

WLO
99

PVC
45

PD-AAV-013
48719

AN EVALUATION OF
COORDINATION IN DEVELOPMENT, INC.
(CODEL)

Submitted to the
Bureau for Population and Humanitarian Assistance
Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation
under contract AID/otr-c-1380

by
Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc.
Consulting Economists
Washington, D.C.

April 1978

CONTENTS

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II.	CODEL HEADQUARTERS EVALUATION	3
	Summary	3
	Executive Committee Perspective	5
	Staff Perspective	11
	Source and Use of Funds	18
III.	EVALUATION OF CODEL WORK IN AFRICA	22
	Background	22
	General Observations on CODEL	23
	Evaluation of CODEL's Inputs	31
	Evaluation of CODEL's Outputs	45
IV.	EVALUATION OF CODEL'S WORK IN LATIN AMERICA	65
	CODEL's Inputs in Latin America	65
	Outputs -- The Projects to Which CODEL Relates	76
	The Capacity of the Overseas Organizations to Implement "Good Projects"	85
	Field Relationships with USAID Missions	87
V.	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	90
	Summary	90
	Recommendations	96
	APPENDIX A: Persons Interviewed	100
	APPENDIX B: Projects Reviewed	107
	APPENDIX C: Analysis of Current CODEL Projects	110
	APPENDIX D: Descriptions of Projects Reviewed in Field Visits	112
	APPENDIX E: Systems and Forms for Project Analysis and Evaluation	125

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The evaluation of Coordination in Development, Inc. (CODEL) which is presented herein was prepared by Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc. (RRNA) at the request of USAID. It is based on extensive interviews of CODEL staff and CODEL Executive Committee members, as well as on field observations of selected CODEL projects and discussions with overseas personnel of CODEL's member organizations.

CODEL has been an effective source of funding for its member organizations' projects. Most projects conform to CODEL's own project criteria and in particular focus on assisting the "poorest of the poor." CODEL has been less effective in providing the training and support in project preparation originally anticipated in its DPG agreement; but CODEL has had some beneficial impact on the project-related capabilities of its members. A major challenge to CODEL lies in finding ways to provide proper non-financial assistance to its members in development work.

CODEL has strongly communicated its desire for ecumenical collaboration to members in the field. Encouragement of such "coordination in development" emerges in practice as CODEL's fundamental organizational goal. Achievement of coordination helps to enhance members' capabilities in development work and to create the resource network CODEL seeks to foster.

The size and composition of CODEL's staff are barely adequate to manage its present program. CODEL's non-field operational status is strongly supported by its staff and members but complicates management and development of CODEL's programs.

CODEL's Executive Committee and headquarters' staff believe the organization has achieved satisfactory success in most of its endeavors. Both groups believe greater progress is needed in domestic development education among members and in raising funds from non-member sources.

Overall CODEL's operations during the DPG period have demonstrated effective use of funds in building its program capabilities. Therefore, it is recommended that USAID's support for CODEL be continued at an expanded level for a 3-year period 1978-80. But it is recommended that the terms of the agreement between USAID and Codel be reviewed to achieve a more realistic understanding of CODEL's potential.

Also it is recommended that CODEL take new steps to strengthen its operations including: appointment of a trained project analyst to its New York staff; use of CODEL country "correspondents" among its members overseas; and preparation of a roster of specially skilled individuals affiliated with CODEL's members who might provide technical assistance to CODEL projects. Finally it is recommended that CODEL intensify efforts to identify projects for OPG support, to secure funding from non-member sources, and to strengthen its domestic and international lines of communication, including contacts with USAID.

II. CODEL HEADQUARTERS EVALUATION

Summary

With headquarters in New York City, Coordination in Development, Inc. (CODEL) has 39 members, consisting of mission societies and church-related organizations. Representatives of all member organizations constitute the Board of Directors of CODEL and meet twice a year. Twelve representatives form the Executive Committee, which meets every two months, and they play a strong role in directing the activities of CODEL. There are also a Project Committee, a Finance Committee and an Interpretation and Presentation Committee. A Board of Advisers has both members and non-members, emphasizing participation of business executives and lay talent. The staff includes an Executive Director, Chief of Operations, three regional coordinators, four support employees, two consultants and a full-time volunteer.

RRNA interviewed all members of the Executive Committee, with the exception of a Maryknoll Sister who authorized a Maryknoll Father to speak for her order. The views of all key staff people were also obtained by interview and observation. An RRNA representative also attended a project committee meeting.

While board members and staff held some differing perception of CODEL's operations, they agreed on most. There is a consensus that ecumenical coordination and cooperation to bring development to the poorest of the poor is the most important goal, the reason for being of CODEL. A majority believe that coordination is being achieved domestically; slightly fewer are satisfied with overseas coordination. Most feel that CODEL has a steadily improving track record in fund raising, project identification, project development and funding; it has been somewhat less effective in member training. They see CODEL's role overseas as a patient catalyst or a gentle adviser to organizations and projects needing encouragement. Most hope to attract increasing funding from non-member sources and to improve communications to members and the field. AID support and sometimes advice are appreciated, but voluminous paperwork causes headaches. The confidence level is high; nearly all concerned are optimistic about the potential for future service and are convinced that present projects do meet developmental goals. All stress the fact that CODEL is fulfilling a unique function, obviously desired by increasing numbers of organizations and individuals. There is also a conviction that Private Volunteer Organizations (PVOs), including church-related groups, provide the most direct and effective way to reach down to the poorest of the poor to provide developmental assistance. CODEL and PVOs can draw on armies of congregations and volunteers to do work which would cost millions in paid staffs.

More detailed views of the Executive Committee and staff members respectively follow, along with suggestions and recommendations for improvement (Table II-1).

Executive Committee Perspective

The Executive Committee is impressive. Many members have theological backgrounds, and others have careers in social service. The majority have worked for long periods overseas; all have devoted years to foreign mission, relief or development programs. All travel abroad periodically for the purpose of inspecting projects of particular interest to their own organizations. Nearly all attempt to visit CODEL projects when convenient. More than half the individuals or the organizations they represent were among the founders of CODEL in 1969.

In terms of their own perceptions of CODEL's operations, members of the Executive Committee, not surprisingly, believe that the committee itself plays a strong and effective role. A few admit that the committee becomes too involved in daily operations, which might better be left to the professional staff.

The committee is pleased in general with the professional staff. Although Executive Director Boyd Lowry is new, he comes from the National Council of Churches with a fine reputation; and he is already well known to many members of the Committee. Chief of Operations Barbara Magner is

Table II-1. Summary of Assessments of CODEL Effectiveness by Members of CODEL Executive Committee

Factors assessed	No. of respondents	No. of assessments		
		Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Outstanding
Inputs:				
Work of Executive Committee	12	0	8	4
Work of staff				
Sufficiency of number	12	0	12	0
Sufficiency of skills	12	1	8	3
Effectiveness of deployment	12	1	11	0
Outputs:				
United States				
Building Ecumenical network	12	0	6	6
Attracting resources				
From members	12	0	11	1
From other sources	12	8	4	0
Focus for project development	12	0	8	4
Providing information to members	12	2	10	0
Overseas:				
Building Ecumenical network	12	2	6	4
Increasing capacity of members (training)	12	0	12	0
Assisting in project development	12	1	12	0

Source: RRNA; interviews

credited with possessing the institutional memory and excellent proficiency in daily operations. The three regional coordinators, who are key to project design and implementation, are knowledgeable area-wise, technically competent, and strong advocates for their particular projects and views. Support staff is competent. Nearly all committee members feel that the staff is the right size for its present responsibilities, with one commenting that they could easily take on more projects but another suggesting that an additional professional might help build the domestic ecumenical network through improved communication.

Most committee members believe that considerable progress in building an ecumenical network in the United States has been achieved since 1969. An obvious achievement lies in present Roman Catholic-Protestant coordination. It is true that Protestants have provided a high proportion of the funding, while the Catholics operate the majority of projects. However, the balance is beginning to be rectified. There has been considerable discussion and even controversy about the imbalance in the Catholic sponsorship of projects; however, some Protestant committee members commented that the above ratios do represent an understandable division of labor given the current situation in which CODEL is working in new fields both in the United States and overseas. The CODEL coordinating relationship is described as unique by many. One member suggests that even in occasional disagreements, CODEL members, by working together, are building understanding and a network which will ultimately benefit the needy of the developing world.

In attracting resources from members, the committee feels CODEL has been reasonably successful. Although commenting on the imbalance cited above, several expressed hope that a recent contribution of \$100,000 from Maryknoll may encourage more financial participation on the part of Catholic members. The committee notes that CODEL, with the exception of the AID grant, has not been very successful in obtaining funds from non-member sources. It is recognized that foundation sources have dried up. Hope is now centered on the Advisory Committee which includes a few business executives and others who might tap corporate funds.

CODEL's reputation and prestige among member organizations as a focus for project development, according to committee members, is high and steadily increasing. CODEL is building a solid reputation for selecting good projects with few, if any, failures. Success in selecting, supporting and guiding projects exceeds what members might expect from a limited budget. CODEL has been less successful in providing a project focus for non-members, but here too committee members feel that the potential is exciting.

CODEL is moderately successful in providing information to U.S. members on developmental issues and in increasing their understanding of developmental techniques. A bi-monthly newsletter, meetings of the full board, and correspondence are methods used to inform the U.S. members. Some committee members do feel, however, that there are communication gaps; two observed that word of CODEL's good work doesn't "get down to the person in the pew." Others

feel that such depth is not necessary, but that CODEL could and should produce more graphic, dramatic informational literature. Budget limitations, affecting publication format and staff capabilities, are recognized.

The Executive Committee believes that CODEL has so far been less successful in network-building overseas, although almost all members cite examples of progress and note limitations in staff size and resources. One member observed that CODEL was endeavoring to overcome centuries of non-cooperation and credited the three regional coordinators for current progress.

As for CODEL's effectiveness in increasing the capacity of overseas participants to plan and implement good projects, committee members admitted that herein lies a difficult task. It is believed that the regional coordinators are making major efforts with varying degrees of success. Progress is most noticeable in Africa; the Far East is picking up; but Latin America presents the most resistance.

One or two questioned the wisdom of CODEL's endeavoring to train or guide field project managers through formal mechanisms such as seminars or manuals.

When asked to rate CODEL's effectiveness in choosing projects and assisting in improving the design and planning of projects, committee members agreed that the project selection process worked well. Particular credit was given to the Project Committee. The staff (particularly Ms. Magner

and the regional coordinators) were credited with patient, wise counsel during the design and planning stages. A few suggested that the procedures and format for submitting projects could be simplified. Two committee persons feel that there is weakness in follow-up procedures, and that CODEL has not yet perfected a criterion or a matrix for evaluation. However, it was admitted that few projects had yet been completed so final impact could be assessed.

All Executive Committee members commented on relations with AID. Unanimous appreciation was expressed for AID funding, particularly its timeliness. Said one member: "AID funding has given us breathing space; it has helped establish the organization necessary to do the job we know we can do." Some members had initial qualms about accepting federal funds (church vs. state) and were concerned about political motives and restrictive criteria; now all are comfortable with the relationship. Several expressed surprise at discovering AID could act out of purely humanitarian motives and could permit considerable freedom of choice and action. The majority felt that CODEL had benefitted from the relationship in technical and managerial terms, and expressed appreciation for frank, highly professional guidance and methodology; there was at least one dissent on this score. A few expressed concern over the potential danger of developing too great a dependency on AID funds. Many criticized excessive paperwork required by AID and frustration at slow payment; these same members agreed that such problems were far outweighed by benefits of the relationship.

Staff Perspective

Senior staff members also have excellent credentials. The new Executive Director, Reverend Boyd Lowry, has spent 18 years with Church World Service, 15 as part of the National Council of Churches. He served 3 years in Pakistan as a United Presbyterian fraternal worker. Chief of Operations, Barbara Magner, has the tenure in CODEL, having joined the organization in early 1971. Having served with Catholic Relief Services since 1956, Ms. Magner spent a number of years overseas working with Hungarian refugees and Vietnamese.

Father Patrick Cullen, the Regional Coordinator for Africa and a member of the Society of St. Patrick, has spent 17 years in western and northern Kenya as a missionary priest. He has had considerable experience in educational development. Father Walter H. George, the Regional Coordinator for Latin America and a member of the Redemptorist Order, worked 23 years as a missionary priest in Brazil, mainly in the Amazon region. He has done graduate work in moral theology and the ethics of development and has taken short courses in community development and agricultural extension. Dr. James T. Thomas, the Regional Coordinator for Asia, is an educator with considerable experience in the Far East. Lydia Rodriguez is a well organized and competent office manager. George Fells is regarded as a conscientious and meticulous accountant. Mrs. Elizabeth Clark Reiss, who volunteers her time to edit CODELnews, has a keen perception of the organization and its functions. Ms. Hazel Johns fills a useful role as liaison with the United Nations and

Mrs. Joyce Bartholomew contributes as a consultant, based on her experience with the United Church Board for world ministeries.

