), but they have not had the courtesy to offer any assistance to get the boatyard back on its feet. They stayed with the project for three years--as long as their fee was paid--then made their exit.

--Lessons Learned:

While it was an expensive experience, this project reinforces some basic tenets of grassroots development:

¶ This project was not rooted in the community and the real local needs. Rather, it grew out of the needs of a consulting firm to sell its services;

¶ This project did not address the problem comprehensively: there was insufficient background research among previous ferro-cement boat projects to see what kind of results had occurred. There was not enough research to see whether this new technology would be acceptable to and affordable for local fishermen;

¶ MEP paid lip-service to the concepts of local leadership and local project control but did not give up leadership or control easily. MEP's personnel were the effective directors of the project and the Center board members had minimal operational role or oversight.

The Malindi Rural Center board has learned, its members report, to be more careful in their dealings with external organizations and to ask more questions.

The CODEL regional representative reports an increased awareness of the need to assume less about the competency and motives of "First World" companies touting package development projects. Those projects may work in a given area, or they may not.

III. C. CONSISTENCY OF PROJECTS WITH CODEL SELECTION CRITERIA.

A comparison of CODEL's project selection criteria with the relevant characteristics of the sample projects is presented below. The table represents the evaluator's assessment of the degree of consistency between CODEL's selection principles and the present-day, actual operations and impacts of the sample projects. The evaluator's assessments are necessarily subjective but represent his best judgment based on the field survey research (see Table 5 on following page).

As Table 5 indicates, there is a high degree of consistency between CODEL's written guidelines for project selection and the main features of the sample projects [The Malindi Boat Project--now non-operational--is not included in this assessment]. The total number of rankings representing 'High' consistency totaled 59% while the number of 'Moderate' consistency rankings was 36%. Combined, there is moderate or high consistency between the characteristics of the sample projects and CODEL's written criteria in 95% (146 out of 153 possible rankings) of the cases.

This high degree of consistency indicates that the sample projects--in their actual beneficiary impacts and other outcomes--closely reflect the principles and goals of CODEL. The importance of those goals is explored in relation to development impacts in Section IV. E.

*Using Good
Comm. and some in
Consistency?*

Table 5
PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH CODEL CRITERIA

CODEL PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

Key

H=High Consistency

M=Moderate Consistency

L=Low Consistency

SAMPLE PROJECTS	Assists Socio-Economically Disadvantaged.	Encourages economic and political participation.	Develops community self-reliance.	Meets community's highest priority needs.	Implemented cooperatively with beneficiaries.	Surveys community resources in the project plan.	Emphasizes women's roles.	Provides technical training for local persons.	Uses indigenous human and natural resources.	Fosters initiative, self-reliance.	Positive, complementary rel. among all project partic.	Reponsive to environmental concerns.	Emphasizes socio-economic development, not evangelism.	Doesn't serve sectarian goals.	Doesn't train persons for inappropriate roles.	Doesn't duplicate similar prog	Money not used mainly for building construction.
Social Promoters	H	H	H	H	H	H	M	H	H	M	H	H	H	M	H	H	H
Lajas Comm. Bridge	M	H	M	H	H	H	L	L	H	M	M	H	H	M	M	H	M
Butcher Training	H	H	M	H	M	M	L	H	M	M	M	H	H	H	H	M	M
Beekeeping for Women	M	H	H	M	H	M	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H
Agriculture Credit	M	H	M	H	H	M	L	H	M	H	H	H	H	M	H	H	H
Cornmill/Livestock	H	M	M	M	H	M	H	H	M	M	M	H	H	H	H	M	L
Homecraft Extension	H	M	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	M	H	M	H	H	H
School Leaver Carp.	H	H	H	H	M	M	L	H	M	M	H	H	H	M	M	H	H
Chilema Women's Prog.	M	M	M	M	M	M	H	M	H	H	M	M	M	M	M	M	H

Malindi Boat Proj.

////////NOT OPERATIONAL////////

Source: Author's Table.

which projects, most consistent?

IV. SPECIAL TOPICS.

IV. A: CODEL PROJECTS IN RELATION TO A.I.D. MISSION INTERESTS

Following the instructions of the Statement of Work as well as the suggestions of staff members in the A.I.D./P.V.C. office, the evaluator contacted the A.I.D. mission offices as often as feasible during the field trips. He was able to visit at least one staff member--often, but not always, the PVO liaison officer--in seven of the eight countries he visited. The only exception was Cameroon where the mission office was not readily accessible from the sample projects.

These mission visits proved to be a valuable source of information on the A.I.D. Development Program priorities, on staff members' views about PVOs in general as well as CODEL funded project-holders, and for general background information on in-country social and economic conditions. Interviews were supplemented with the mission's C.D.S.S. or its equivalent. Both of these information sources have been very helpful in the preparation of this report.

One important finding that emerged is that in most cases the types of projects and/or project-holders with which CODEL is affiliated are endorsed by the A.I.D. missions. On the other hand, mission staffers may not, (in fact, usually were not) ~~be~~ familiar with specific CODEL funded projects or project-holders: if they knew of ^{them} ~~it~~, they approved. Table 6 below summarizes these findings:

Table 6
RELATIONSHIP OF CODEL PROJECTS AND
PROJECT-HOLDERS TO A.I.D. MISSION INTERESTS

A.I.D. Relationship/Mission:	Ecuador	Peru	Jamaica	Dom. Repub.	Togo	Zambia	Malawi
Mission knew of CODEL project-holder	x	x	x	x	x	-	-
Mission knew of CODEL funded project	-	-	x	-	x	-	-
Mission gives priority to CODEL funded activity	x	x	x	x	x	x	-/x ^o
Mission approves of CODEL project-holder	x	x	x	x	x	-	-

Source: Author's table. ^oC.D.S.S. supports ferro-cement boats.

Table 6 illustrates that there was knowledge of specific CODEL project-holders in a majority of the countries where A.I.D. missions were visited. In every case where the mission staff knew of the project-holder, they spoke highly of that organization's work. In fact, at two of the missions, A.I.D. is or will soon cooperate with a CODEL project-holder through an OPG and in three other cases, they would strongly consider a CODEL project-holder as a possible OPG grantee. Thus, at five of the seven missions, CODEL funded project-holders were viewed as serious, responsible, and effective development organizations.

There was little specific knowledge among A.I.D. mission staff of CODEL funded projects. Only two of the sample projects were explicitly known to mission personnel (it should be noted that the PVO liaison officer in Zambia was on training leave).

Despite this lack of visibility to A.I.D. mission personnel, the mission C.D.S.S. or comparable document revealed that almost all CODEL funded projects have high priority from the mission's perspective. Only in the case of the Chilema Women's Program was this finding not applicable.

In summary, the majority of CODEL project-holders: (1) are known to appropriate A.I.D. mission staff members, (2) specific projects funded by CODEL usually were not known to them, (3) the missions are not only aware of project-holders but in some cases are themselves supporting them with an OPG, and (4) even in those cases where CODEL funded projects were not known to staff, these projects were rated as high priority national need areas by the mission C.D.S.S.

IV. B: ECUMENICAL DIMENSIONS OF CODEL FUNDED PROJECTS

One of the secondary concerns of the A.I.D. Statement of Work was investigation of the effects of ecumenical cooperation on development projects. This section will review the types of cooperation and coordination found between Protestant and Catholic groups in the sample projects. Some observations on ecumenical aspects in broader terms are provided by regional representatives' comments which are discussed at the conclusion of this section.

In order to better understand the role of ecumenicalism in development work, it is important to initially delineate the possible forms that this cooperation could take. Five major possibilities exist with respect to CODEL projects:

(1) Ecumenical Project Sponsorship by CODEL Members--That is, ecumenicalism is present when a Catholic CODEL member organization supports a project that (a) is operated by a Protestant and/or ecumenical organization, or (b) has predominantly Protestant project staff and/or beneficiaries...or, vice versa in the case of a Protestant member organization.

(2) Ecumenical Project Sponsorship by Local Institutions--This is cooperation between Catholic and Protestant organizations at the local level. Such cooperation is signified on CODEL project summaries where the section on 'Cooperating Members and Organizations' usually notes the names of local Protestant and Catholic congregations or other types of organizations locally who have given the project their approval.

(3) Ecumenical Local Institutions as Project-Holders--In some instances, ecumenical cooperation is present when the project-holder is itself an ecumenical organization. CODEL has encouraged the formation of such organizations world-wide.

(4) Project Staff and/or Beneficiaries are of Ecumenical Composition--This situation is "ecumenical" if we stretch that concept a bit. In this case often the project-holder staff and beneficiaries are a mixture of Catholics, Protestants, and even non-Christians. It is not clear that there is a high level of cooperation present in this form of "ecumenicalism".

(5) Active Ecumenical Cooperation in Project Implementation--
Finally, there is the possibility--unrealized in the sample projects--
that actual project implementation will be carried out in joint cooperation
between Catholic and Protestant local institutions: ecumenicalism
in action.