A summary of staff views about CODEL's effectiveness appears as Table II-2. As a generalization, it appears that most staff members are more project-oriented than some members of the Executive Committee, who regard ecumenical coordination as a high priority, almost an end in itself. Staff members support and work through the cooperative mechanisms, but they focus strongly on delivery of services to the ultimate recipients -- socio-economically disadvantaged people in developing countries. No member of the board forgets or rejects this objective, but some are particularly inspired with growing evidence and improving prospects for healing centuries of ecclesiastical and theological rifts through the CODEL consortium process. On balance, it would seem that both perspectives blend fairly well, as expressed in the hope of a key staff member that the organization "can give new life and hope to the poorest people overseas in a coordinated way through the CODEL formula." There is clearly a dedication and determination on the part of the staff to establish confidence on the part of the members that CODEL can select good projects, handle them professionally and capably support developmental work among the needy.

Most staff feel that the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee are very supportive, understanding and helpful. There does appear to be a growing tendency, however, for some members of the Executive Committee to

Table II-2. Summary of Assessments of CODEL Effectiveness by Member of Staff

Factors assessed	No. of respondents	No. of assessments		
		Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Outstanding
Inputs:				
Work of Executive Committee	4	0	4	0
Work of staff				
Sufficiency of number	4	1	3	0
Sufficiency of skills	4	0	4	0
Effectiveness of deployment	4	0	3	1
Outputs:				
United States				
Building Ecumenical network	4	0	3	1
Attracting resources	0	0	4	0
From members	4	0	4	0
From other sources	4	4	0	0
Focus for project development	4	1	2	1
Providing information to members	4	2	2	0
Overseas:				
Building Ecumenical network	4	0	3	1
Increasing capacity of members (training)	4	0	4	0
Assisting in project development	4	0	4	0

Source: RRNA; interviews.

become too involved in operational and administrative decisions. This is perhaps understandable because many members of the committee are senior executives in their own organizations, with years of command experience in directly related fields. A certain degree of jurisdictional overlap is not uncommon in relations between corporate and institutional boards and staffs and is, if restrained, indeed beneficial.

Senior staff officers, with one exception, believe that CODEL has a sufficient number of paid employees for the present scale of operations. Some consideration is being given to the addition of a qualified analyst with relevant overseas experience, who can help evaluate project proposals and progress. There may also be future need to have available certain specialists for specific development assignments. However, at least one staffer expressed strong opposition to deploying people to the field and supports a CODEL principle of being "non-operational in the field." Generally speaking, senior officers are satisfied with the professional skills at their disposal, although one or two relatively new staff additions will benefit from longer experience and training in the CODEL process. There is a feeling that a couple of staff positions should be reevaluated and realigned.

Aside from their views on the relative importance of the ecumenical aspect of CODEL's role, staff members believe that considerable progress is being made in building an ecumenical network in the United States. They express

pride that they have been able to construct a viable organization against tremendous odds. One described the process as "practical ecumenism - coming together to work." Particular satisfaction was expressed over the fact that numerous, rather autonomous Catholic orders and missions are now working with each other in the spirit of the CODEL consortium. The ultimate limits of collective action are recognized because there is concern that the consortium can not replace the direct support of the member field projects.

Fund raising is regarded as a critical element at this moment. Satisfaction was expressed over the level of Protestant contributions, and hope voiced that Roman Catholics would contribute more. The staff was encouraged by the Maryknoll contribution. Hope is diminishing for help from foundations, which are funding few overseas projects, so more attention is now being directed to potential business sources. Renewal of AID funding is regarded as absolutely essential. CODEL, along with its members, is watching closely for indications of possible shifts in U.S. government support to PVOs.

The staff works very hard to identify, attract, process and implement good projects, and they believe most members credit them with increasing success in this endeavor. Nevertheless, they admit that there is a wide spread in member perception and utilization of the CODEL mechanism. Large, established organizations, such as Catholic Relief Services and Church World Service, although cooperating in principal, are pretty self-sufficient. Many

smaller, less well-known organizations are sending proposals or offering support; and this is expected to increase as staff experience and skills grow. The staff recognizes a need to develop regional strategies and coherency.

Like the Executive Committee, the staff recognizes that it has been less successful in providing information to U.S. members on developmental issues and increasing their understanding of these issues. One person stated that "our counterpart organizations in the field know more about us than our members." Part of the problem is budgetary; part is time. However, the staff is determined to improve communications with members through upgrading its publications, mailings, meetings and workshops.

Some progress is being made in achieving ecumenical coordination overseas on individual projects. Headquarters staff find overseas network-building difficult to assess. A regional coordinator considers CODEL to be the only organization interested in this objective and cites a number of important examples of ecumenical efforts at the project level. However, he admits at the same time that ecumenical cooperation in development at a more general level has probably not yet been achieved to the extent envisaged.

One field coordinator emphasizes that CODEL cannot begin collaboration in developing countries where no local inclination to "sacrifice" for greater unity exists. Thus, he believes that CODEL can encourage and support the local

participants in collaboration, but does not have an initiating role.

CODEL people feel that they do provide a useful service in helping overseas participants plan and implement good projects. Considerable staff time is directed to increasing participant's capacity to identify and prepare proposals for submission to CODEL and funding organizations. One senior officer believes an even greater effort should be made to encourage participants to submit all relevant back-up information and to insure that projects are not turned down, simply for lack of data or careful analysis. A regional coordinator admits that formal training activities overseas have been minimal, but the act of coordination at the project level itself has significantly increased the capacity of several participants. Strong reservations, however, have been expressed by some members of the staff in regard to the degree in which CODEL should actually be involved in training participants through any formal mechanisms, such as field workshops or seminars. One regional coordinator believes that the potential for CODEL involvement in such training is similar to that in network-building: CODEL can support what local participants are ready to do themselves; it cannot begin such efforts entirely on its own.

The staff feel that they have been quite successful in initial selection of projects and accept the role of the Project Committee in final selection. They also think that they have been fairly effective in improving the design and planning of projects. Several agree, however, that better techniques should be developed for evaluation of projects

at various stages from initiation to implementation. With experience, and perhaps the addition of one person, the staff should steadily increase its capacity to critique proposals in a comprehensive way, although there is a commendable reluctance to adapt too formal or complicated evaluative instruments.

Source and Use of Funds

In the 12-month period ended June 30, 1977, CODEL's receipts from all sources totalled \$864,027. Of this amount, 23.8 percent (\$205,666) was from AID, 75.2 percent (\$649,342) from membership contributions and fees, and just over 1.0 percent from interest and dividends. In the same period, project grants by CODEL totalled \$558,247 (almost 65 percent of total receipts); operating expenses, including overseas efforts not specifically covered by project funding, \$289,671 (33.5 percent of total receipts); while the end-of-period balance rose by \$16,109 (almost 2 percent of receipts). CODEL's allocation of expenditures for the FY 1977 show 14 percent for administration; 20 percent for "overseas programs"; and 66 percent as project grants. This classification of operating expenses into administration and overseas programs probably provides a more accurate reflection of use of funds than the classification used in the audit report.

In the 10-month period ended June 30, 1976, the two major sources of funds contributed about the same percentages of total revenues as in the year ended June 30, 1977. Expenditures in the form of grants for specific projects were \$444,419, equivalent to 68 percent of total receipts during the 10-month period. The remaining expenditures, while primarily for administrative costs of the New York

headquarters, include several significant amounts - in both periods - that are directly attributable to overseas projects and related services.¹

USAID Development Program Grants (DPG)

Since December 1974, USAID grant funds in the amount of \$755,000 have been made available for use by CODEL for specified purposes. From the beginning, AID funds have been used to enable CODEL to develop its administrative capabilities and to provide financial assistance for certain types of projects. Initially, AID funds were used largely to cover administrative expenses. The headquarters staff of CODEL has been increased from three persons in November 1974, to eleven, largely through financial resources provided by the DPGs. The addition of the three regional coordinators has made it possible to strengthen lines of communication with the field, although this link in the network is still weak.

Budget estimates for receipts from AID and non-AID sources, and for administration and project support for the period from December 1974 through November 1977 are shown in the following tabulation:

1. Financial data for CODEL's FY 1977 and the 10-month period ended June 30, 1976, are taken from the Price-Waterhouse audit covering the two periods.

Source of Funds

<u>Budgeted for:</u>	<u>A.I.D. grants</u>	<u>Non-AID sources</u>	<u>Total funds</u>
Administrative expenses	\$505,000 (65 percent)	\$274,500 (35 percent)	\$779,500 (100 percent)
Project grants	\$250,000 <u>(24 percent)</u>	\$812,000 <u>(76 percent)</u>	1,062,000 <u>(100 percent)</u>
	\$755,000 (41 percent)	\$1,086,500 (59 percent)	\$1,841,500 (100 percent)

As of February 1, 1978, actual expenditures of USAID grant funds totalled just under \$600,000, leaving a balance of slightly more than \$155,000 on the above date. It is understood, from CODEL, that an extension of the termination date to June 30, 1978, is to be requested for utilization of the balance of AID funds. The extension will avoid a cashflow problem during the remainder of the 1978 fiscal year, by which time decisions with respect to further AID/DPG funding can be reached. Approximately \$80,000 of the remaining balance is being allocated for operating expenses; the remaining \$75,000 is to be used for project support.

USAID Operational Program Grants (OPG)

In a move to decentralize the allocation of grants to PVOs and other agencies, USAID missions have been provided with funds and authority to make limited grants in the field. CODEL has recently been negotiating three substantial OPGs totalling over \$1.2 million in Kenya and Tanzania. Where the OPG programs are available, an opportunity exists for greatly expanding CODEL financial assistance to projects.

At the same time, the OPG will pose a serious strain on the highly centralized (in New York) administrative capabilities of CODEL, as presently organized.

Regional and Sectoral Distribution of CODEL Project Funding

Since the establishment of CODEL, 59 percent of the funds for projects provided by CODEL have been for projects in Africa, chiefly in Kenya and Tanzania. An additional 26 percent of project funding has been in Latin America largely in Brazil. (See Appendix C.) While the target populations of CODEL exist in all countries and on all continents, it is noted that the countries where major allocations have been concentrated are relatively better off - in terms of economic conditions and the level of social services - than are many of the countries in which CODEL has, so far, provided little or no project support.

An analysis by sector indicates that projects in "Agriculture" and in "Medicine" (including health) have each received more than a third of the funds. "Community Development" has received another 23 percent. While these designations indicate the general pattern of CODEL's concentration, the categorizations are not mutually exclusive in many instances. For example, the Duverge Food and Nutrition Project in the Dominican Republic is listed under "Agriculture"; the Education for Rural Health and Nutrition in Bolivia is designated as "Medicine". Both of these projects focus on community organization and development to achieve their purposes.

III. EVALUATION OF CODEL WORK IN AFRICA

Background

The CODEL/Africa evaluation is based upon a field trip to Kenya and Tanzania made by Father Patrick Cullen, CODEL Regional Coordinator for Africa, and Roger W. Manring, of RRNA. The trip lasted approximately three weeks between January 13, 1978 and February 4, 1978. The trip provided an occasion to interview a wide range of individuals familiar with CODEL's Africa program, many of them persons involved in African projects directly assisted by CODEL over the last three years. A list of persons interviewed is presented in Appendix A, while projects reviewed are listed in Appendix B. Interviews were loosely structured around an "Agenda for Field Interviews" prepared by RRNA and reviewed by Mr. Steve Bergen of USAID Washington, prior to departure for Africa. The agenda sought to explore the nature of CODEL-supported projects in relation to its own criteria; the nature and usefulness of CODEL's contribution to those projects; and generally CODEL's progress in stimulating cooperation in socioeconomic developmental activities among its member organizations in Africa. These interviews, supplemented by a reading of CODEL reports and project documents, and extensive discussions with Father Cullen throughout the field trip, form the basis for the evaluation report which follows.

Most interviews were conducted according to the following format: Father Cullen and Mr. Manring opened joint discussions with interviewees to explain the nature of the evaluation and Mr. Manring's role; Father Cullen then withdrew and left Mr. Manring to conduct the interview alone. Mr. Manring normally later discussed the major points made in each interview with Father Cullen, and sought his comment on certain issues raised. In addition, Father Cullen and Mr. Manring frankly and informally discussed CODEL's goals, programs, and problems more or less continuously throughout the field trip, and together reviewed the draft narrative outline of the present field report prepared by Mr. Manring. The evaluation was in this sense then the "collaborative" exercise mandated by USAID's terms of reference for the RRNA evaluation team.

General Observations on CODEL

The Organization

CODEL is a consortium of voluntary organizations active in development in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Almost all of CODEL's Africa members are Catholic or Protestant mission-sending organizations whose individual missionaries are engaged, in addition to religious activities, in development projects in agriculture, health, or community organization in some form. Formally CODEL's membership is limited to American organizations or to the U.S. chapters of mission-sending societies founded elsewhere, usually in Europe. In Africa any mission is considered a CODEL member if the U.S. chapter of its sponsoring organization has secured

CODEL membership. Thirty-eight mission-sending organizations are members of CODEL at present. Most of these, or often their European parent organizations, have established one or more missions in at least one African country.

In addition, in Africa CODEL has established relationships with several local religious organizations which are "counterparts" to its own membership. Such counterparts include national or regional (diocesan) religious institutions in various African countries. Most of these relationships focus upon CODEL's funding of projects undertaken by the indigenous bodies, often, but not always, in cooperation with the field missions representing CODEL's own members.

In Africa, as elsewhere, CODEL prefers to be "non-operational in the field." This means first of all that CODEL depends upon its member organizations in the field and counterparts to take the major responsibility for planning and executing the projects CODEL supports financially. It also means that CODEL has decided not to establish Africa field offices or any kind of full-time representation in Africa. Rather it prefers to limit its on-site operations to the occasional field trips of its regional coordinator, and generally to follow the "principle of subsidiarity" in which individuals from existing member organizations in the field are asked to act for CODEL whenever the need arises. The desire to minimize CODEL overhead and to emphasize in practice that CODEL "is the sum of its members" is the reason CODEL has chosen this low profile approach.

CODEL sees itself as a "resource facility" which was organized to provide its member organizations in the field "services supportive of more effective development work."¹ Among services CODEL wishes to render its members are:

- Financial assistance for member projects which meet CODEL's own criteria for effective developmental efforts;
- Programming assistance, including training activities, to improve member capabilities in skills of project planning, implementation and evaluation;
- "Network-building" assistance, by stimulating its separate members to work together in particular at the project level, but also to share resources, generally, especially technical expertise and information in areas of common developmental interest;
- Technical (substantive) assistance in defining more effective approaches to developmental problems in health, agriculture and other fields, coupled with funding assistance for these innovative efforts as demonstration projects.

1. CODEL, 1977 Annual Report, p. 2

CODEL's Impact

Based upon general impressions arising from the African field trip, CODEL has been an effective provider of financial resources for its members' development projects. Thus far it has not, however, been able to provide its members, at least in a formal sense originally envisaged by its founders, the same measure of assistance in non-financial matters such as project design, or substantive analysis of development issues. However, for CODEL to aspire to play a formal role as a source of technical and substantive assistance to its members in Africa may have been unrealistic to begin with, given the nature of its membership, the nature of its own operation, and the existence already of some strong development-oriented local church institutions in the field.

Even more fundamentally, because of its ability to generate financial resources and because of its preference for cooperative and ecumenical efforts, CODEL's major real achievement in Africa to date has been to sensitize separate missionary groups active in development in the field to the opportunities to work together. It is this form of "coordination in development" which in practice emerges as CODEL's fundamental goal and reason for being. In the view of CODEL's regional coordinator for Africa, all else -- upgrading member capabilities and creating resource networks -- are seen as related benefits flowing from such "coordination." CODEL's founders made the assumption, probably correctly, that a project which integrates the skills and energies of separate missionary groups in developmental activities of

overlapping interest is by definition a more effective project. Through "coordination in development" at the project level, member capabilities are enhanced and the basic links of a resource network are forged.

USAID Support for CODEL

USAID's support for CODEL has centered upon the three-year \$755,000 Development Program Grant (DPG) it awarded to the organization for the period November 1974 through November 1977. USAID's goal in awarding the DPG to CODEL is understood to have been to enhance CODEL's capabilities to develop and manage its own program, including the sponsorship of projects judged to be "good" by its own criteria. In CODEL's African program, the DPG provides funding for the salary, travel and all other overhead costs of CODEL's regional coordinator for Africa, working out of the organization's New York Office. In addition, a portion of the DPG has been earmarked to fund (with USAID approval) specific projects which CODEL designates as demonstrations of the effectiveness of CODEL's approach and project criteria in developmental work. As of February 1978, about \$120,000 in USAID project funds have been applied to CODEL African projects out of a total of \$820,000 actually approved by CODEL for African projects funding during the DPG period (excluding USAID Operational Program Grant funding). This sum includes \$70,000 for the planning and pilot stages for a Hanang, Tanzania Village Health Scheme; \$1,400 for a Leadership Training Center in Arusha, Tanzania; about \$25,000 for health teacher training as part of the pilot phase of a Primary Health Care scheme in the southern Sudan; and \$23,000 for a Kitui Primary Health Care Project. (In the Hanang and Kitui projects, not all these amounts have been spent; the figures indicate the total of contracts with CODEL, of which a portion of the total remains to be paid.)

Recently, CODEL has also received direct funding for two new individual African projects in the form of Operational Program Grants (OPGs). In each case CODEL is serving as the sponsor and project holder of USAID funds for projects to be implemented by its members and other organizations. The two projects are the fully operational Hanang, Tanzania Ujamaa Village Health Scheme, and the Tanzania Cancer Control Program. Together both OPGs will amount to about \$837,000, in total running from December 1, 1977. CODEL is also about to request OPG support of about \$381,000 from the USAID Mission Kenya for the operational phrase of a Kitui, Kenya Primary Health Care Programme, and is a participant in a fourth health care project proposed by the African Medical and Research Foundation (AMREF) for OPG funding for the southern Sudan.

CODEL also was active in generating USAID funding for another project, in Kananga, Zaire. In this instance, CODEL's regional coordinator for Africa brought the local Catholic diocese together with two foreign missionary efforts to formulate an integrated rural development project composed of agricultural extension, health care development and rural works (construction of a bridge) for presentation to the USAID Mission Zaire for funding. It was originally planned that the project would be proposed for OPG support, with CODEL as project holder; and in fact CODEL actually completed the draft of an OPG request. Eventually, however, participants were advised that the project could be funded more expeditiously through USAID's local currency account than in an OPG format. This course of action was agreed upon by all concerned although it meant that CODEL withdrew from any formal role in the project.

Apart from the funding of certain CODEL projects, USAID country missions reportedly have not had much substantive contact with CODEL's African program or with its members in the field. Over most of the period of the DPG, such contacts have been limited mainly to discussions in general terms between mission staff and the CODEL Africa regional coordinator regarding the overall nature of CODEL's program and objectives, or more frequently "protocol" visits in which the regional coordinator on field trip has informed the missions of his itinerary and reported on general activities. Mission staff interviewed in both Kenya and Tanzania seemed to agree that CODEL's regional coordinator has been more diligent than most PVO representatives in keeping in touch with the local USAID personnel. For his part, the CODEL Africa regional coordinator would like to increase contacts with USAID, especially at a working level in the context of project development.

With the advent of the OPG funding mode, at least in Tanzania and Kenya, the missions and CODEL have begun to have greater occasion to come together from time to time on specific issues connected with projects CODEL considers candidates for OPG support. These contacts have not been extensive and have not involved field visits by mission staff to potential project sites; they have not regularly involved individual missionaries from CODEL member organizations, other than the CODEL regional coordinator himself. Consequently, neither the Tanzania nor the Kenya USAID mission staff interviewed indicated enough knowledge of CODEL to render any kind of an opinion on its local effectiveness to date. Both believed that with the availability of OPG funding, ties

with CODEL will expand. One USAID representative interviewed suggested that more contact -- especially early in the project development stage -- between the mission's staff and CODEL members in the field could be very helpful to the mission in understanding CODEL's grass-roots approach to developmental issues, and in appraising future CODEL project proposals. It was also suggested that while a greater measure of technical consultation during project formulation by CODEL with selected USAID personnel in matters of project design, content and budget could be useful to all concerned, present mission workloads and procedures clearly limit the kind of participation that could be expected of mission staff.

On the other hand, many of CODEL's members (at least in the sample interviewed) presently prefer to keep contacts with USAID at a minimum. In a handful of cases this might also include a refusal to use USAID funds for member projects. The root of this position would appear to be a feeling that the intentions of foreign government funding for development in general and USAID funding in particular are suspect, especially for missionary efforts which are to be strictly "people-oriented" and above politics. In addition, several individual missionaries interviewed among CODEL's members indicated that the mechanics of USAID funding, including the project analysis procedures (notably the logical framework approach), were overly abstract and "bureaucratic" in relation to the kind of human needs that missionary projects are meant to serve. Thus, while both USAID staff and the CODEL regional coordinator may generally favor expanding working contacts, the reluctance of many of the individual missionaries among CODEL's members in the field may slow the process.

Evaluation of CODEL's Inputs

Level of Contact with Field Members

CODEL's member missionaries in East Africa, and in particular those assigned in Kenya and Tanzania, have been the major focus of attention in CODEL's African program. Of 41 active CODEL projects (funded or pending) sponsored by member organization missionaries, all but seven have been located in East Africa¹ and 24 have been located in Kenya and Tanzania alone. CODEL's Kenya/Tanzania concentration in Africa reflects the background of its Africa regional coordinator, Rev. Partick Cullen, who spent 17 years as a missionary priest in Kenya between 1952 and 1969 and whose organization, the Society of St. Patrick, continues to be active in that area.

Contact with field members in Africa has been maintained by correspondence, by field trips of the regional coordinator, and by visits from the field members to the New York office of CODEL. Over the three years of DPG support for CODEL Father Cullen has made five major multi-country visits in Africa as well as two project-specific visits in connection with development of the Hanang, Tanzania Health Scheme. The major trips provided an occasion to introduce CODEL to field missionaries of its member organizations, to counterparts, to USAID missions and to government agencies. Father Cullen also used these trips to visit staff of potential and ongoing CODEL-supported projects. For example, taking the fifteen projects reviewed in the course of the Africa field evaluation as a sample, prior to the present evaluation trip, Father Cullen

1. Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia, Sudan, Malawi and Zambia.

had met personally at least once with missionary or African staff involved in each of the projects, and in many cases had visited project sites. The country itineraries and approximate dates of Father Cullen's field trips between 1975 and 1977 are as follows:

<u>Approximate Dates</u>	<u>Countries Included</u>
May-July 1975 (70 days)	- Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Malawi, Zaire, Nigeria
March-April, 1976 (40 days)	- Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Malawi, Zaire, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Zambia
August-September 1976 (20 days)	- Kenya, Tanzania
January, 1977 (20 days)	- Kenya, Tanzania, Zaire, Sudan
July-September, 1977 (70 days)	- Kenya, Tanzania, Zaire, Sudan

Field contacts between CODEL member field missionaries in Africa and CODEL's staff other than its regional coordinator appear to have been limited. Apparently in a strictly CODEL capacity only Dr. Alfred Bartholomew of the Executive Committee has met with representatives of CODEL members in the field and counterparts, during a trip to Nairobi, Kenya in April 1975. In addition, on two occasions members of CODEL's accounting staff have met in the field with member missionaries in connection with project financing, notably the Hanang, Tanzania Health Scheme. However, various persons working with projects in Africa frequently visit the CODEL offices in New York. The number of such visits has reportedly been about 50 per year.

The CODEL New York staff also maintains contacts with members' missionaries in Africa through regular correspondence. In addition to the bimonthly CODELnews a general information newsletter, most correspondence revolves around specific

project applications. Initial project requests from missionaries in the field are normally channeled to CODEL in New York through the U.S. hierarchy of a field missionary's own organization. Subsequent communication regarding projects is often conducted directly between the CODEL staff and the field missionary with copies to his/her organization's U.S. authorities. All field missionaries and counterpart staff interviewed indicated that CODEL's promptness and attention to correspondence has been satisfactory; a few found it superior to most other private outside organizations with which they had dealt.

In general, based on the interviews of the field evaluation, CODEL's members and counterparts in Africa appear to be satisfied with the level and mode of contacts CODEL has attempted to maintain. Many individuals also specified that Father Cullen's background and understanding of grass-roots development problems made him a particularly effective representative of CODEL in the field.

Nature of CODEL Inputs

CODEL's founders envisaged that the organization could provide assistance to members in project financing; in programming, including training in project planning, implementation and evaluation; in technical analysis of substantive issues in agriculture, health and community organization for member projects; and in network-building activities.