These distinctions are needed in order to understand the forms of
ecumenical cooperation which were found and not found in the sample
projects. These projects are classified by type of ecumenical cooperation
in Table 7 below:

Table 7
TYPES OF ECUMENICAL COOPERATION IN
SAMPLE CODEL FUNDED PROJECTS

Projects and Project-Holders:	Social Promoters (FEPP)	Lajas Bridge (SEFAS)	Rutcher Train. (St. John Bosco)	Beekkeeping (MUDE)	Ag. Credit (PTS)	Hills & Livestock (Bui Food Coop)	Homecraft Ext. (Ndop HCC)	School Leaver Car. (Dioc. of Kasama)	Women's Training (Chilema LTC)	Malindi Boats (Dioc. of S. Mal.)
Ecumenical Project Sponsorship by CODEL Member	+	2		?	2	1	1	1	+	2
Ecumenical Project Sponsorship by Local Institut.	+	+		+	+	1	+	+	+	2
Ecumenical Local Institution as Project-Holder	1	+	1	1,2	2	1	1	1	+	2
Project Staff or Benef. are of Ecumen. Composition	1	+	+	+	+	+	+	1	+	+
Active Ecumenical Cooperation in Project Implement.	1	2	1	1,2	2	1	1	1	2	2

Key: '+' = Ecumenicalism Present; '1' = Protestant Participation
Absent; '2' = Catholic Participation Absent.

Source: Author's field data and information from CODEL project
summaries.

Before concluding this section on ecumenicalism in development, the information below offers some insights and observations by the CODEL regional representatives for Africa and Latin American and the Caribbean. Because this topic is of central importance to understanding CODEL as a development organization and because the evaluator only sampled a fraction of CODEL funded projects in these regions, the regional representatives' information on ecumenicalism is summarized here:

The Africa regional coordinator offered these observations--

§ Relationships between CODEL's Catholic and Protestant members have grown less tense and more cordial as these organizations have worked together constructively. In some cases, CODEL has brought together members of different religious organizations that have worked in the same country for years and yet not known of each other's existence. In Liberia, for instance, CODEL brought together Catholic and Protestant church groups to discuss a possible joint medical program. At a water project in Cameroon, Catholics and Presbyterians will share a common water source despite years of animosity.

§ The possibility of and degree of ecumenical cooperation varies from place to place. Another example of grassroots ecumenicalism is in Ghana where a priest and Protestant ministers joined together to develop a project for destitute young boys. Here all of the church groups have had an input and are partly "owners" of the project.

The Latin America and Caribbean regional coordinator offered these comments--

§ Catholic churches in Latin America claim they represent 95% of the population; most Protestants are converts from Catholicism. The Spanish-speaking Catholic Church is sure of itself and hard to deal with. Most CODEL projects there have been with small local institutions.

§ CODEL offers its money and project assistance as an ecumenical alternative to Catholic Church monies. It presents this opportunity in order to inspire more ecumenical cooperation there.

§ The only ecumenical organization south of North America is the Caribbean Council of Churches which CODEL helps support.

§ CODEL sometimes "forces" ecumenicalism on groups as it did with the Mennonites in Central America: to get CODEL funds they had to show an ecumenical dimension to their proposed project.

IV. C: BENEFICIARY IMPACTS OF CODEL PROJECTS.

The impacts of CODEL funded sample projects on beneficiaries is ~~one~~ of the high points and strengths of this organization. CODEL's project selection process have resulted in a portfolio of which the CODEL staff and board can generally be proud. Below are some general observations about the majority of sample projects:

§ Most projects had a high level of involvement, enthusiasm, and participation by beneficiaries. Much of the reason for this high level of involvement and positiveness may be attributed, in the evaluator's view, to the immediacy and visibility of positive benefits for the target population. The beekeeping project for women, social promoters for campesinos, agricultural credit program for farmers, and several other sample projects provide direct benefits of a significant economic nature to project participants. They do not have to wait for anticipated or planned results; they receive them at once.

§ Not only are benefits immediate in several cases but they are benefits which have clear utility for the project participants. Unlike a paved highway or fertilizer plant development project that will have long-range impacts on many farmers, CODEL funded projects concentrate significant quantities of resources to a limited pool of recipients. This approach reduces the quantity of beneficiaries served but intensifies the project impacts on those within the target group.

§ More often than not, the beneficiaries in this sample are persons or groups from socially marginal categories: Andean Indians, uneducated women in traditional rural areas, school leavers and pre-delinquents. These populations generally bear a heavier burden than the majority of Third World citizens in the race for survival.

§ Finally, these sample projects share another important feature related to beneficiary impacts. Not only are they appropriate projects for the economic development of socially-marginal people, but these projects closely reflect the larger national goals. These projects thus act to fulfill high priority "felt needs" of not only the local beneficiary populations but also those needs identified by planners and international development agencies (including A.I.D. missions).

IV. D: LOCAL INSTITUTION IMPACTS OF CODEL PROJECTS

With respect to the impact of CODEL's organizational style on local institutions, there are few generalizations that apply to all or even most of the sample project-holders. Instead, the overall picture is a varied, complex one:

¶ For some project-holders, CODEL is "just another donor": one of numerous funding agencies that support one or more projects in their multi-faceted program. For other project-holders, CODEL is the major or only international donor and there is a sense of "specialness" about the relationship with CODEL;

¶ Some project-holder staff's expressed the view that CODEL's reporting procedures and other paper-work were more demanding than that of other donors. Yet other project-holders felt they didn't need to be as prompt in sending in their project reports to CODEL as they do with other donors;

¶ Several project-holders noted that they felt especially comfortable dealing with CODEL as a donor because CODEL--like themselves--has an explicitly religious orientation. Other project-holders did not make that observation;

¶ Several project-holders pointed out that without CODEL's involvement and participation, there was little chance that their project would ever have received funds from A.I.D. Some project-holders, for instance, are too small or remote to catch the attention of the A.I.D. mission PVO liaison person. Other project-holders--mostly in Latin America--felt they could not openly take money from U.S. government sources for domestic political reasons;

¶ Most project-holders expressed genuine and spontaneous appreciation for the personal attentiveness and cordiality of the CODEL regional representatives. Most felt that they visited often enough and that their visits were helpful. Some said that CODEL representatives visit more frequently than other donor organizations and that this indicated CODEL's sense of shared partnership in the project as well as an interest in being sure the project is implemented effectively.

¶ A few project-holders with long-term CODEL relationships said they had seen increased bureaucratization in CODEL's organizational style (particularly its forms and requirement for more paper-work) but none indicated that the situation was overwhelming or unduly burdensome;

¶ Several project-holders, especially those for whom CODEL was a sole or main source of funding, pointed out that without its assistance, their project would have been shrunken, stunted versions of what they had become because of CODEL's funding. CODEL money had enabled these projects a level of flexibility and stability that would have been impossible otherwise.

¶ When asked their suggestions on ways in which CODEL could be improved as a donor agency, few project-holders had any comment. One said that they should give more money, another felt they should better communicate the services they offer, and two of the Africa projects said that communications could be improved (one of these projects was the organization which did not have any record of its own correspondence with CODEL, a point that calls its criticism into question).

In addition to the above observations by project-holder staff, the evaluator noted these points of commonality among sample project-holders organizations:

§ CODEL does not seem to be encouraging intermediary local institutions (e.g., FEPP, SEPAS, MUDE) to become more self-reliant. In the short run, CODEL's impact may be to increase their external dependency by introducing them to more international donors and linking them up with external technical assistance.

However, it would appear that CODEL's assistance to intermediary local institutions is helping them to organize grassroots associations which are making good progress toward self-sufficiency. The dynamic of this relationship is that the intermediary project-holder makes use of external funds to develop economically self-reliant grassroots organizations. This situation requires that the intermediary organization remain in a dependency position with international donors.

§ CODEL's approach to project selection has a conservative (that is, careful) bias. Preference is given to project-holders of a more-or-less proven probity. Such an approach assures that in most cases donor

*
S. [unclear]
[unclear]

funds will be spent responsibly...certainly an important consideration in this age of fiscal accountability.

§ CODEL has maintained a long-term relationship with numerous project-holders. Over the years these project-holders have had a series of non-overlapping CODEL funded projects. Such a pattern is not visible to an outsider casually looking at CODEL's CPR which only lists ongoing projects. This pattern suggests that CODEL works with project-holders in a supportive manner that helps these organizations mature as development agencies. The Africa regional representative provided this list (without benefit of the CODEL files) which illustrates this pattern: *(perhaps)*

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project-Holder</u>	<u>Number of Projects</u>
Cameroon	Diocese of Kumbo	4
"	Diocese of Bamenda	3
Egypt	CEOSS	1 completed, 1 being negotiated
Kenya	Diocese of Meru	2
"	Diocese of Kitui	3
"	Diocese of Eldoret	2
Liberia	Gouta Leprosy Center	2
"	Diocese of Monrovia	2
Madagascar	FIKFIFAMA	2
Malawi	Diocese of So. Malawi	2
	Christian Service Comm.	3
Tanzania	Diocese of Musoma	2

She also noted that CODEL had supported the pilot phase of three different projects in Africa and had then supported the project which grew out of them.