Based on examination of the roughly 15 projects reviewed in the CODEL African Evaluation as well as discussions with the regional coordinator on others, it is apparent that CODEL's major contribution to its members developmental activities has been in the area of financial assistance to projects. To a certain extent, some members have also benefited from some project programming assistance from CODEL. This assistance has, however, been provided largely in the form of informal discussions and project-related dialogue with members on the part of the CODEL Africa coordinator, rather than in the context of formal training activities. Technical assistance to members in substantive areas such as agriculture or health development has been rather limited. Finally, thus far CODEL's network-building activities have focused upon fostering ecumenical efforts in certain projects, plus conducting rounds of meetings and visits to members in the field to explain the CODEL approach to development. Each of these CODEL inputs is discussed below in greater detail.

Financial Assistance

To date CODEL's most clear-cut role in supporting the developmental activities of its members in Africa has been the provision of financial assistance to selected development projects. All individuals interviewed in the field belonging to CODEL's member organizations regard project funding to be CODEL's primary purpose. Most recognize CODEL's preference for projects of an ecumenical nature in providing financial assistance. Few are aware, or choose to recognize, CODEL's

desire to play an explicit role in the non-financial substantive side of project development as well. In this sense, except for CODEL's emphasis on ecumenical cooperation in development work, it appears that many of CODEL's member missionaries look to CODEL primarily as one of a range of potential outside funding sources, of which others are MISEREOR (Germany), CEBEMO (Holland) and Trocaire (Ireland).

While CODEL operates on a smaller scale than many other religious funding organizations active in Africa, its financial inputs to projects have not been insignificant. During the DPG period CODEL has had a role in supporting 39 development projects in Africa.¹ The total cost of these projects has been nearly \$2.67 million. Authorized CODEL funding for these projects amounts to about \$1.66 million, or over 60 percent of total project costs. This figure includes however about \$837,000 in public funds recently awarded to CODEL by USAID in Tanzania in the form of Operational Program Grants (OPG) to support health sector projects. The balance of project funding, about \$1 million, equals the value of local contributions plus funding from other outside overseas sources.

In general in Africa CODEL prefers to fund projects in which its contribution is the major financial input, other than local shares. Although there are notable exceptions, in most of its projects CODEL has been the dominant funding source. One reason that this has been possible is that the bulk of CODEL's individual projects in Africa have been

1. CODEL has made a financial input in 38 of these projects. For the one remaining project -- Kananga Integrated Rural Development, Zaire -- CODEL has a role in initially bringing project participants together, but the project was eventually funded independently of CODEL, from USAID local currency resources.

relatively small in dollar value. Twenty-nine of its 39 Africa projects presently funded have had a total cost of less than \$50,000 and 11 have run less than \$10,000:

Table III-1. Size of CODEL Projects in Africa, by Dollar Value

<u>Number of projects</u>	<u>Cost</u>
11	less than \$10,000
18	\$10,000 - \$49,999
6	\$50,000 - \$99,999
3	\$100,000 - \$500,000
1	over \$500,000

Source: "Financial Analysis of Current CODEL Project Listing, Attachment D," January 1978.

For Africa, CODEL has expressed preference for funding staff and services, compared with projects which consist only of new buildings and equipment. In practice, it appears that there is no clear pattern in CODEL financing of members' projects. CODEL has funded capital construction and equipment purchases as frequently as it has funded staff salaries, expendable materials or other operating costs.

CODEL's members in the field seem to consider the organization's financial procedures and requirements justified and reasonably efficient. For most projects, accountability is maintained through quarterly financial reports; for the recent Tanzania OPG projects, CODEL's financial office has devised special bookkeeping systems for use of the field staff. Such inefficiencies as do exist in CODEL project-

related financial procedures are largely due to poor communications between New York and member missionaries in rural Africa, as well as lax practices by banks in the field which have slowed transmittals of funds.

Overall, much of CODEL's usefulness thus far as a funding organization in Africa has been its capacity to identify and channel resources to smaller projects which might otherwise be overlooked by larger outside agencies. Given USAID's recent establishment of the OPG funding, CODEL has already begun to increase its attention to larger project funding opportunities. If CODEL's two present Tanzania OPGs and its prospective Kenya OPG are an indication, CODEL can serve as a valuable intermediary in targeting USAID funds to the grass-roots level, as well as a force to stimulate field missionaries of its member organizations to apply their expertise in development on a larger scale than heretofore.

Programming Assistance

Project Development. Where CODEL has had an opportunity to assist its Africa member organizations in project planning its regional coordinator has been quick to do so. These opportunities have not come in any formal requests from members for project planning assistance nor in the form of training seminars or workshops on planning techniques. Rather CODEL's influence in planning and project formulation has been exerted mostly in terms of assisting its members in developing project proposals.

CODEL's Africa regional coordinator is the organization's point of contact with its field members in Africa. Members' requests for project funding come initially to him, and it is his responsibility to draft project applications, including his own recommendation, for presentation to the CODEL Projects Committee. Much of his work has centered upon dialogue with members through field visits and correspondence to encourage and to develop project proposals. Since he is strategically placed in CODEL's own internal project approval mechanisms he is able to press members for more information and sharper analysis in formulating project requests, to the ultimate benefit of project planning. Additionally, in pre-project discussions with members in the field he is also in a position to make suggestions on conceptual issues in the interest of designing project proposals which conform more closely to CODEL's own criteria for "good" projects. In about seven of the 15 projects reviewed in the evaluation there is evidence that CODEL has had impact in this respect.

It is in formulating projects for OPG support that CODEL appears to have had the greatest latitude to play this informal role in project development. CODEL's members in the field seem to be more prepared to involve CODEL in project development in the OPG context, since in such projects CODEL acts as actual project holder, and is responsible for satisfying USAID requirements and procedures. Accordingly, in two of its current active OPG projects¹ CODEL has, through a private consultant, been a full partner with its field members in designing project evaluation and monitoring components, and has had an important part in

1. Kitui, Kenya (proposed), Hanang, Tanzania (underway).

preparation of project budgets. Further, in its third OPG (Tanzania, Cancer Control) there is no doubt that CODEL has had an impact on project planning and that its influence has led to a recasting of the original project design to incorporate a rural outreach orientation.

Among CODEL's members it is interesting to note that there is little acknowledgement of even the informal role that CODEL has had in project development, even among members involved in OPG projects. Most individuals interviewed believed that there is little that any "outside" organization can contribute to their efforts in the way of planning or analytical assistance since it is the missionaries themselves who are "on the spot" -- sometimes for many years -- and "know the problems." Thus, CODEL's few attempts to offer formal assistance in planning and project development methodology have been largely unworkable. Such offers were rebuffed immediately in Kenya where the possibility of CODEL planning workshops was informally proposed in 1975. The regional coordinator was told that indigenous institutions existed (Kenya Catholic Secretariat and National Christian Council of Kenya) which had their own and satisfactory project design systems. In Tanzania a seminar was conducted by the regional coordinator in Arusha in 1975, in which an attempt was made to introduce a CODEL approach to planning based on the logical framework, but this has apparently had little acceptance among members in project development since.

For the most part field missionaries interviewed rejected the motion that CODEL or any organization should even attempt to introduce its own planning systems from the

outside, though some conceded that there may be room for finer analysis and greater precision in some missionary project development efforts. Thus CODEL's input to the project planning of its members is likely to continue to be an informal one, centering on the regional coordinator's opportunities to discuss project proposals with members and to offer advice in a low-key way.

Project Management and Evaluation. Given its "non-operational" status in the field, CODEL is in a poor position to assist its members in implementation or management of projects on any continuing basis. In fact, although the regional coordinator is knowledgeable in a general way about the evolution of projects CODEL has assisted, he has made little apparent attempt to involve himself in the implementation or management of a project, even in an advisory capacity, once funding from CODEL has been approved. Further, in the one case in which CODEL has sought to help in the overall management of a project -- planning and pilot phases of the Hanang, Tanzania Ujamaa Village Health Scheme -- the tenuous lines of communication between New York and the field have demonstrated the limitations of its capacity to offer assistance.

In the matter of project evaluation, in Africa CODEL has made some attempt to encourage structured evaluation procedures among its project holders. In a minority of its projects, some interest in evaluation and indicators of project effectiveness has existed independently of CODEL. The staff of the Arusha Leadership Training Center, for example, has developed a regular schedule of formal analyses

and evaluations of activities on its own, and some project proposals to CODEL have featured baseline surveys to generate data to measure future impact. But among CODEL project holders generally, the practice of formal evaluation activities is not well established or entirely accepted.

Where CODEL has been able to make a contribution, it has been in the form of a mid-term evaluation report of four questions to be filled out by the project holder, and a similar form to be completed at the end of the project. Questions deal with the adequacy of inputs, effectiveness of original projects planning, evidence of project success, and indicators that project beneficiaries consider the project worthwhile and their own responsibility. While only a handful of responses were available for review during the African field trip, there is some indication that the CODEL-prepared forms prompted some critical analysis on the part of a few project holders who filled them out.

As mentioned above CODEL has also pushed for the incorporation of detailed monitoring and evaluation systems in the design of both its proposed Kitui, Kenya and actual Hanang, Tanzania OPG-supported health projects. In general, CODEL supports the need for evaluation systems, but the real impetus for development of formal evaluation components in these two health projects appears to have been a desire to meet USAID OPG requirements. For both projects CODEL engaged the services of a private consultant who is a specialist in project evaluation. The field missionary staff who are to actually implement each of these projects readily acknowl-

edge the consultant's expertise and personal contribution, but some are critical of CODEL's readiness to finance relatively high cost evaluation activities and thus divert resources from what they see as more immediate "human needs."

While CODEL has therefore begun to make an effort to equip its members engaged in African projects to more systematically evaluate their activities, it has met strong resistance in many instances. This resistance derives from a feeling in some quarters that to evaluate projects through formal evaluation systems is unnecessary, since the people in the field "know what is working." Others see evaluation systems as more an instrument of control for outside funding agencies than as a benefit to their own work. In addition among some of the missionaries interviewed there seems to be an undercurrent of feeling that because missionary efforts are unselfish and good in themselves, any attempt to evaluate them -- especially through a system designed by outsiders -- is unjustified.

Technical Assistance

CODEL has not had much occasion to provide assistance to its members in the way of technical expertise in agriculture, rural public health, or other substantive areas. For one thing CODEL's regular headquarters staff are not technicians or specialists in technical disciplines. The organization has however occasionally funded individual specialist services for its members. For example in one instance CODEL did meet the expense of hiring a specialist in product design and marketing for cottage industry development, although the

individual in question was identified and recruited by national church institutions in Kenya. And more recently CODEL has funded part of the services of a trained medical illustrator, recruited from among its members, to support activities of the African Medical and Research Foundation.

In a few cases CODEL has been able to tap the expertise of an individual belonging to one of its members in the field for the benefit of other member organizations. Notably, a project designed by Sister Marita Malone, M.D., an expert in rural health development who belongs to one of CODEL's members in Kenya, has been used as a guide in formulating the proposed Kitui, Kenya Primary Health Care Program which is to be implemented by representatives of other CODEL member organizations. Dr. Malone has also been called upon to play a continuing advisory role in the Kitui project. Following this example, since many of the individual missionaries belonging to CODEL's members throughout Africa have had long experience in aspects of agricultural development, health care, rural public works and other subjects, CODEL clearly has a role to play in making such expertise more widely known and accessible among its members. Technical conferences sponsored by CODEL, or perhaps establishing the practice of enabling highly experienced individuals among CODEL's members in the field to analyze and advise upon other members' development projects, might be useful approaches to achieving this end, but neither has been widely tested as yet.

Network-Building

CODEL's network-building activities in Africa have thus far been confined largely to encouraging cooperation among separate missionary groups in any project situation where this appears feasible. The organization's access to financial resources for project funding, coupled with its widely recognized preference for ecumenical efforts, have been CODEL's major network-building tools.

In perhaps five of the 15 projects reviewed for the Africa field evaluation, some measure of practical "coordination in development" between two or more CODEL members is discernible. While CODEL may not be able to claim full credit for stimulating this coordination since in several project areas some desire for inter-church cooperation predates CODEL in the field, at the very least it can be said that CODEL has reinforced the spirit of coordination. And even in many of those projects where no real coordination in development has been achieved, it is probably fair to say that for one reason or another to do so has been impractical, and that CODEL's network-building message has still been strongly communicated to project holders. All of the missionaries interviewed representing CODEL's members in the field are aware of the organization's emphasis on ecumenical network-building, even if such individuals do not fully identify themselves as part of the network.