IV. E: PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS IN RELATION TO PROJECT IMPACTS.

After observing, studying, and reflecting on the sample projects, the evaluator has devised a Development Impact Hierarchy which ranks the projects from highest to lowest in terms of their perceived development impacts on project beneficiaries. Three criteria have been used in assigning projects to positions on this hierarchy:

(1) The extent to which the project has addressed significant local and/or national (in that order of preference) socio-economic needs and problems;

(2) The ability of the project-holder to conceptualize and implement an effective solution or remedial program to address these problems;

(3) The capacity of the project-holder to organize a project which has a strong likelihood of approaching--if not totally achieving--a high degree of self-sufficiency.

These criteria are similar, in some respects, to CODEL's project selection criteria. However, the Development Impact Hierarchy focuses on assessing the presence of certain end-results from the operation of a development project. Table 8 represents the evaluator's ranking of the sample projects (using the above criteria) as well as some notes concerning each project-holder:

Table 8

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT HIERARCHY OF CODEL SAMPLE PROJECTS

<u>Development Impact</u> (Highest to Lowest)	<u>Comments</u>
Social Promoters/FEPP	Addresses major socio-economic problems with strong, effective program that builds local capacity for future solutions.
Homecraft & Medical Extension/Ndop	Addresses significant problems in lives of whole community--health care--while also focusing on women's upliftment. Working to develop cadre of trained local leaders.
Agriculture Credit/PTS	Making major economic impact on some farms that may become engines of change for plateau area. If number of beneficiaries increased, would improve effectiveness.

Recent assessment of the project's performance

Table 8 (Continued)

Beekeeping for Women/MUDE	Excellent example of a low-cost high-yield project. Maximizes small resource input by building beneficiary's confidence and income.
School Leaver's Carpentry Project/ Diocese of Kasama	May prove to be successful source of employment for needy young people if post-training placement can be worked out.
Butcher Training Project/St. John Bosco	Project promises to have high benefit impact on very small population. Also, has high cost per participant ratio and lack of certainty about trainees' employability.
Cornmill & Livestock Project/Bui Food Coop	Part of project--grinding mills--have had broad, important impacts. Part of project--piggery--has been wasted money so far.
Chilema Women's Training Program/Lay Training Center	Effectively implemented training but overall importance of content is not highest priority. A nice program but not an essential one.
Lajas Community Bridge/SEPAS	Bridge is completed and some positive impacts...though hard to measure...and those who have been most benefitted may be merchants. Unfortunately, no by-products or spin-off development activities.
Malindi Boats Project/ Malindi Rural Center	The money invested in this project has had the least positive impacts of any sample project.

The dashed lines separating these ten projects into three groups indicate a division into three major categories: those with the most impact, those with moderate or ambiguous impacts, and those with least impact. The evaluator feels a high level of confidence about the rank order of those projects in the highest and lowest categories; it is easiest to pick out superior projects and those that have had marginal or negligible impacts. He feels less confidence about the rank order of the three middle-range projects: it is difficult to be convinced of this order because (1) two of the projects have yet to test their training graduates in the labor marketplace, and (2) the CODEL funded

food cooperative projects produced such uneven results. There is little doubt, however, that these three projects belong at the hierarchy's mid-point.

Looking closely at the hierarchy for insights on those attributes found in common among successful (high and significant impact) projects, there is one important correlation. The rank order of the sample projects is strongly related to the degree of consistency with CODEL project selection criteria. As shown in Table 9 below, the same projects can be ranked numerically in terms of consistency with CODEL criteria using this method: instances of high consistency are scored as '3', moderate consistency is scored as '2', and low consistency as '1'. Combining these scores produces a cumulative score which is the consistency index for each project. The results of this quantification are displayed in Table 9:

Table 9
CONSISTENCY INDEX FOR SAMPLE PROJECTS

Project/ Consistency Scores:	# of High	# of Moderate	# of Low	Cum. Index
Social Promoters	14	3	0	58
Lajas Bridge	8	7	2	40
Butcher Training	8	8	1	41
Beekeeping for Women	14	3	0	58
Agriculture Credit	11	5	1	44
Cornmills & Livestock	8	8	1	41
Homecraft & Med. Ext.	14	3	0	58
School Leaver Carpentry	10	5	2	42
Chilema Women's Training	4	13	0	38
Malindi Boat Project	-----Not Operational-----			

Key: The Cumulative Index represents the combined total of all scores for a sample project's consistency with CODEL project selection criteria (see Table 5). High consistency is scored as '3', moderate consistency as '2', and low consistency as '1'.

Source: Author's table based on quantification of Table 5 findings.

→ why repaired from wood other

Having converted the degree of consistency which project impacts hold in relation to CODEL project selection criteria into numerical indices, it is possible to rank order the sample projects. Table 10 below provides (1) a list of sample projects rank-ordered from highest to lowest in terms of their Cumulative Index score [from Table 9], and (2) a list of sample projects rank-ordered in terms of their level of development impact [from Table 8]:

Table 10

COMPARISON OF CUMULATIVE INDEX SCORE RANKING
OF SAMPLE PROJECTS WITH DEVELOPMENT INDEX RANKING POSITION

<u>Cumulative Index Rank [Table 9]</u>	<u>Development Impact Rank [Table 8]</u>
1. Social Promoters (CI= 58)	Social Promoters
Homecraft Exten. (CI= 56)	Homecraft Extension
Beekeeping Project (CI= 58)	Agriculture Credit
4. Agriculture Credit (CI= 44)	Beekeeping Project
5. School Leaver Carpent. (CI= 42)	School Leaver Carpentry
6. Butcher Training (CI= 41)	Butcher Training
Cornmill & Livestock (CI= 41)	Cornmill & Livestock
8. Lajas Bridge (CI=40)	Chilema Women's Training
9. Chilema Women Tr. (CI= 38)	Lajas Bridge
10. Malindi Boat Project	Malindi Boat Project

Source: Author's table.

As Table 10 indicates, there is a strong positive correlation between (1) the ability of a project-holder to effectively accomplish the project characteristics which CODEL has identified in its selection criteria as important, and (2) the presence of important development impacts. The lesson to be learned here is that CODEL already knows those attributes which produce a high development return. The problem facing CODEL is finding out how to identify--from an array of potential projects--which of them will actually manifest those characteristics when a project is funded and implemented. Sometimes they have good fortune in their choices, sometimes they do not.

(Code)
Comparison
with
Table 8

IV. F: GENERIC P.V.O. QUESTIONS AND CODEL FUNDED PROJECTS

The A.I.D. Statement of Work expressed interest in issues of participation, innovativeness, and replicability. These issues were raised in "Generic Questions for PVO Evaluations", a paper prepared by Dr. Mary B. Anderson for A.I.D. Some of these issues--particularly beneficiary impacts and participation--have been addressed above in Sections IV. C, IV. D, and IV. e. This section is intended to summarize those points and issues raised in the "Generic Questions..." paper that have not been discussed previously.

This section will focus on two particular issues: innovativeness and replicability. With regard to the former, the evaluator's questionnaire asked each project-holder to describe the origins of the project model: was it original or borrowed?

The majority of project-holders studied in the sample group have been innovative in one respect. Eight of the ten project-holders funded by CODEL have been local pioneers of proven technologies. That is, these project-holders have not innovated totally new or unique forms of social or economic development. But they are characterized by the tendency to introduce and adapt a technology that was innovated elsewhere to their local area. Based on the information available to the evaluator, the following project-holders introduced these technologies into their nation or region:

- *FEPP/Ecuador: Animators for Rural Campesino Communities.
- *SEPAS/Peru: Self-Help Public Works Projects for Rural Communities.
- *St. John Bosco/Jamaica: Butcher Shop for Trade Training.
- *MUDE/Dominican Republic: Beekeeping for Women.
- *PTS/Togo: Small Tractor Mechanized Farming.
- *Kidop Homecraft/Cameroon: Homecraft/Health Village Workers.
- *Bui Food Coop/Cameroon: Village-Based, Coop-Owned Cornmills.
- *Malindi Rural Center/Malawi: Ferro-Cement Fishing Boats.

Only two of the ten project-holders were implementing a project type that had been borrowed or adopted from a local source:

- School Leaver Carpentry/Zambia: Borrowed idea from nearby diocese. C101?
- Chilema Women's Training/Malawi: Same project used with different beneficiary group earlier.

None of the above project activities was absolutely unique or original with these project-holders. Instead, CODEL project-holders transfer more-or-less "tried and true" social and economic technologies into their area. These are not risky, "cutting edge", highly experimental project types...but they are usually not far from being "state-of-the-art" approaches, either. When CODEL does fund a risky, innovative technology--such as ferro-cement boats--it apparently seeks to lower the risk level by using what appears to be a reputable and responsible consulting firm.

This type of project-funding pattern is not one that will result in major knowledge leaps for CODEL or other development agencies. But these are the kind of projects which will (1) be a relatively safe, low-risk investment for donor agencies, and (2) should have meaningful benefits for the target population. These "pre-tested" project types will not generate new strategies but they are the kinds of activities that have had proven impacts.

With respect to project replicability--that is, the replication of a project type by another project-holder--it should be clear from the above discussion that CODEL funded projects are replications of other projects. To the evaluator's knowledge, only four of the sample projects were used as models by other development projects. Those were national government programs in the respective countries of the project-holder:

† The use of school farm profits for program support at St. John Bosco has now been adopted by the Jamaican government as a policy for its residential schools.

† The small farmer mechanization program in Togo may have been a factor which inspired the Togolese government to introduce a tractor rental scheme in rural areas.

† The Malawian government now offers a women's training program similar to that offered at the Chilema Women's Training Program.

† As noted above, the ferro-cement boat building approach first used in Malawi at Malindi Rural Center has now been taken up by a government agency.

It is not clearly the case that any of these national government projects were directly inspired by the model of a CODEL funded project-holder. But these cases do indicate that CODEL funded projects address needs which are recognized by their respective national governments. Based on limited information about government programs, it would appear that services offered by CODEL project-holders are superior in quality and impact.

In terms of Anderson's typology, the sample projects can be classified as having two major relationships vis-a-vis government programs: they substitute for them when the government has not yet assumed any responsibility and they compete with them when the government tries to meet a need. This competition does not seem to create tension because government programs are willing to concentrate their limited resources in areas not served by PVOs.

Finally, although CODEL project-holders are not markedly innovative, they have in several cases expanded upon projects which had seed money from CODEL. Of the ten sample projects, about half were extensions or expansions of smaller-scale, pilot-phase projects which CODEL had originally funded. This pattern of "planting seeds" seems to be an important one in CODEL's program for local institution development. In at least two of the sample projects, St. John Bosco School and the Ndop Homecraft Center, CODEL's regional representatives have encouraged the project-holders (after completion of one small project) to build upon a modest program success with an expansion of that effort. Such an approach not only helps the project beneficiaries but also encourages the professional growth of the project-holder staff.

In summary, projects undertaken with CODEL funds:

--are not highly original but emphasize local adaptations of solutions and strategies that were demonstrated to have substantial beneficiary impact at other project-holder settings;

--are more likely to replicate projects than to be replicated (except by national government agencies) and tend to expand projects which CODEL originally "seeded".

IV. G: REVIEW OF SAMPLE PROJECT BENEFITS/COST RATIOS

The A.I.D. Statement of Work expressed interest in the issue of whether CODEL funded project impacts are "...commensurate with the costs." In addition, the evaluator was given a copy of a paper titled "Assessing the Cost-Effectiveness of PVO Projects: A Guide and Discussion" prepared by Theodore Wilde of Robert R. Nathan Associates for A.I.D. P.V.C. staff members indicated that any information which could shed light on the cost-benefits or cost-effectiveness of CODEL funded projects would be useful for evaluation purposes.

The sample projects included several that had readily measurable cost and benefits information. What follows is the evaluator's best effort to summarize benefits/cost ratio information from four of the projects. The basis of selection for these four was simply the ease with which these data could be collected during the tight time schedule imposed by field travel. Table 11 summarizes the ratios of total cost and annualized net benefits for these four projects:

See cost data to 0?

Table 11

RATIOS OF TOTAL COST AND ANNUALIZED NET BENEFITS FOR FOUR SAMPLE CODEL PROJECTS

<u>Type of Project Activity</u>	<u>Beneficiary Unit</u>	<u>Total Cost^a Per Unit</u>	<u>Net Annual Bene- fits^a Per Unit</u>	<u>Benefits/ Cost Ratio</u>
Cheese Factory Coop (Social Promoters)	Village	\$19,531.00	\$23,000.00	1.18
Beekeeping Project (MUDE)	Women's Group	\$3,271.66	\$500.00	.15
Agriculture Credit (PTS)	Farmer	\$3,580.00	\$6,959.99	1.94
Butcher Shop (St. John Bosco)	Shop	\$137,101.00	\$77,361.00	.56

[^a Note: all costs and benefits have been converted to US dollars]

Source: Author's field data; CODEL project summary information.

The origins of these summarized cost and benefits data as well as additional details on their components are provided below:

Cheese Factory Coop (Social Promoters)

If a Social Promoter can successfully organize a cheese-making cooperative in the Salinas area--and this has occurred several times--it is possible for that enterprise to have a very respectable benefits/cost ratio. This factory can not only cover the Promoter's annual salary but can also pay off the start-up loan in a few years and provide a sizable income to the local dairying households.

These are the circumstances under which such a project is viable:

- The cooperative needs a daily supply of 300 liters of milk;
- The cooperative must obtain a start-up loan for facilities and equipment amounting to about 720,000 sucres (about \$12,000); loans such as this are available from FEPP [not from CODEL funds] at 8% simple interest with a three-year repayment period;
- Soft cheese can be sold locally and mature cheese can be sold at FEPP's commercial outlet in Quito.

Below are some representative benefits and cost statistics for a village cheese factory using the above model:

COSTS	BENEFITS
Start-Up Loan.....\$12,000	Dairy Income.....\$18,000
Promoter's Salary.....\$ 1,200	Cheese Profits.....\$ 5,000
Promoter's Exp. & Overhead..\$ 3,451	
Interest on Loan.....\$ 2,880	
TOTAL COST.....\$19,531	TOTAL BENEFITS.....\$23,000

BENEFITS/COST RATIO= 1.18

Notes:

--Start-up loan estimates as well as statistics for village dairy income and anticipated cheese profits are based on information supplied by Salinas cheese cooperative officers.

--The Promoter's salary represents the monthly amount provided by FEPP (6,000 sucres) when the role is filled by one individual.

--Promoter's expenses and overhead are based on the total project expenses listed in the CODEL project summary.

Beekeeping Project for Women (MUDE)

Based on the total costs detailed in the CODEL project summary as well as field interviews with beekeeping project beneficiary groups, these total cost and annualized benefits apply:

COSTS	BENEFITS
Revolving Loan Fund.....\$1,678.33	Gross Honey Income.....\$500.00
Operations Costs.....\$ 66.66	
Educational Materials.....\$ 160.00	
Personnel Salaries.....\$1,200.00	
Misc./Inflation.....\$ 166.66	
TOTAL COSTS.....\$3,271.65	TOTAL BENEFITS.....\$500.00

BENEFITS/COST RATIO= .15

Notes:

--The costs statistics include two proportional reductions in order to reflect costs for one production group: (1) they are reduced by one-third to reflect the fact that delegates have an average of about three income-generation projects with each group...thus the whole salary amount should not be charged to beekeeping only, and (2) they are reduced by one-third again to reflect the costs for one group only instead of the three groups combined in the project summary costs.

--Gross honey income figures are based on statistics provided by members of the production groups.

Agriculture Credit (PTS)

Interviews with PTS staff members and beneficiaries (farmers) provided the following cost and benefits statistics for a successful Togolese farmer receiving production-inputs credit under the CODEL funded project:

COSTS	BENEFITS
Tractor Payments.....\$ 914.00	Net Income from Maize.....\$2,600.00
Production Inputs.....\$1,466.00	" " " Cotton.....\$ 906.66
Administ. Overhead.....\$1,200.00	" " " Cowpeas.....\$1,533.33
	" " " Sorghum.....\$1,920.00
TOTAL COSTS.....\$3,580.00	TOTAL BENEFITS.....\$6,959.99

BENEFITS/COST RATIO= 1.94

Notes:

--Costs of the tractor payment include principal and interest; this assumes a five-year repayment period.

--CODEL's contribution to this project has been a revolving fund for production input costs. These costs average CFA 500,000-600,000 per year according to PTS accounts. An average loan of CFA 550,000 (about \$1,466) is repaid at the end of the agricultural year in most cases.

--Net crop income represents the farmer's profit after deductions for labor costs and home consumption. The maize income represents 65 bags worth CFA 15,000 each; 5.6 bags of cotton salable at CFA 65,000 each provides another high profit item. The hybrid cowpeas income is based on

the sale of 25 bags at CFA 23,000 per bag and the sorghum income on 60 bags worth CFA 12,000 each. These per bag figures are mid-range averages: crops bring lower prices immediately after harvest and higher prices just before the next harvest. PTS farmers use simple storage systems in order to sell their cash crops as late in the season as possible.

All of these net income figures are based on actual production costs and sales returns from one farmer who kept good records.

--Administrative costs are an estimate of what it costs to operate the PTS maintenance and administrative facilities on a per-farmer cost basis.