Efforts to build networks to share resources beyond the kind of coordination that can be achieved at the project level have only just begun. These have been pretty much

limited to the initial rounds of meetings and seminars CODEL's regional coordinator called in his first field trips to Africa to introduce the CODEL approach and to make the organizations more aware of each others' existence and activities.

Evaluation of CODEL's Outputs

CODEL Supported Projects

Sector and Location

In Africa, the development projects implemented by CODEL's members in which CODEL has had a supporting role are the most visible evidence of the organization's impact. CODEL-supported projects in Africa range from small, relatively straightforward capital projects to large, ambitious human development programs. In the sample of 15 projects directly reviewed for the present Field Evaluation, examples ranged from construction of 6 cattle dips in Musoma, Tanzania (Maryknoll Fathers) to organization and implementation of a primary health care scheme in the Catholic Diocese of Kitui, Kenya (Holy Rosary Sisters, Sisters of Mercy, and Society of St. Patrick) to be proposed for OPG funding to the USAID Mission Kenya.

As of January 1978, CODEL had supported a total of 39 projects¹ in Africa over the three year period of 1975 through 1977. According to CODEL's own classification, most of the projects it chose to support were in agriculture, with projects designated as community development (including

1. A CODEL financial contribution had been made to all but one project, the Kananga, Zaire Integrated Rural Development effort, in which CODEL had a planning role; see above p. 28.

community infrastructure), health and education (including non-formal education and vocational training) following in that order. In terms of project size measured by total dollar cost of projects (CODEL funding plus value of all other contributions) the eight health projects in which CODEL has had a supporting role accounted for more than half the total effort represented by all 39 projects in which CODEL was involved (\$1.48 million or 55 percent of total value of \$2.67 million of all 39 projects).

Table III-2. Current CODEL African Projects, by Sector and Total Value

Sector	Number Projects	Total project value
Agriculture	17	\$910,715 ¹
Community development	10	167,758
Health	4	1,477,288 ²
Education	8	118,861
Total	39	\$2,674,622

1. Includes the cost of the Kananga, Zaire Integrated Rural Development Project, which has a total cost of over \$600,000.

2. Includes OPG support valued at about \$837,000 for the Hanang, Tanzania Ujamaa Village Health Care Scheme and the Tanzania Cancer Control Project. Source: "Financial Analysis of Current CODEL Project Listing, Attachment C," January 1978.

While CODEL's members have missionaries working in countries throughout the African continent most of the projects CODEL has chosen to support are in Kenya and Tanzania:

Current CODEL Africa Projects, by Location

<u>Country</u>	<u>Number Projects</u>
Cameroon	1
Ethiopia	1
Ghana	1
Kenya	16
Liberia	1
Malawi	1
Nigeria	1
Sudan	4
Tanzania	8
Uganda	3
Zaire	1
Zambia	<u>1</u>
Total	39

Source: "Financial Analysis of Current CODEL Project Listing, Attachment F," January 1978

As explained above, this geographical concentration reflects the special familiarity of Father Cullen, the CODEL regional coordinator, with the Kenya-Tanzania region.

Project Criteria

To guide its members in project planning, CODEL has formulated a set of six principles of development assistance. These principles are CODEL's criteria for "good" development

projects, and are meant to be the standard against which member organizations' request for project funding are to be measured. Briefly stated, CODEL-supported projects should:

- . Assist the socio-economically disadvantaged to participate more fully in the economic and social life of their communities;
- . Meet priority needs and be implemented in cooperation with those affected;
- . Ultimately become the full responsibility (including financially) of the community served;
- . Provide training where necessary to insure effective participation of local personnel;
- . Demonstrate positive relationships with other organizations involved in development, both government and private;
- . Focus upon socio-economic issues as opposed to proselytizing.

All of the 15 projects directly reviewed in the African field trip appear to conform more or less closely with the above criteria. The following Table III-3 summarizes the evaluator's rough impressions of the correspondence between the projects and CODEL criteria.

Table III-3. Performance Relative to CODEL Guidelines
in African Projects Visited during Evaluations

CODEL criteria for projects	Performance		
	Unsatis- factory	Satis- factory	Out- standing
Assist socio-economically disadvantaged to participate more fully	0	2	13
Design meets priority needs and can be implemented in cooperation with those affected:			
priority needs	0	6	9
cooperative effort	0	6	9
Insure projects become a community responsibility (including financially)	0	11	4
Training insures partici- pation of local personnel and fosters self-deter- mination	0	7	8
Positive relationships with other organizations in- volved in development	0	9	6
Absence of proselytizing	0	8	7

Source: RRNA; ratings based on field visits.

Grass-Roots Focus

CODEL prides itself in its ability to reach people at their "grass-roots." It can do so because it works through its member organizations, and its members have established long-term and direct relationships with the communities they serve. Accordingly, CODEL projects genuinely do appear to respond directly to development needs among the rural poor. agricultural training and cooperative development for small farmers; rural health promotion and village health care; establishment of village water systems; and human development efforts such as adult literacy.

The question of who initially articulates these development needs is not a clear-cut one. In many cases it appears that the "need" for a project emerges as the result of dialogue between missionaries and the communities they serve. But since all projects -- especially in Kenya and Tanzania -- must be cleared with official local level planning bodies, it is reasonable to assume that on that basis CODEL projects "fit" with local development priorities. Moreover, one person interviewed, an African clergyman in a CODEL counterpart organization, suggested that in his experience CODEL's emphasis upon community priorities and participation was helping to reverse a trend in which expatriate missionaries with their access to overseas resources were often disposed to launch projects which they felt were good for their communities, but without much consultation with the people concerned.

Community Participation

Community involvement in projects -- as opposed to communities becoming passive beneficiaries of project services -- also generally appears to be genuine. Most projects reviewed consciously build upon local institutions, depending upon indigenous parish or village level bodies to organize, give direction and implement project activities. The Kokise Kenya Village Agricultural Polytechnic Project which is organized and run entirely by village and local church members, and which involves the fathers of Polytechnic students in agricultural training activities is one outstanding example. The Hanang, Tanzania, Ujamaa Village Health Scheme, a health promotion effort in which local village level health workers are selected by and function through Ujamaa village institutions is another. Further, most of the projects reviewed place local individuals in leadership positions in the implementation of project activities. This appears to have been most successful in relatively less technical projects, particularly in non-health fields. Even in relatively technical projects there is evidence of efforts to call upon technically qualified local government officials to exercise overall leadership responsibility.

In addition many of the CODEL-supported projects reviewed consciously strive to provide opportunities to foster both community participation and local leadership. In some projects, this purpose is primary and explicit. The CODEL-supported Arusha, Tanzania Leadership Training Center, for example, sponsors seminars and workshops to assist

village groups in organizing themselves to identify and deal with their own village-level development problems. But others are expressly designed to offer informal training opportunities for community participation and leadership development in the context of other activities. Outstanding examples are the Meru, Kenya Interchurch Seed Project, which involves farmers in decisions as to what kinds of cropping programs are to be offered, and how and by whom extension activities should be executed; and the Kalokol, Kenya Adult education project which approaches adult literacy through psycho-socio-techniques that focus on community development needs.

Community Responsibility for Projects

All CODEL projects reviewed incorporated some local resource contribution toward capital and operating costs, either in cash or in kind. Whether the communities benefiting from CODEL projects will eventually become fully responsible for them -- financially and otherwise -- is somewhat problematic. In all cases there appears to be reasonable intention that projects will ultimately become a full responsibility of the community. But whether or not this will actually follow a "limited and prescribed period of outside support"¹ varies greatly with the circumstances of each community.

In a few cases the local government authority has either already taken responsibility for keeping projects going or has committed itself to do so within a fixed period

1. CODEL Principles of Development Assistance, number 3.

of time. The Musoma, Tanzania Cattle Dips project which has been absorbed into a government animal health program, and the Iramba, Tanzania Ujamaa Village Water Supply project for which the Regional Ministry of Water has already taken full responsibility are examples of the first case. The Tanzania Cancer Control project, where the National Ministry of Health has guaranteed to take on full responsibility within five years, is an example of the latter case. But in other projects reviewed, notably those in arid northern Kenya, it is likely that any development effort will not be able to depend on some measure of outside support for a long time. And it should also be recognized that many CODEL projects are themselves related to larger, on-going programs which will continue to attract a flow of overseas resources directly from missionary and charitable organizations so that the boundaries of self-sufficiency are basically difficult to define.

Coordination with Other Programs and Agencies

Among the projects reviewed, coordination of CODEL-supported efforts with broader development activities is impressive, particularly in regards to government development programs. An endorsement of proposed projects by government officials concerned is a part of CODEL's consideration of project requests. But at an even more practical level most CODEL projects reviewed for Kenya and Tanzania appeared not only to depend upon a relationship of mutual support with existing government efforts, but also to reflect and flow from the development priorities determined by the local-level development committees that are an integral

part of the development planning process in those countries. This integration may be facilitated in part because of the fact that many of the field missionaries interviewed among CODEL members sit as official participants in district or regional development committees. Additionally, however, it is also due to CODEL's policy in Africa to consider government priorities and requirements. The CODEL sponsored Hanang, Tanzania Ujamaa Village Health Scheme is an outstanding working example of this policy: the project reportedly represents one of the first attempts by a foreign church-related organization to structure a project entirely within the Ujamaa Village framework that is the Tanzanian Government's foundation for rural development.

In CODEL projects working relationships among private organizations in the field -- almost all of these church organizations -- are also generally positive. Some projects reviewed are indeed truly ecumenical undertakings in the practical sense of "coordination in development." The Meru Interchurch Seed Project, the Kalokol Adult Education Project and the Kokise Village Polytechnic are notable for fostering the close practical relationships among different church organizations that CODEL wishes to stimulate in development work.

This kind of coordination has not been achieved in all projects, however, though an absence of inter-group cooperation does not appear to have necessarily emerged by design. In some regions, there has apparently been little overlap in development activities among separate church organizations.

In other situations the foreign missionary groups which operate side by side with CODEL members are more evangelical than development-oriented, so that no ground for coordination exists. Consequently in some CODEL projects ecumenical cooperation is present in name only in the form of paper advisory committees, but often even these situations represent an attempt by CODEL to generate coordination among missionary groups.

Overall, however, it is CODEL's emphasis on stimulating inter-church coordination within development projects which distinguishes the organization from other outside funding agencies in the minds of nearly every individual interviewed in the African field evaluation. This is not to say that CODEL has originated the idea of inter-church group cooperation in the field. In both Tanzania and Kenya some forces for ecumenical coordination in development appear to be at work independently of CODEL. Nevertheless evidence suggests that CODEL has clearly made inter-church coordination in development an issue in some situations where it was not considered important before, and at the very least has given the process new influence in areas where it had begun to work on its own.

Small Grants Projects

The Small Grants Projects are, for CODEL, something of an innovation. The concept involves CODEL's award of a block grant to a local institution which then in turn uses it to fund individual project applications either in the form of grants or project loans. Projects to be funded are

to be consistent with CODEL's project criteria, and are to be small-scale, no more than \$2,000 in value. In Africa CODEL has made available small grants funding in the amount of \$25,000 each to two national church institutions: the Kenya Catholic Secretariat (KCS) and the (Protestant) National Christian Council of Kenya (NCKK).

Originally one grant of \$50,000 was to have been made to the two bodies together, so that they would function as a single unit in making awards in the interest of coordination in development. This process was seen to be too cumbersome by both the NCKK and the KCS so in practice the two have not acted in common session in awarding small grants. Representatives of both bodies point out, however, that the impact of the small grants has been ecumenical in that the KCS has funded project applications from Protestant groups, while the NCKK has funded applications from Catholic groups.

As it has turned out, both institutions have had other funds available expressly for small projects grants in addition to the CODEL monies. Consequently CODEL's contribution has been commingled with the other funds and no discrete "CODEL projects" have been singled out for support with "CODEL resources." Nevertheless the KCS and NCKK criteria for project funding applications have been compatible with CODEL's own project criteria, and by these standards the grants have supported "good" projects. Many of the grants and loans awarded have supported such efforts as small irrigation or water catchment schemes, purchase of small agricultural equipment and hand tools or seeds, and handicraft or small livestock projects.

The small grants projects are potentially an especially effective way to implement CODEL's approach to development. From the point of view of the communities served, the small grants mechanism focuses upon providing resources for very small-scale, grass-roots projects and acts as an incentive for communities to organize themselves to take advantage of available funds. In this way both local leadership and community participation are nurtured. Further, in calling upon locally-formed committees to take responsibility for the actual consideration of individual small project requests and allocation of project funds, an opportunity is provided to CODEL to encourage representatives of separate groups to come together in a working relationship. In the interest of this latter benefit CODEL might in the future urge greater effort among local groups controlling CODEL's small grants funds to coordinate their programs than has been the case with the NCKK and KCS.