Butcher Shop (St. John Bosco)

It is not presently possible to assign a value to the future income that Mandeville Trade Training project students will earn one day as commercial butchers. But it is possible to calculate the contributions which the CODEL funded training equipment is now making to the St. John Bosco school's balance sheet. The following cost and benefits information is derived from the CODEL project summary and from butcher shop statistics:

COSTS	BENEFITS
Start-Up CODEL Grant.....\$69,000	Gross Pork Sales.....\$54,561
A.I.D. SDP Grant.....\$10,000	Gross Chicken Sales.....\$22,800
Operating Expenses.....\$48,101	
Salaries.....\$10,000	
TOTAL COSTS.....\$137,101	TOTAL BENEFITS.....\$77,361

BENEFITS/COST RATIO= .56

Notes:

--Both the CODEL and A.I.D. SDP (from the mission to help purchase a refrigeration unit) grants are one-time, non-recurring expenses while operating expenses and salaries would be recurrent.

--Operating expense figures and gross pork sale statistics are taken from the butcher shop financial report for 1982-1983.

--Both the salaries statistic (which is an estimate of the salary costs for expatriate staff in terms of proportionate time spent with this project) and gross chicken sales (which began only in September, 1983) are based on estimates.

These cost and benefits ratio information provided above should be viewed in light of these factors:

1 The evaluator is not a professional economist and was guided in the preparation of these ratios by the Wilde guide and by common sense.

§ The statistics used in these examples are derived from actual case study information, as provided by project-holder staff and project beneficiaries, whenever possible. Estimation of costs and benefits has been reduced to the minimum possible degree.

Even with these constraints kept in mind, the Wilde guide to benefits/cost ratio analysis indicates that the majority of these projects show very healthy benefits/cost ratios. Table 8 (p. 32) of the Wilde guide provides interpretational guidance for ratios. Using those guidelines, the CODEL sample projects can be classified in these categories:

<u>Project Benefits/Cost Ratio</u>	<u>Wilde Interpretation</u>
Agriculture Credit.....1.94	Ratios greater than 1.0: "The project is an excellent one"
Cheese Factory Coop.....1.18	
Butcher Shop.....0.56	Ratios from .31 to .99: "This project is probably cost-effective"
Beekeeping for Women.....0.15	Ratios from .0 to .31: "The project is probably not cost-effective"

Based on Wilde's interpretational guide, it appears that the majority of CODEL funded sample projects analyzed had very respectable benefits/cost ratios. Even the beekeeping project might be cost-effective in the long term because (1) its start-up costs would not be recurrent, and (2) the number of beehives will increase annually.

Another factor which must be considered in evaluating these ratios is that in using this method, total project costs (not only CODEL funding but also project-holder and beneficiary inputs) have been the cost basis.

V. ASSESSMENT OF CODEL'S STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES AS A DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION.

This section will summarize three topics: (1) it will review the major characteristics of CODEL's development approach, (2) it will discuss and analyze the strengths of that development approach, and (3) it will identify the weaknesses of that approach.

A. CHARACTERISTICS OF CODEL'S DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

Based on a review of CODEL's publications, project summaries, annual reports, self-study document, and other materials as well as first-hand field study of CODEL funded projects, the evaluator offers this summary of the main features of CODEL's style and strategy as a development organization. CODEL places high priority on...

(1) Maximizing Existing Networks of Religious Organizations for Promoting Socio-Economic Development--First and foremost, CODEL has assumed for itself a unique, innovative role as a development organization: it has taken on the task of trying to mobilize the complex and unconnected networks of Christian religious organizations scattered literally all over the world. These organizations collectively have a long and, in some cases, impressive history of development-related work since the early part of this century. There is potentially a rich set of resources--people, money, community rapport, and other development resources--locked within these networks. Unfortunately, these organizations have in many cases become accustomed to and comfortable with working independently of other organizations. In many cases they have felt the need to compete with and protect their "turf" from other religious groups. CODEL has taken on the difficult task of trying to link up these religious groups at various levels--in the "First World", in the "Third World", within nations and between nations.

(2) Seeking Effective, Immediate Solutions, not New Knowledge--CODEL seems to place very high priority on funding projects that will, in all likelihood, have a significant and direct impact on the project beneficiaries. It is a service-oriented organization that is intent on (a) joining together disparate church groups in order to (b) provide

effective development services to "the poorest of the poor". Possibly because of the strong service-orientation of its constituent members or possibly, because like most development organizations it is not set up to undertake systematic research, CODEL is not regularly or relentlessly generating new development knowledge. This organization's forte is locating a good program to fund, shaping a sound project with a limited budget, and then raising the money from members to fund it. CODEL is not organized to do research or make major contributions to "development science" either now or in the near future. This is not to say that CODEL's board and staff do not recognize the importance of new knowledge about effective development methods--they do have a strong development education program--but only that it is not a central activity of their overall program.

(3) Facilitating Other Organizations to Implement Projects--CODEL is concerned with facilitating the implementation of worthwhile development projects by raising the funds to enable a local institution to do a project. CODEL has no interest in doing projects itself but sees its central role as one of "networking": linking up parties with resources with parties that have a good project in need of funds. The underlying impetus for CODEL's facilitation is to encourage a particular kind of coordination and sharing--one that brings otherwise separate organizations into contact; ecumenicalism. CODEL staff and publications emphasize that this is a 'non-operational' organization, which means that it does not itself do development work at the grassroots/village level. Instead, it seeks to make it possible for other organizations to do so.

(4) Reactive to Other Organization's Proposals--CODEL does not seek out organizations to implement a favorite project type but, instead, is willing to listen to project proposals on almost any subject. The cardinal criterion for its funding is evidence of ecumenical cooperation. It matters little in which country a project will be located or what the special topical focus will be so long as this central criterion is observed. There are other criteria also, but unless ecumenicalism is present, a proposal will not get a hearing. Thus, CODEL encourages organizations world-wide to "think ecumenical". It offers the incentive of financial aid.

(5) Small-Scale, Community-Based, "Grassrooted" Projects--Partly because of the institutional memory of its member organizations, CODEL emphasizes small-scale, community-centered projects that will involve the beneficiaries in their own development. One former CODEL board member explained to the evaluator that many persons who sit on that board are veterans of past missionary village work. They had experience at giving inoculations, helping with crop production problems, starting handicraft projects, and educating the illiterate. Given that personal history as well as a similar legacy in their parent religious organization, it was only natural that CODEL projects tend to be small-scale and village-based. Part of the philosophy of CODEL funding, to continue this man's explanation, is that "small is better" when it comes to providing money. That is, limited help tends to stimulate the community more to help itself than more abundant help might do. Moreover, as past missionaries, many board members remembered that they had been able to do quite a bit of good with just a small sum of money.

(6) Project-Focused instead of Project-Holder Focused--While CODEL has some tendency to refund project-holders where they have been able to start an effective pilot project or where a project-holder has been particularly productive, it tends to favor projects over project-holders. Part of CODEL's underlying impetus--ecumenicalism--drives it to seek out new project-holders in places which CODEL has never funded before. This search for new sites in which to stimulate ecumenical cooperation helps explain the (to an outsider) seemingly random funding pattern of CODEL within its regions. There does not seem to be a coherent pattern or clear rationale to the selection of countries in which projects are funded. But the explanation of this apparent randomness is that while CODEL wants to fund good projects, it also wants to scatter the seeds of ecumenicalism...and that won't be achieved if it keeps funding the same project-holders in the same countries every year.

These then, from the evaluator's perspective, are some of the key features that explain the way in which CODEL operates as a development organization. It is a distinctive style with definite preferences and a clearly-defined set of interests. This organization, like some people, has a "strong personality" that will appeal to some and be a problem for others.

B. STRENGTHS OF CODEL'S DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

Whether or not one is attracted to CODEL's development style, there is little doubt but that it has a distinctive one. This approach, given its preference for small-scale, community-based projects that will bring new organizational interaction among different religious organizations, is one which results in an operational system that some will see as strong and positive and others will see as weak and wasteful. In this and the following section, the evaluator will summarize some of the strengths and weaknesses ascribable to CODEL's particular approach to development. First, some strong points:

(1) A Logical and Positive Emphasis--There is merit in CODEL's attempt to harness the energy of religious organizations in international development. Often these organizations have strong credibility--more than some local governments--at the grassroots level; priests and ministers are rarely accused of corruption. Moreover, the church is often the only significant outside institution found in remote rural areas: it represents the larger, external society to many villagers. Many church groups have spent decades "building rapport" at the community level by healing wounds, educating children, and burying the dead. Given those credentials, it is logical and positive to find some ways to train ministers and priests as well as concerned laypeople as effective development agents. This is one of the most important outcomes, in the broader sense, of CODEL funded projects.

(2) An Appropriate Emphasis on Impacts--Part of the task of transforming church organizations in the Third World to development agencies involves a re-orientation of their service style. For decades, many church organizations provided social welfare-type services to their parishoners and others. If those organizations are going to become skilled in stimulating self-help and serious about "working themselves out of a job", they will need some prodding and encouragement. In the way which it structures its funding, CODEL is helping bring about that re-orientation. By placing emphasis on project impacts and the organizing of projects that will lead to self-reliance, CODEL is assisting this needed educational process for church groups.

(3) "Partnership with Project-Holders" Builds Trust--Because it places so much importance on a close, harmonious relationship with project-holders, CODEL is able to gain the confidence and trust of local church organization members and development workers. This close rapport with project-holder staff can help CODEL bring about the maturation of these groups as development agencies. CODEL's high visibility as a religious-based institution enables it ^{to} push more effectively for changes in administrative practices and to ~~seek~~ higher standards of project implementation than might otherwise be possible. Hopefully, someday (but probably not real soon), CODEL will be able to introduce systematic record-keeping systems among project-holders that will enable baseline data collection and other procedures that will facilitate sound research.

(4) Many Project-Holders are Well-Managed Organizations--Many, but by no means all, of the project-holders which the evaluator visited are well-managed organizations. They are effective, responsible, and cost-conscious development agencies with competent leaders and, often, committed and talented field workers. Moreover, these project-holders are likely to be seasoned, experienced organizations that are not just put together to carry out a project but have some continuity and internal coherence. In many cases they have already implemented several--if not many--projects before and have a suitable infrastructure already established.

(5) It Funds Worthwhile but Less Conspicuous Projects--Because of its preference for small-scale projects, CODEL has channeled money to projects that have a significant impact on the local level. These are not the kinds of projects which will have thousands (or even hundreds, in some cases) of potential beneficiaries. But they tend to be projects which will provide some solid, substantial benefits to those that they do have an impact on. Projects with small beneficiary populations are not ones which have a "high visibility quotient": they are likely to be obscure in relation to the view from the local A.I.D. mission. Because such projects are not likely candidates for an OPG, it is probable that they will never receive A.I.D. money unless it comes to them as matching funds from a CODEL grant.

C. WEAKNESSES OF CODEL'S DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

There are areas of weakness in CODEL's operational style, from the evaluator's perspective, that are brought on partly as a by-product of its development style and for other reasons also. These include:

(1) A Lack of Sufficient Attention to Project Evaluation--At present, CODEL's procedures for project evaluation do not result in an educational experience for either CODEL or the project-holder. In a review of a random sample of past projects from both the Africa and Latin America/Caribbean regions, the evaluator found widely varying responses to the CODEL requirement for a project evaluation report. Some project-holders took this task very seriously and made a major effort. One or two project-holders in each region did not submit any report (to the evaluator's knowledge). Most of these reports were not the product of reflection on what could have been done differently and how a similar project might be done better but were efforts to satisfy the imposed requirement. To be fair, some of these reports were prepared 5-6 years ago, at a time when CODEL did not have full-time regional representatives. Nonetheless, this is an area which needs substantial improvement because of the wide range of responses in terms of quality and depth. Hopefully a satisfactory evaluation system can be developed which will not interfere seriously with CODEL's close rapport with project-holders.

(2) The Need for Focusing Selective Attention on Project-Holders--It was the evaluator's experience that there was considerable variation between project-holders (especially in Africa) with respect to their level of project-implementation expertise. This is partly a function of differing infrastructure, experience levels, and budgets. But this difference is one that should be addressed in CODEL's programming approach. Specifically, there seems to be insufficient attention to some projects once they are operational. Several projects visited in Africa seemed somewhat neglected. This was especially true in the case of project-holders where an expatriate had begun a project and then been transferred. In such cases, when new personnel take over the project, there may be the need for special attention to that project-

holder until the situation stabilizes. The transfer of key project personnel was a problem for several of the Africa projects and may be a serious enough problem that CODEL should develop some standard-operating procedure to deal with that event when it occurs.

(3) There are Disadvantages with a "Reactive" Approach--CODEL's emphasis on reacting to project-holders' project ideas rather than seeking to initiate projects itself is a workable strategy but has some drawbacks. One of the major problems that results from this approach is the "scattergun" distribution of funded projects. In both the Africa and Asia regions, there is a very wide geographic dispersion of project-holders literally over half the world. Such a pattern serves the purpose of encouraging ecumenical cooperation but is a hindrance to close communications with remote projects. Oftentimes it is the project which is most "off the beaten track" that most needs the advice and counsel that a regional coordinator can offer...and yet they may never get a visit because of tight travel schedules. The evaluator is aware that CODEL has been criticized in the past for concentrating its resources in only a few countries in each region. But the present situation would seem to carry the situation to the other extreme. This is not to say that CODEL should alter its reactive approach but to point out that it would be possible to develop a modified reactive approach that would serve the purpose of spreading ecumenical cooperation while, at the same time, providing for more frequent and sustained communication between project-holders and regional representatives. One suggestion by which CODEL might modify its reactive style would be to divide up its regions into suitable subregions and give preference to projects sent in from one of those subregions for two years, then shift the preference to another subregion for two years. This would provide for clustering of projects in geographically contiguous areas at the same time period without interfering with the principle of project-holder initiative.

(4) Fewer Projects Could Create Stronger Ecumenicalism and Better Projects--The evaluator feels that the number of projects in the Asia and Africa regions is still too large (he is aware that this point was brought up in an earlier CODEL evaluation). Both the major objectives of CODEL as a religious-based development organization--ecumenical

*Need to
...
...
...*

cooperation toward socio-economic development for "the poorest of the poor"--would benefit from fewer numbers of projects in these regions: those regions are too large and heterogeneous for so many projects. Moreover, fewer projects in those regions would enable the regional coordinators to focus more attention on encouraging grass-roots cooperation between those different religious groups at the local level. It is the evaluator's view that ecumenicalism only at the "top" of the religious organizations' hierarchies is important but not enough. The regional coordinator's could be focusing more effort on encouraging those parties which have pledged their cooperation prior to project funding to really work closely together on its implementation. Fewer projects in those regions would facilitate this important task.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluator has these recommendations to offer concerning the CODEL program. The first set of recommendations are suggestions to the CODEL staff and board for ways in which they could, in his view, enhance their development efforts. The second set of recommendations are some final points the evaluator offers to the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation concerning their CODEL grant.

(A) Recommendations to CODEL:

CODEL has a strong development program that is marshalling the money and manpower of a far-flung network of religious organizations; these groups have the potential to generate a great deal of effective and important socio-economic development among groups that may not always be reached by government projects. The following suggestions are intended as "food for thought" about some aspects of your operations--

1. Evaluation procedures need strengthening. A more systematic and probing questionnaire needs to be developed. There might be some merit in holding periodic "debriefing" workshops in nations or regions so that several project-holder staffs could share their experiences and, at the same time, receive some nonformal education from the regional representative about what they can learn from their project outcomes.

2. CODEL should recognize that given its bias toward small-scale projects, there is often substantial responsibility placed on the shoulders of one individual at the project-holder organization. If that person is shifted to another location (as seems to occur with some regularity in diocesan systems), then a serious problem can arise for project continuity. The evaluator has no specific suggestion to offer concerning how CODEL should deal with this eventuality. But he does feel that CODEL should recognize that (a) such an occurrence is a potentially big problem for some project-holder organizations, and (b) that its occurrence is not infrequent.

(3) Even without the loss of a key project person, some CODEL project-holders--especially those with little development experience--may need more guidance and assistance than others. The kind of assistance needed may not be technical assistance but project management help.

*publication
of findings
to
CODEL
representatives*

*Agency
to
help*

Project-holders may find it difficult (because embarrassing) to request that kind of aid. The responsibility for recognizing this situation when or before it occurs should rest with the regional representatives. Part of their pre-funding assessment of project should include a close look at the managerial resources of the project-holder. If a project-holder has little project management experience, perhaps CODEL should insist on some project funds being earmarked for development administration training for one or more staff members. If this is not feasible, regional representatives should at least be sensitive to a project-holder "in trouble"--without having to be told as much--and seek sources of assistance for that project-holder.

(4) The three CODEL regions differ considerably in the levels of local institution sophistication and expertise in development work. It would seem to make sense that in the region with the most competent local organizations there could be the most projects: these project-holders would require the least attention. Instead, the opposite is the case. Latin America and the Caribbean region had the most polished, resourced local institutions and yet it has the fewest projects. Africa and Asia, on the other hand, have far more projects and project-holders that may need considerably more encouragement, counseling, and supervision. One remedy to this situation would be to find some system by which CODEL can fund a fewer number of projects without interfering with its goals for ecumenical cooperation. One system, mentioned above, would be to give rotating preference to different subregions, thus providing some partial concentration of effort in both time and space. Whatever the system, the evaluator concurs with previous suggestions that CODEL is spreading its resources too thinly in Africa and Asia.

(5) Finally, although this may be a heretical suggestion in these days of shrinking budgets and growing accountability, it might be a good use of some staff member's time if CODEL could put together selected case studies of ecumenical cooperation in development. The subject is one on which CODEL is the expert. Moreover, CODEL now has enough project experience to provide a rich source of information about how ecumenicalism benefits or affects development projects. Such an undertaking would also advance CODEL's goal to encourage more ecumenical cooperation.

(B) Recommendation to P.V.C.

An Action Memorandum from the P.V.C. office outlining the current CODEL grant includes the following passage under "Expected Results from Our Grant":

Through CODEL, AID would continue to maintain a beneficial relationship with a worldwide network of indigenous private organizations in AID countries, primarily mission groups. The grant would provide funding for small and innovative projects not easily funded through other AID mechanisms.