Demonstration Projects

CODEL has designated a number of the projects it has supported around the world to be "demonstration projects." To be so designated, a project is to exemplify CODEL's approach to development, including the distinct expertise of church development workers, and the effectiveness of coordinated action among separate church groups in development activities. In addition, such projects are supposed to be innovative efforts and to have a potential demonstration effect to guide socio-economic development problem-solving in other communities or regions.

In Africa eight of the projects CODEL has supported have been identified by the organization as "demonstration projects." Six of these have been reviewed in connection with the present evaluation: the pair of small grants projects in Kenya; the Kokise, Kenya Village Agricultural Polytechnic; the Hanang, Tanzania, Ujamaa Village Health Scheme; the Tanzania Cancer Control Project; the Kitui, Kenya Primary Health Care Program; and the South Sudan Primary Health Care Program. With the exception of the Kitui Health Care and South Sudan Health Care efforts, which are currently operational on limited scales, but which have been proposed for OPG funding in an expanded form, all the projects are presently underway. Three of them are among CODEL's largest -- Hanang Health Scheme, Tanzania Cancer Control and Kitui Health Care. (The South Sudan Primary Health Care Program is also a major undertaking, but since a non-CODEL member will act as project holder, CODEL's responsibilities appear to be less critical in it than in the Hanang Cancer Control or Kitui projects.) The same three are of course to be OPG-supported, and therefore are efforts in which CODEL serves as project sponsor for purposes of USAID funding, even though actual project implementation is effected by various CODEL member organizations in the field.

While it is unclear whether each of the projects individually fully meets all points in CODEL's own criteria for "demonstration" status, it is fair to say that as a sample all do have demonstration potential. The Small Grants Projects, for example, are an innovative way in which to channel resources directly to the grass-roots and to stimulate development of local village-level leadership. Moreover they do appear to provide an appropriate framework for fostering coordination among separate groups working in development.

Through its involvement of parents as well as students in training activities, the Kokise effort represents an interesting new approach to agricultural training and dissemination of agricultural technology. Further, it is a working example of coordination in development in which the local Anglican and Catholic Dioceses have cooperated and provided mutual support. The Tanzania Cancer Control project is also an innovative undertaking, in which, because of CODEL's involvement sophisticated academic medicine has been linked with CODEL members' missionary hospitals in rural areas to provide services to rural poor and to generate more comprehensive data to guide future cancer assistance programs in Africa.

In Kenya, the Kitui Health Care Programme may also represent a model for rural health promotion, and for harnessing the energies of existing institutions, namely womens' groups, for health care development. Finally, the Hanang Tanzania Health Care Scheme which, including its pilot phase, has been in action about a year, appears to have already had a demonstration impact. This project, which involves training of village level health leaders who are to help organize and implement basic health programs in the Ujamaa villages of Hanang District, has recently been declared a prototype by the Tanzanian Government for rural health care development throughout the country.

But it is important to emphasize that in order for the full demonstration value of each of these projects to be realized, a rigorous monitoring and analysis of progress

will have to be conducted by CODEL's Africa regional coordinator and by the staff involved in each project's execution. In this way a systematic determination of what has worked and why (or why not) will be possible for each project. In the case of the three OPG-supported efforts there is provision for the monitoring and formal evaluation of projects, presumably in a form that will make results available for review in relation to other potential project situations. But in the Kenya Small Grants and Kokise Projects there has not as yet been the kind of detailed follow-up which would make the most of the projects' usefulness for replication elsewhere.

Networks for Development

CODEL sees creation of "networks" among organizations active in socio-economic development in the field in Africa, Asia and Latin America to be one of the significant results of its program. The concept of networks in CODEL's meaning of the word is somewhat elusive. At one level it appears to mean achievement of working cooperation -- coordination in development -- between separate missionary groups in a given project situation. At another level it appears to mean extending the concept of coordination in development to cooperation among groups in non-project-specific situations; that is, a general coordinating of development programs among separate mission-sending organizations, and their sharing of information and experience in development work.

CODEL's success in building networks through stimulating coordination at the project level has been discussed above.

In general CODEL appears to have been able to identify and channel support to a few projects which are outstanding examples of the kind of coordination it believes is important. In most other projects it has strongly encouraged project holders, with varying degrees of success, to find a basis for cooperation with neighboring church groups. Among all its member organizations in the field, it appears to have built a reputation as a ready source of support for projects which demonstrate the potential for an inter-church coordination of effort.

Beyond the project level, CODEL's attempts to create a resource network among its members generally have only just begun, and in any case are a long-term proposition. At this point, based on responses of the sample of individuals interviewed, many field representatives of CODEL's members do not yet recognize themselves as links in a resource network, related to each other through their common tie to CODEL and in that context potentially able to assist each other in common areas of development interest. In part, this may be due to the fact that in Kenya and in Tanzania, at least at the national level, there are some working committees and cooperative relationships among existing church institutions which accomplish to a certain extent the resource sharing which CODEL aims to foster. Apart from individual project situations, CODEL's network-building intentions in these two countries may therefore be somewhat duplicative. But in other countries where CODEL has been less active but still has had a presence -- Sudan, Zambia, Malawi or Zaire -- existing inter-church institutions may not be as well equipped

to development work so that there may be a real opportunity for CODEL's network-building role.

Overall, the key to successful creation of networks for development will lie in CODEL's capacity to provide concrete reasons for a network of member organizations and counterparts to form. Identification with CODEL may be a beginning, but will not be sufficient in itself. Cooperation among members in individual projects are of course fundamental links in a resource network, but CODEL also wishes to achieve coordination at a more general level.

There are other opportunities to increase such coordination. Selective technical conferences sponsored by CODEL on topics of special interest to its members and others -- i.e., adult education, rural public health, irrigation technology, etc. -- might be very effective in network building. This approach has not been attempted in Africa and would be an appropriate way in which to bring the expertise and practical experience of individuals affiliated with CODEL member organizations to benefit the CODEL membership generally. CODEL might also encourage more widespread acceptance of its small grants project mechanism. By making block funding available to several separate missionary organizations which agree to act as a group to determine small grants allocations, CODEL can provide a working context in which to foster coordination and inter-group cooperation. CODEL might also consider establishment of larger non-designated block grants to its member organizations in a given region or an area to jointly award to a project(s) as they see fit. As with the

small grants projects, this mechanism would stimulate the practice of coordination, and would take advantage of member organizations' presence, expertise and information as a group in an area.

Member Organization Capabilities

One of CODEL's ultimate purposes is to enhance the capabilities of its members to plan and design, implement and evaluate good development projects. Because CODEL has not exercised a formal training function in relation to its members in Africa -- in terms of conducting project development workshops and training seminars and producing project manuals -- measurement of its actual impact to date on member organizational capabilities is highly impressionistic.

However, it does appear that CODEL has had some influence in the development projects of some of its members and, on balance, evidence suggests that this influence has worked in the direction of more systematic thinking in project formulation. In some projects where CODEL has had an identifiable role in budget preparation or other specifics such as design of evaluation systems, its influence is relatively more visible. In others, where its role has been mainly to assist members in conceptualizing project issues and sharpening analysis, but entirely on an informal basis at the project proposal stage, its impact is less evident in the project which finally emerges, but probably no less real.

In any event the basic proposition is not that CODEL's members lack the capacity to plan, execute and evaluate

successful projects without CODEL's assistance. Rather, it is simply that as an outside, interested organization able to command financial resources and possessing its own approach to development work and its own staff with field experience, CODEL is able to enhance its members' capabilities by providing another perspective on their project activities, and by encouraging them to take the time to be more precise in project development and execution. And in the final analysis, because it has its own perspective, CODEL's major contribution to strengthening its members' capabilities may actually turn out to be establishing the concept of cooperative working relationships among church organizations in development. That is, by encouraging its members to integrate efforts in project planning and implementation CODEL may help to achieve a more efficient use of human and financial resources than would have otherwise been the case.

IV. EVALUATION OF CODEL'S WORK IN LATIN AMERICA

CODEL's Inputs in Latin America

Levels of Contact and Impact

Contacts between CODEL and Latin American projects have been slight in a number of instances, depending on occasional visits by the Latin America Coordinator, correspondence, and visits by Latin American project personnel to the CODEL office. The following listing of visits by the Coordinator to the eight Latin American projects visited during this evaluation indicates the frequency of contacts:

<u>Number of visits from CODEL coordinator</u>	<u>Number of Latin American projects visited in this evaluation</u>
0	3
1	1
2	1
3	3

In the case of projects with no site visits, contacts have usually been through CODEL members in the United States. The projects with three visits each were in Brazil. Actually, the familiarity with Brazilian projects on the part of the Latin American coordinator is greater than would be indicated

by the extent of visits, since he knows the persons and organizations involved through his more than 20 years of work in Brazil.

The coordinator is responsible for all the work of CODEL in Latin America. The CODEL coordinator spent 44 days in Latin America in 1976 and another 44 in 1977 (counting weekends). Of these 88 days, 28 were in locations included in the eight projects visited in this evaluation.

Correspondence with organizations has been infrequent in most cases, but extensive in a few instances. For example, one project has never corresponded directly with CODEL and has communicated only through its U.S. office; the various organizations participating in another project in the same country received at least 12 letters from CODEL in 1977 alone. In addition, persons working with projects in Latin America are estimated to make 30 to 40 visits per year to the New York office.

As would be expected from the level of contacts described above, CODEL's contribution to the Latin American projects has been limited mainly to funding, supplied from a distance without persistent personal involvement. In some instances there has also been identifiable assistance from CODEL in proposal development and network building. Of the kinds of inputs onto projects which CODEL had envisioned as possible, few have been contributed in practice (Table IV-1).

Table IV-1 CODEL Inputs, Eight Latin American Projects

<u>Input from CODEL</u>	<u>Number of Latin American projects visited in evaluation</u>	
	<u>Receiving</u>	<u>Not receiving</u>
Assistance in project design and planning (proposal review)	3	5
Financial assistance	7	1
Assistance in Training	1	7
Assistance in evaluation	1	7
Technical Assistance	0	8
Assistance in network building	3	5

Source: RRNA based on field visits.

One project -- the joint revolving fund in the Dominican Republic -- is the recipient of some CODEL input in five categories listed above. Other project visits have received assistance in training and evaluation, and no project has received technical assistance. In general project respondents do not express an interest in assistance from CODEL in these areas.

Although CODEL's contacts with the Latin American projects have been intermittent, it is noted that CODEL headquarters was able to arrange the field trip for this evaluation, so that it was carried out on a tight schedule with full cooperation from the overseas organizations visited. In the planning of the field trip, two organiza-

tions indicated their unavailability to take part on short notice. The CODEL staff also recommended against visits to some possible project sites because contacts between the project carriers and CODEL has been so slight that the project leaders would not have been able to contribute substantially to an evaluation of CODEL.

Project Design

The influence of CODEL on project design has been mainly through communicating its guidelines and information on the kind of projects which are most likely to receive funding. In response, organizations chose from their total program those elements which satisfy most closely CODEL's guidelines. For example, one respondent stated that CODEL seems to give higher priority to projects which stimulate communication and cooperation among groups involved in development. The respondent's organization and CODEL agreed on the withdrawal of three previously submitted proposals, and submission of an alternative proposal for support of a recently established publication. This project was approved and funded by CODEL. In all, two programs visited agreed to withdraw proposals and submit alternatives; both did so because the initially proposed projects were not likely to receive funding, not that they needed to conform more closely to CODEL criteria.

Another respondent quoted the CODEL coordinator's assessment about the difficulty of funding projects in non-formal education. The respondent's organization accepted the reduced level of funding which was approved by CODEL.

A similar process is found when U.S. member organizations recommend projects to CODEL. Then, member offices in the United States review a considerable number of overseas projects for which they are asked to help secure funding, and they identify those most appropriate for CODEL. There appears to be little direct influence over CODEL criteria on project design in this process, other than that U.S. agencies inform their overseas project carriers that CODEL requires an ecumenical aspect. This requirement may be reflected in the project design and proposal write-up.

In one instance, CODEL suggested and contributed to an evaluation and an interim conference of participating organizations before the funding and start-up of the main proposed project. The results of this conference may well affect the project design, even though such an effect will not be reflected in the proposal, which has already been approved by CODEL.

From CODEL's viewpoint, the culmination of the design process is the review and approval of proposals by the Projects Committee. The proposal summaries prepared by the CODEL staff for the Projects Committee demonstrate that the proposed projects meet the CODEL guidelines. Less attention is given to issues which may be problematic but which may also be instructive in terms of building up the local network, or promoting development among the poorest groups and communities.