This same section of the memo also lists other expected benefits-- CODEL would continue to mobilize private human resources including private sector funds, CODEL's project categories coincided with A.I.D.'s current priorities, CODEL's projects would strengthen local development-oriented institutions. This evaluation has tested CODEL in terms of these expected benefits. On the whole, the evaluator gives CODEL high marks for its effective use of taxpayer's money in development projects that are the kinds of activities that most American citizens would probably support. CODEL seems to be able to produce significant benefits for deserving people with relatively small sums of money. For example, the total amount of A.I.D. money spent to date on the ten sample projects is \$326,195. This sum is slightly less than the average A.I.D. mission OPG (which were rarely less than \$400,000 at the visited missions). This money has produced significant benefits for projects' target populations already even though the full impact of some projects is yet to occur. At the same time, there is organizational development taking place in many local institutions as a result of this funding.

A.I.D./P.V.C. assistance to CODEL's program is a means to complement the P.V.O. activities of the various A.I.D. missions. CODEL's typical project is budgeted much lower than the amount that some missions consider to be minimal funding levels for an OPG. CODEL thus fills an important gap in serving the smaller PVOs around the world.

Although CODEL has some weaknesses in its operations, as noted above, the evaluator's basic view is that this is a healthy, well-run organization that needs some refinements and 'fine-tuning' of its operations, not drastic changes.

A.I.D.'s assistance to CODEL has helped that organization develop its potential to mobilize a rich reservoir of resources. Matching funds have been used very effectively by this organization to link up a wide network of donors from disparate backgrounds to fund projects they might never have considered otherwise. That is a valuable function and one which, in the evaluator's view, the P.V.C. office should encourage with continued support.

CODEL - COORDINATION IN DEVELOPMENT, INC.
MEMBERSHIP LIST

AMERICAN LEPROSY MISSIONS 1262 Broad Street Bloomfield, New Jersey 07003	DOM/UPCUSA 475 Riverside Drive New York, New York 10115
ATONEMENT FRIARS 138 Waverly Place New York, New York 10014	EPISCOPAL CHURCH 815 Second Avenue New York, New York 10017
CAPUCHIN FATHERS St. Francis High School 200 Foothill Boulevard La Canada, California 91011	ERIE DIOCESAN MISSION OFFICE 246 West 10th Street Erie, Pennsylvania 16501
CHRISTIAN BROTHERS CONFERENCE 100 De La Salle Road Lockport, Illinois 60441	FRANCISCAN FATHERS 135 West 31st Street New York, New York 10001
CHRISTIAN CHILDREN'S FUND, Inc. P.O. Box 26511 Richmond, Virginia 23261	FRANCISCAN MISSIONARIES OF MARY 225 East 45th Street New York, New York 10017
COMBONI MISSIONARIES 8108 Beechmont Avenue Cincinnati, Ohio 45230	FRANCISCAN MISSIONARY UNION OF CHICAGO 1434 West 51st Street Chicago, Illinois 60609
COMMUNICATION FOUNDATION FOR ASIA 131 University Street San Francisco, California 94134	HEIFER PROJECTS INTERNATIONAL P.O. Box 808 825 West 3rd Street Little Rock, Arkansas 72203
CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN SERVICE COMMITTEE 475 Riverside Drive New York, New York 10115	HOLY CROSS FATHERS 7020 Sunnyside Avenue Beltsville, Maryland 20705
CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY GHOST FATHERS 65 West 138 Street New York, New York 10037	INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY SERVICES, INC. 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036
Inter-Provincial Mission Office DIVINE WORD MISSIONARIES Techy Illinois 60082	LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF 360 Park Avenue South New York, New York 10010
DOM/CHURCH WORLD SERVICE 475 Riverside Drive New York, New York 10115	MARIST MISSIONS 31 St. James Avenue Boston, Massachusetts 02116

Page 2
MEMBERSHIP LIST

MARYKNOLL FATHERS
Maryknoll, New York 10545

MARYKNOLL SISTERS
Maryknoll, New York 10545

MEALS FOR MILLIONS/
FREEDOM FROM HUNGER FOUNDATION
815 Second Avenue
New York, New York 10017

MEDICAL MISSIONARIES OF MARY
565 Minneford Avenue
City Island, New York 10464

MEDICAL MISSION SISTERS
8400 Pine Road
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19111

MILL HILL MISSIONARIES
P.O. Box 5068
Albany, New York 12205

MISSIONARIES OF AFRICA - "THE WHITE
FATHERS"
1624 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE
CONFERENCE
4625 N.W. Beaver Drive
Des Moines, Iowa 50322

P.I.M.E. MISSIONARIES
35750 Moravian Drive
Fraser, Michigan 48026

PRECIOUS BLOOD FATHERS
St. Alfonso's Church
540 St. Claire Avenue, West
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M6C 1A4

SECRETARIAT FOR LATIN AMERICA
National Conference of Catholic Bishops
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

SOCIETY OF AFRICAN MISSIONS - S.M.A. FATHERS
23 Bliss Avenue
Tenafly, New Jersey 07670

SOCIETY OF THE HOLY CHILD JESUS
443 Shadeland Avenue
Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania 19026

ST. COLUMBAN FOREIGN MISSION SOCIETY
St. Columbans, Nebraska 68056

ST. PATRICK FATHERS
70 Edgewater Road
Cliffside Park, New Jersey 07010

TECHNOSERVE, INC.
11 Belden Avenue
Norwalk, Connecticut 06852

UNITED METHODIST COMMITTEE ON RELIEF
475 Riverside Drive
New York, New York 10115

YMCA - INTERNATIONAL DIVISION
101 N. Wacker Drive Suite 1400
Chicago, Illinois 60606

YWCA
600 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10022

103

STATEMENT OF WORK

A. Objective

The primary purpose of the proposed work is:

- to arrange and conduct an evaluation of the development value and impact of projects supported by Coordination in Development (CODEL), with special reference to the program interests and funding priorities of AID.

Secondary purposes of the work include:

- specific assessment of the impact on local institutions of CODEL's program and style of operations;
- identification of project characteristics and project environments which determine project results;
- analysis of issues related to CODEL's ecumenical orientation and composition, i.e., significance to AID of the relationships afforded through the consortium; segregation of religious and development activity, and development consequences of collaboration between groups of different religions and faiths in development projects.

B. SCOPE OF WORK

The contractor shall have primary responsibility for: review of earlier evaluation efforts and project information in CODEL files; planning, arranging and conducting supplemental site visits to CODEL supported projects; and preparation of the evaluation report. This will be done in collaboration with CODEL staff and member agency representatives, some of whom will participate in the site visits.

1. Scope

A major evaluation of CODEL's program was conducted in 1981 by an independent contractor, Consultants in Development. The report, issued in October 1981, includes several project case studies, but focuses on CODEL operating procedures and staff capabilities. In early 1983, CODEL conducted a self-evaluation to mark the mid-point of its three year plan. In addition, a series of project "audits" were initiated, conducted by CODEL of religious and development activities mentioned above. The evaluation report will include comments on the development significance of ecumenical collaboration in CODEL projects.

staff with the local project holders and, when possible, personnel from member agencies not directly involved in the projects. These prior evaluation efforts will be incorporated in and form the starting point for the contractor's work.

A Cost Sharing Program Grant to CODEL was authorized in 1982 in the amount of \$3.2 million over three years. This was the second largest PVC grant authorized in that year. CODEL matches AID funds with private funds and consciously maintains its independence. The grant represents AID support for the PVO as an independent entity, rather than as an intermediary. An important AID objective of the evaluation is to determine whether CODEL's program is of sufficient interest and value to AID to justify this large allocation of AID funds.

The Action Memorandum recommending authorization of the grant states:

"A major evaluation, to be conducted at mid-point in the grant period, would demonstrate more general achievement by finding: increasingly self-reliant local institutions; significant cases of replication; and, in a few instances, small-scale project beginnings leading to much larger efforts with local government and, possibly, AID Mission support."

Testing this hypothesis shall be an important part of the contractor's work. In particular, the evaluation will examine whether the local institutions are becoming increasingly self-reliant. Instances of replication and expanded follow-on efforts will be sought within a broader examination of the development impact of CODEL projects, which will be the major evaluation focus.

2. Field Survey

To supplement information already available, the contractor will arrange and conduct a field survey covering at least six representative CODEL supported projects. This relatively small sample is predicated on the expectation that project information already available from earlier evaluations and the project "audits" by CODEL staff will contribute significantly to the total data base for this evaluation. Part of the contractor's responsibility will be to assess the available information in planning the field survey, to determine the number, location and types of projects to be visited in order to provide an adequate basis for conclusions about CODEL's program as a whole.

If possible, the sample to be visited will be from among CODEL projects in two regions, Africa and Latin America. Reasons for this geographic limitation include economy of travel costs, availability of case study material from Asia (from the 1981 evaluation and AID and CODEL trip reports), and the planned retirement of CODEL's Asia Coordinator about the time this evaluation begins.

Since project impact is a primary focus of the evaluation, projects to be reviewed will of necessity include projects underway long enough to have demonstrated impact. Thus, the sample may include projects funded prior to the current grant period.

3. CODEL Participation

In planning the field survey, the contractor will involve CODEL staff and member organization personnel as available. The contractor will arrange orientation/training for these individuals in the methodology to be employed, the information needed, and techniques for gathering that information. This may be accomplished at a single session in the U.S. (New York), or it may be more practical to conduct separate sessions in the field at the beginning of the field surveys.

Personnel available from CODEL member organizations not involved in the projects to be surveyed may be used to expand the number of projects covered if the contractor is satisfied that meaningful and objective information can be obtained in this way. While the organizations would be expected to contribute the services of such individuals, to facilitate their involvement and provide the contractor with some measure of control, costs of travel and accommodations for such individuals may be reimbursed under the contract. CODEL staff personnel shall be responsible for their travel and per diem.

4. Survey Content

As noted, the primary objective of this evaluation will be to assess the development value of CODEL projects, with particular reference to the program interests and priorities of AID. Copies of the guidance provided by AID to its field Missions for preparation of Country Development Strategy Statements will be made available to the contractor as indication of these interests and priorities.

A document entitled Generic Questions for PVO Evaluations has been prepared for AID, raising questions on participation, innovation and replicability designed to provide a basis for

106

generalized learning about project characteristics and project environment which determine project results. This will be incorporated into the evaluation, but without prejudice to the primary objective of assessing CODEL project results, i.e., what benefits are being achieved, are these benefits consistent with AID interests, and are they commensurate with the costs.

Ecumenical collaboration is a primary CODEL objective and criterion for project support. The consortium is composed of church related organizations and local project holders are also generally church groups. Another secondary purpose of the evaluation will be to examine some of the issues related to this ecumenical orientation and involvement:

- a) Although a few of CODEL's members also have direct grants from AID, most probably would not maintain such independent relationships. Many are small missionary groups for whom direct grants would be administratively impractical; others may not want a direct relationship with the U.S. Government, but are willing to participate through the consortium. At the same time, CODEL often funds projects of local organizations not affiliated with its members, further broadening the scope of indirect relationships. While the evaluation will not provide comprehensive or necessarily representative coverage, it should furnish some useful information about the role and potential of such groups in development. Specifically, the report should include comments on the significance to AID of the relationships afforded through the consortium.
- b) Separation of religious activity from development activity is a common issue in AID grants to church related organizations. Besides the constitutional church-state question, there can be questions of effectiveness if religious and development priorities are not clearly distinguished or compete for attention and resources. This issue will be included in the contractor's review of CODEL project experience and covered in the evaluation report.
- c) Ecumenical collaboration per se is not a matter of AID interest in its grant support, however, consistent evidence that such collaboration influences project results would be of interest to AID. Collaboration between groups of different religions or faiths may also have significance with regard to the separation

10/1

of religious and development activities mentioned above. The evaluation report will include comments on the development significance of ecumenical collaboration in CODEL projects.

d. Schedule

The planning phase of the contractor's work may begin as soon as the contract is signed. The field surveys are expected to be conducted during October through December, 1983, and the final report to be completed by January 15, 1983. A more detailed proposed schedule and work plan is attached.

4. Reports

The contractor will prepare a mid-term evaluation report of findings, conclusions and recommendation. The report will be submitted in draft to AID and CODEL for comment prior to preparing the final version.

103

ANNEX C

CODEL STUDY TOPICS AND QUESTIONS

1) Project and Beneficiary Characteristics

- A. The Socio-Economic Context:
 1. Income levels and resource distribution patterns
 2. Occupational patterns and unemployment levels
 3. Health and sanitation conditions
 4. Nutritional patterns
 5. Population size and density
 6. Housing conditions
 7. Educational facilities
 8. Other contextual factors
- B. Beneficiary Characteristics
 1. Income levels and sources
 2. Social status level
 3. Occupational patterns
 4. Religious affiliation
 5. Political participation
 6. Ethnic identity
 7. Age and sex patterns
 8. Major socio-economic problems
- C. Project Characteristics
 1. Problem(s) at which project is aimed
 2. Objectives: Intended means to affect these problems
 3. Activities intended to achieve these objectives (and respective locations)
 4. Project personnel
 5. Project funding source(s)
 6. Phases of project activity/implementation
 7. Anticipated final outcome of project (or, if completed, present status)
 8. Types of project participation by beneficiaries
 9. Sources of this project design model
- D. Results, Outcomes, and Impacts
 1. Types of and degrees of social impacts: Intended; Actual
 2. Types of and degrees of economic impact: Intended; Actual
 3. Factors influencing differences between intended and actual impacts
 - a. Social
 - b. Economic
 - c. Cultural
 - d. Political
 - e. Other
 4. Has this project been visited, studied, or used as a model by any other development organization?
 5. Will this project be expanded and/or continued by local institutions?
 6. Ecumenical aspects/dimensions of this project.

CODEL STUDY TOPICS AND QUESTIONS, Page Two

II) Project-Holder [PH] Characteristics

- A. Development Capacity and Potential
 1. Number of years PH has undertaken development projects
 2. Types of projects? Any special emphasis?
 3. Number of past and current projects
 4. Major sources of project funding
 5. Development training and background of PH staff
 6. Number and duties of PH staff
 - a. Administrative and support personnel
 - b. Field personnel
 7. Collaboration/cooperation with other development organizations
 - a. Other religious PVOs
 - b. Secular PVOs
 - c. Government agencies/programs
 - d. Other organizations or institutions
 8. Methods used to calculate project cost-benefits or cost-effectiveness
 9. Methods used to encourage/foster project self-sufficiency
 10. Methods used to encourage/foster project participation by beneficiaries
 11. Relationship between church work and project activities
- B. Relations with CODEL and Other Organizations
 1. What kinds of assistance have been requested from CODEL?
 2. What kinds of assistance have been provided by CODEL?
 3. How often does PH have contact/communication with CODEL concerning the project?
 4. Has PH provided CODEL with regular, complete project progress reports?
 5. What are CODEL's main strengths as a donor agency?
 6. How might CODEL's work as a donor agency be improved?
 7. Has this PH expanded its contacts with other organizations as a result of this project?
 - a. Other religious organizations (development or otherwise)
 - b. Other development organizations (religious or secular)
 - c. Government agencies/programs
 8. Could this project have been undertaken without CODEL assistance?
 9. How has this project been affected by CODEL assistance?
- C. Impacts on the Poor
 1. How does this PH identify the poor/needy population?
 2. Major social impacts of project on poor men? Women?
 3. Major economic impacts of project on poor men? Women?
 4. Other types of impact?
 5. What role(s) do the poor play in this PH's
 - a. Project design process
 - b. Project implementation
 - c. Project assessment and evaluation
 6. Types of contributions made by poor/needy to project

CODEL STUDY TOPICS AND QUESTIONS, Page Three

III) Project Consistency with CODEL Criteria and Exclusions

Criteria #/ Degree of Consistency:	High	Moderate	Low	Nil
1 Assists socio-economically disadvantaged Encourages econ. & pol. participation Develops community self-reliance				
2 Meets local comm. highest priorities Implemented coop. w/beneficiaries				
3 Surveys local comm. resources in project planning process				
4 Emphasizes role of women				
5 Provides tech. training for local personnel Uses indigenous natural & human resources effectively Fosters initiative, self-reliance				
6 Demonstrates positive, complementary relationship among all project participants				
7 Responsive to environmental concerns				
8 Emphasizes socio-economic development, not evangelical goals				
<u>Exclusion #</u> [Projects should <u>not</u>]				
1 principally serve sectarian interests				
2 train personnel or inappropriate or non-relevant careers, roles				
3 duplicate similar programs in area				
4 be used principally for building funds (except under certain conditions)				

ANNEX D

GENERAL QUESTIONS FOR CODEL STAFF MEMBERS

1. How are potential projects identified?
2. How are funded projects selected?
3. What are CODEL's expectations regarding development expertise of potential PHs?
4. What assistance is provided by CODEL in project planning and conceptualization to PHs?
5. To what extent does CODEL expect participation of potential beneficiaries in project design and need identification?
6. Does CODEL provide technical assistance (or suggest sources of it) for projects and PHs?
7. Relative to some PVOs, CODEL provides small fund sums--is that a deliberate policy/philosophy?
8. Relative to some PVOs, CODEL funds projects in many countries--is that a deliberate policy?
9. 'CODEL' stands for 'Cooperation in Development'--which is more important, cooperation or development? That is, are development projects a vehicle for ecumenism or vice versa?
10. What is the greatest strength of CODEL's present development approach?
11. What is the area of greatest potential improvement concerning CODEL's present development approach?
12. How does ecumenical cooperation affect development work?
13. What are important features of the "partnership" between CODEL and PHs?
14. What are the strengths of AID as a donor agency?
15. What are the weaknesses of AID as a donor agency?