Financial Assistance

Since 1975, CODEL has greatly accelerated its approval and funding of projects in Latin America. From 1972 to 1974, four projects were approved and one was funded. Since

the beginning of 1975, 33 projects have been approved, and 28 have received some funds. In addition, two previously approved projects were finally funded as well, bringing the total funded in Latin America to 31.

The amount of CODEL financing approved for these Latin American projects ranges from \$600 to \$60,000, with an average of \$19,500. Of the \$605,000 in funding approved, \$430,000, or 71 percent, has actually been transmitted through January, 1978. In general, the amounts supplied by CODEL represent relatively small proportions of the total annual budgets of the organizations administering the projects, with it being only one of a number of foreign sources from which funds are received.

It is difficult to determine precisely what proportions of cash resources available to these overseas project carriers are provided by CODEL. Often, specific parts of large programs are designated by the organizations as being projects for CODEL and for other funding agencies. Funds from CODEL often represent half or more of the amount of these budgets for specific components of larger projects. However, CODEL funds are a much smaller proportion of total resources administered by the responsible Latin American project carriers. The proportions for the projects visited in this evaluation are as follows:

<u>CODEL funds as proportion of estimated total annual budget of project carrier</u>	<u>Number of Latin American projects visited in evaluation</u>
Less than 2 percent	4
15-25 percent	3
Almost 100 percent	1

The inclusion of the salaries of foreign staff, which often do not appear in the program budgets, would lower these proportions for a few agencies. (No attempt has been made in this analysis to estimate the value of local contributions of volunteer time and donated materials.)

Usually the CODEL assistance is for operating expenses. In two of the eight projects visited, CODEL funds are designated for capital costs and in a third project for a revolving fund.

Most of the organizations visited relate to a number of other overseas funding agencies beside CODEL.

<u>Number of foreign agencies providing funds to the organizations receiving CODEL assistance</u>	<u>Number of Latin American projects visited in evaluation</u>
2	2
4-6	5
29	1

Despite the relatively small contribution from CODEL in terms of financial aid, CODEL's assistance was widely recorded as being of importance. For one small project, the CODEL assistance was the main source of funding. For two others, CODEL funds are to be directed specifically to funding ecumenical aspects of the project. The representative of one very large program (for which CODEL funds constituted less than 1 percent of the annual budget) commented that most of the programs funds received from the

national government were limited in flexibility; therefore the less than 10 percent of outside discretionary funds are of great value in terms of new program development.

Despite the appreciation expressed for CODEL assistance, problems in the receipt of CODEL funds were mentioned in more than half the visits. All these problems relate in some way to the procedure of CODEL's approving projects and then having to search for funding whenever CODEL's own discretionary funds are not designated as the source of financing. This process frustrates the expectations raised when notice of CODEL's acceptance is received. The letters of notification from CODEL have explained that the overseas organizations did not realize just how long the process might be nor how great the possibility that no approval would be received at all. Of the programs visited, two programs withdrew proposals submitted many months previously when they were informed by CODEL that no funding could be attained.

For the projects receiving funds, the length of time from approval to the first receipt of funds was less than 4 months of five of nine funding actions; the average length of time was 4.75 months:

<u>Months from CODEL Approval of Project to First Receipt of Funds from CODEL</u>	<u>Number of Latin American Projects Visited in Evaluation</u> ¹
Less than 2	2
3-4	3
5-7	3
10	1

1. One project has actually had two separate funding actions, for a total of nine funding actions in all.

Except in the case of the one delay of 10 months the length of time required to transmit funds was considered by respondents as being good, or at least reasonable.¹

Assistance in Training

For the projects visited, CODEL input into training has been limited mainly to the recommendation and support of a conference on rural development funds in the Dominican Republic. The responsible agencies in the Dominican Republic designed and conducted the conference without further direct CODEL input. In fact, the organizational representatives in this project expressed no need for assistance in conducting such a conference, other than that from resource persons who are obtained locally. The CODEL initiative in suggesting the conference was recognized; it was clear that the respondents accepted this input, but they did not look for any more intense level of involvement from CODEL.

CODEL is now in the process of arranging and supporting a visit of two Brazilian project directors to ecumenical development programs in the Caribbean. Such a visit would certainly constitute an input into training, but persons from other developing areas, not CODEL representatives, would serve as the "trainers."

Most of the project directors interviewed had graduate education in fields related to their work. No need was expressed for training in project design and operations.

1. One respondent commented that delays in approval and funding from other organizations could be much longer. The example given was CICARWS of the World Council of Churches, which also circulates approved projects to members to secure funding. The time required from application to funding was cited as 2 years, which was considered by the respondent as being too long to be worth the effort of submitting proposals to CICARWS.

Assistance in Evaluation

Similarly, there were no special expressions of need for assistance in evaluation from CODEL. CODEL's own reporting requirements -- a programmatic evaluation at the halfway point and at the end of projects, and quarterly financial reports -- are accepted as reasonable. CODEL did fund an evaluation of a program's performance before its involvement with CODEL. This evaluation was used as an input into the Dominican conference mentioned above.

The mid-project and terminal reports are to serve as evaluations, but these take the form of reporting activities carried out, rather than of comparing progress with objectives specified in the project proposal. A few organizations contacted in the field visits do conduct internal monitoring of their own progress against such pre-specified objectives. Such evaluations have not been the result of CODEL inputs, and usually have not been shared with CODEL. Annual reports are usually sent to CODEL.

It appears that CODEL does not make significant use of the reports received. There is generally no substantive correspondence commenting on the reports. In one instance where a report indicated decline in ecumenical collaboration in the project, there was no reaction from CODEL. Neither was there response to a financial report showing substantial delays in the hiring of local staff, which was to be a central use of the funds from CODEL.

Technical Assistance

Apparently, no specific kinds of technical assistance have been requested from CODEL and no need for such assistance was expressed by the overseas respondents in Latin America.

Network-Building

All respondents were aware that CODEL is an ecumenical organization and is interested in ecumenical cooperation on the part of project carriers. Beside the fact that CODEL funds projects, this ecumenical dimension is the most salient feature of CODEL.

The CODEL input in ecumenical cooperation consists mainly in raising specific questions about this aspect of a project. In one instance, CODEL assisted in bringing together the Catholic and Protestant participants of a project now proposed for joint sponsorship (the two organizations had been in some communication before). In most cases of joint ecumenical sponsorship in Latin America, CODEL's role has been more to confirm or reinforce already existing contacts.

CODEL has apparently had little input in developing broader development networks beyond the scope of ecumenical cooperation in specific projects. In countries with more than one project assisted by CODEL, the officials of the project carriers generally do not know which other projects in the country are funded by CODEL.

Outputs -- The Projects to which CODEL Relates

The Quality of the Projects

The increase in CODEL's identification and funding of projects in Latin America during the past 3 years has already been noted. We can assess the extent to which a selected group of these projects, contacted in the field visit of this study, appear to fulfill the expectations of the CODEL guidelines for projects.

The projects to which CODEL relates in Latin America are characterized above all by an involvement with and an understanding of the poorest sectors of the population and by imaginative approaches to encouraging individual and community development. Projects and programs of the carrier organizations appear to have met CODEL's primary goal of assisting the socio-economically disadvantaged. Performance related to some other goals is not quite as consistent, but is at least "satisfactory" in almost all cases and often is "outstanding" (Table IV-2).

Given the nature and intensity of the CODEL inputs described in the previous section, it would not be appropriate to consider these projects as CODEL outputs in any direct or causative sense. This lack of a causal relationship should not be interpreted as meaning that CODEL has not made any difference at all, or that its efforts make no difference over the long run. By identifying and providing

Table IV-2. Performance Relative to CODEL Guidelines in Latin American Projects Visited during Evaluations

CODEL criteria for projects	Performance		
	Unsatis- factory	Satis- factory	Out- standing
Assist socio-economically disadvantaged to participate more fully	0	2	6
Design meets priority needs and can be implemented in cooperation with those affected:			
priority needs	0	3	5
cooperative effort	0	1	7
Insure projects become a community responsibility (including financially)	1	5	2
Training insures partici- pation of local personnel and fosters self-deter- mination	0	2	6
Positive relationships with other organizations in- volved in development	0	4	4
Absence of proselytizing	0	2	6

Source: RRNA; ratings based on field visits.

modest financial support and some other assistance to projects congenial to its own vision of development, CODEL is reinforcing the continuance and growth of certain types of projects and of certain methods of operation in poor communities overseas.

Assisting the Socio-economically
Disadvantaged to Participate
More Fully

Most programs to which CODEL relates in Latin America emphasize activities to increase the effectiveness of local community organizations and of various kinds of non-formal education. In seven of the eight programs visited in the evaluation, the approach to community organization and education is not primarily to transfer information and skills. These programs are concerned with attitudinal changes especially perceptions about the ways in which families and communities can make and implement decisions which affect their development. Through this "human promotion" the programs are working to enlarge the understanding, motivation, and self-confidence needed for families and communities to plan and implement their own developmental programs.

In a sense, then, the programs are not primarily and directly focused on assisting the disadvantaged to participate more fully "in the economic and political life of their country." Rather there is as much emphasis on community self-determination and self-sufficiency. This emphasis is not inconsistent with greater national integration, but it

does reflect a different model of the development process for the poorest people in the country. Furthermore, while there is an encouragement to increase production of food and to increase incomes in almost all programs, the community organizational work is often understood as an end in itself, not only as a means to higher productivity and incomes.

In half the programs visited, the specific projects designated for CODEL are targeted on intermediate staff or on local leadership, rather than on direct assistance to the poorest people. Nevertheless, the staff and local leadership are closely related to the target population, as indicated in the performance related to the second criterion.

Local Priorities, and Participation by Target Population

In the programs visited, the initial impetus for the various community development efforts came from persons not indigenous to the community. In some instances, there is no way to test whether the projects began as a reflection of community needs. For example, one respondent told of a survey in which many women expressed an interest in crocheting and sewing. Instead of accepting this as an expression of priorities, the program leaders tried to encourage consideration of basic needs such as improved nutrition.

In most instances there now exist mechanisms and procedures for the poor population being served to choose local development projects. Usually this participation by the poor population is not formalized at the level of the governing board and policy making for entire programs; and this is a weakness in terms of the CODEL standards. At the same time, most programs are distinguished by the existence of imaginative and institutionalized channels of communication by which persons in the target population can transmit felt needs, ideas, criticisms, and suggestions to the leadership of the organizations. For example, projects using radio broadcasting also relate to local community organizations. Representatives of the organizations then convene to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the radio effort. One radio station also has "mail boxes" placed throughout the communities served, and uses questions and comments from the communities, as well as direct interviews with the target population, in its daily programming.

Almost all the projects visited are characterized by the sustained residency of some project staff in the communities being served. This increases sensitivity to community needs and also facilitates the integration of the developmental efforts being promoted with the lives of the local communities affected.

Insuring That Projects Will
Become Community
Responsibility

Currently, the level of local (including national) cash support for projects and programs to which CODEL relates appears to be small with a few notable exceptions. Most proposals indicate expectations of increased community support for submitted projects. For the projects visited, two project carriers already raise almost all funds from national sources, in one instance from the national government, and in the other from an annual urban benefit fair. One radio project covers most of its operating expenses through advertisements.

Three project carriers visited are attempting to move toward greater self-support through the establishment or enlargement of revolving loan funds. In each case, the initial capitalization of the fund is expected to come from outside sources. Interest payments from loan recipients help defray some operating expenses of the revolving funds, and this should be viewed as a satisfactory attempt at increasing self-sufficiency. Nevertheless, the revolving funds are currently not large enough to generate substantial revenues. Interest rates tend to be below the rates of inflation in the respective countries, thus eroding the real value of the fund.

Most cash resources generated within the project countries visited did not come from the target communities themselves. The project leaders are reluctant to press very poor people for cash contributions to the projects and services being offered. In most projects there are substantial local resources in donated time; these inputs provide substantial in-kind contributions, but do not necessarily move the projects in the direction of financial self-sufficiency.

All the project carriers expect that some overseas assistance will continue indefinitely. As the funding period for a given project ends, or when a major expansion of a program is planned, consideration is given to finding other overseas agencies likely to provide the financial help required.

Providing Training

Most projects to which CODEL relates in Latin America have a definite intent and program to train local personnel. This is certainly true for the projects visited in the evaluation.¹ Methods used include radio broadcasts, community meetings, conferences, publications, and "learn-by-doing" through involvement in specific community projects. Little use is made of classroom sessions.

1. The term "training" is usually avoided by the overseas project representatives, as it implies a transfer of information and skills rather than an enlargement of personal and community capacities.

Positive Relationships Among Organizations

CODEL is associated with some outstanding collaborative efforts in development projects in Latin America.

These projects illustrate the various forms which such collaboration can take. One organization has been started as a collaborative instrument through which a number of church denominations could promote various community development efforts. In another instance, two existing organizations working in development have joined together for the specific loan fund project to be supported by CODEL. One large national organization has little collaboration in its directorate, but an extensive network of joint effort with local development organizations in each of the areas where it is involved. One smaller localized project invited leaders in other organizations to serve as "advisers" to its program and has used a number of contacts with other developmental groups in its operations.

The CODEL statement of principles does not specify that collaboration should be ecumenical, but the overseas respondents all understand this to be CODEL's intent.¹ Furthermore, in Latin America such ecumenical collaboration is understood as specifically pertaining to relationships between Catholics and Protestants.

1. In some areas, "ecumenical" takes on a broader definition. For example, in Sri Lanka, non-Christian faiths are collaborating in a CODEL-assisted project.

By such a definition of ecumenical collaboration, a number of the projects appear to be weak. To be sure, organizations working vigorously in development have contacts with other persons and groups involved in similar efforts; in today's world, this includes contacts across religious denominational lines. One group of respondents commented that it would not be hard to identify such contacts for highlighting in a revised proposal to CODEL, once it was understood that CODEL was looking for indicators of such relationships. These respondents were concerned, however, that it was more difficult to change existing structures and practices to reflect significant ecumenical collaboration, than it was to change their purpose. As a result of CODEL questions, one organization prepared a working paper suggesting ways in which ecumenical cooperation could be effected in this program. No action has been taken on this paper to date, but it had been prepared and may be seriously considered as a favorable outcome of the involvement with CODEL.

At least two of the other organizations visited, both of which were closely identified with a single denomination, has only progressed as far as identifying sufficient ecumenical contact to qualify for CODEL funding; they have not considered any significant change in their structures and programs.

Where collaboration among organizations is not strong, such a situation does not necessarily represent a break between Catholics and Protestants. In many instances

programs supported and staffed by different Catholic organizations have little relationship with each other. In fact, a number of Catholic organizations visited had greater collaboration with some Protestant groups than with other Catholic agencies active in the same area.

Absence of Proselytizing

The leaders of the projects to which CODEL relates are closely identified with various Christian churches. Persons involved in projects are also serving as priests, pastors, and catechists. Radio stations carry both development and religious programs. Nevertheless, all the projects visited show an awareness of and exercise care to separate development work and strictly religious work, even though the religious motivation of the development work may be explicit. At the leadership level, religious affiliation might be one factor involved in staff selection. No indications of religious discrimination in access to programs were found. Discrimination and direct proselytizing through developmental work are unlikely in these organizations to which CODEL relates.

The Capacity of the Overseas Organizations to Implement "Good Projects"

The above assessment of the organizations to which CODEL relates in terms of the CODEL selection guidelines indicates the many strengths of these organizations for the implementation of projects which are effective in their impact on the poor populations involved.

- . These organizations have strong ties with the most disadvantaged persons living in rural areas. This produces an in-depth understanding of the community problems and imaginative approaches to overcoming them.
- . There is an ability to mobilize substantial community participation, even if this usually does not include the mobilization of substantial cash resources.
- . There is an ability to conduct education and training by a variety of means confirmed by popular support for community organizations which usually serve as the vehicles for education.
- . There is communication and often collaboration with other organizations involved in similar developmental efforts.

An evaluation of planning and management capabilities of CODEL-related projects lies outside the scope of this study. It has been possible, however, to observe indicators of capabilities related to project design and evaluation.

The project carriers visited are able to design workable projects and to document their project designs and plans for implementation in professionally packaged proposals. These proposals generally include a description of the conditions in the area to be served; an identification of problems; a statement of goals and objectives; a description of the

proposed activities and their relation to the problems; a description of the organizational structure and of institutional ties; and a budget. Objectives and proposed activity levels are often quantified. A general weakness appears to be a lack of consideration of alternative means to solve problems and attain goals. Given the nature of the projects, an economic or financial feasibility study would be of limited usefulness in project selection in most cases. However, a study of cost-effective ways of meeting goals could be useful.

Project reports often quantify the programmatic outputs in considerable detail. There will be numbers for activity levels and for participants. In almost all instances, however, there is no explicit comparison of results with previously stated targets for objectives and activity levels.

One rural project has developed an interesting set of indicators of growth in viability of small farmer organizations and uses these indicators to monitor progress. The indicators include regularity of meetings by local associations, attendance, and participation of a representative in meetings of the consortium of local groups.

Field Relationships With USAID Missions

There have been few contacts between CODEL and AID missions in Latin America.

The CODEL coordinator has seldom met with AID personnel during his field trips. The field reports mention a few calls to USAID which did not result in meetings; the coordinator did not pursue the contacts because there was no specific subject matter for discussion. In one instance, an AID officer learned of the proposed visit of the CODEL coordinator and raised questions with USAID Washington about the purpose of the visit; this officer considered the visit to be only "a fishing expedition" for projects.

Most representatives from project carriers interviewed did not know that CODEL received funds from AID for operations and for some overseas grants. In all, only three CODEL project funding actions in Latin America have been designated as using AID DPG funds. Only one project visited had received a small amount of funds from CODEL DPG monies; the project representatives apparently were not aware of the origin of these funds.

The discussion of the CODEL relationship with AID did not elicit any unfavorable comment about CODEL from the representatives of project carriers interviewed. Several interviewees did state that their organizations would be unlikely to seek or accept funds directly from AID. The reasons offered for this view were the reluctance to be identified as a U.S. government project; the great amount of work required to meet AID proposal needs; and subsequent reporting obligations.

Two of the projects visited have had considerable contact with AID or with AID-sponsored projects, but such contacts appear to be the exception. In general, representatives of project carriers feel that programs sponsored by AID, as well as other programs of their national governments, do not do a good job in reaching and helping the poorest people in communities where the church-related projects operate.

The few AID overseas personnel interviewed in Bolivia and the Dominican Republic believe that church-related groups usually design and implement projects poorly. One AID respondent mentioned specific examples of technical deficiencies in church-supported projects to build local community infrastructure.

The AID respondents commented that they usually do not know which PVOs funded under DPGs from the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation were working or visiting in their country at any given time. The AID respondents felt they could not keep track of such a large number of organizations. The main relations to PVOs by AID in these instances revolve around substantial grants to or proposals from the local offices of international PVOs in their country. Local PVOs were considered to be less able to meet AID requirements for acceptable project design and management than were the international PVOs.

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

1. Based on field observations, and discussions with overseas personnel of CODEL member organizations, CODEL has been highly successful in selecting projects that benefit the "poorest of the poor." While financial support by beneficiaries of projects has generally been minimal, in-kind contributions have been significant; there is a high degree of involvement of indigenous personnel.
2. Less uniformity was found in the prospects for projects attaining self-sufficiency that would enable them to carry on without further assistance. Realistically, the span of years during which CODEL has operated is perhaps too short for the type of projects CODEL supports to achieve financial independence. Nevertheless, some projects have made significant progress in this direction.
3. The size and composition of CODEL headquarters staff are barely adequate to administer a program of the nature and size reached in 1977. In particular, some weaknesses in network development -- overseas and

domestically -- can be attributed to lack of staff and funds. Additional professional staff would also permit improved analysis of project proposals, monitoring and evaluation, although there does not appear to be a felt need in the field for CODEL assistance in some of these activities.

4. CODEL has fallen far short of generating and funding the number of "demonstration projects" anticipated in the USAID agreement. Comments from CODEL indicate that USAID has not been overly restrictive in its determination of what constitutes a "demonstration project." The orientation of overseas personnel responsible for identifying and formulating project proposals may be responsible, in part, for the relatively small number of demonstration projects submitted for CODEL funding. In any case, the goals established in the original DPG agreement should be reviewed in future agreements.

5. CODEL's training, project preparation and evaluation activities have also fallen short of levels anticipated. In part, the shortfall may be attributable to the lack of CODEL staff, combined with priorities properly being given to the project selection process and the search for funds to finance approved projects. However, a more significant constraint is a commonly held view among existing and potential project carriers in the field: with many years of experience in local communities in which projects are to be implemented, training in project preparation and implementation are not required; detailed

evaluation procedures are not necessary for projects that obviously serve the target population; and, in short, local skills are adequate to design, implement and monitor "grass-roots" projects.

6. CODEL has had some impact on the design and development of some of its members' projects. Its impact has been an informal one, realized in the context of the CODEL regional coordinator's assistance to members in readying project proposals for submission for CODEL's consideration, and especially in assistance in project proposal development for submission to USAID for OPG funding. Its impact typically involves sharpening of conceptualization of project issues and assistance in proposal drafting, including budget preparation. In two instances, CODEL has also provided a consultant's services to help to develop formal evaluation and monitoring systems for members' projects. Over the long term, CODEL's role in enhancing its members' capabilities in the techniques of project planning, implementation and evaluation is likely to continue to be this informal one, tied to specific project situations, rather than that of an organization which formally transfers project-related methodologies.
7. CODEL has established firmly its ecumenical image in the eyes of members by supporting those projects demonstrating interdenominational collaboration. In some instances the support has been provided to strengthen ongoing collaborative projects; in most

cases, however, the recognition that CODEL has a preference for ecumenical project carriers has operated as a screening device that tends to bring collaborative projects to CODEL.

8. Although its success has been limited so far, CODEL views encouragement of coordination among separate mission-sending groups in development work as a real and fundamental organizational goal; nevertheless, better communications will be required. Achievement of this coordination helps to enhance its members' capabilities to produce and execute "good" projects and provides the foundation for the resource sharing network CODEL seeks to create.
9. CODEL's non-field operational status is strongly supported by its staff and its members, who wish to minimize administrative expenditures as well as to maintain its image as a non-field organization. However, such status imposes some constraints on CODEL's program since it complicates communications and reduces the continuity of support CODEL can provide its members, and weakens cooperation among its members' field personnel. This problem will grow more critical as CODEL increases its involvement on large OPG-style projects in which CODEL itself serves as project-holder.
10. Relations with USAID country missions are currently largely perfunctory, but working contacts are likely to expand as CODEL becomes increasingly involved in OPG funding for projects. CODEL (and to some extent,

the USAID mission staff interviewed) sees such expansions of working relationships as mutually beneficial.

11. Based on information obtained in the field, CODEL's principal role is viewed as a channel through which financial assistance for projects may be obtained. In this connection it is noted that CODEL has established an enviable record in the quick funding of approved projects, although there is some indication that approval of projects is determined in part by the anticipated ease with which funding can be provided.
12. In several instances CODEL funding has provided a minor -- even miniscule -- portion of total project funds. The minor role of CODEL's share in financial support may result in its having little leverage in project design, implementation, evaluation, etc. CODEL's minor financial support is not necessarily a true measure of its contribution; for some projects, its contributions have served as a catalyst at a crucial point in the development of a collaborative project. In other instances successful implementation of sub-projects has stimulated interest and funding of larger projects serving the target group(s).
13. Based on views expressed by individual members of CODEL's Executive Committee, the organization has achieved satisfactory, or outstanding, success in most of its endeavors. The record has been least successful in fund raising from non-member sources, and in establishing effective communications with, and an

awareness of the development contributions to under-privileged people, on the part of the individual "person in the pew" of its member organizations. As noted elsewhere, the same weakness it noted in the development of a strong network among overseas personnel of members of CODEL.

14. Members of CODEL's headquarters staff hold roughly similar views on the organization's success in carrying out its functions. The staff expressed somewhat less satisfaction on effectiveness in communications than did the members of the Executive Committee. The criticism of the staff reflects the feeling that this represents a function in which improvement is possible and intended.
15. One of the major challenges facing CODEL is to effect modest changes in the attitudes of field personnel of member groups as the thrust of field efforts of these PVOs shift from humanitarian relief works, to equally humanitarian efforts to help the "poorest of the poor" help themselves through community action development projects. There is evidence from field interviews that even relatively simple techniques to improve project design, install monitoring capabilities and evaluation procedures are viewed as unnecessary, or as a diversion of resources needed to improve the lot of the poor.
16. To some extent the reluctance to apply generally accepted techniques for project design, monitoring and evaluation probably reflects efforts to impose more sophisticated techniques than are justified for small, grass-roots projects. But, in a larger sense, these views derive

from a lack of appreciation of the real purpose of the procedures: to maximize the benefits, material and non-material, that can be achieved with given inputs.

Recommendations

1. CODEL's operations during the three-year period in which AID has provided DPGs have demonstrated effective use of funds in an expansion and strengthening of its administrative capability, and judicious selection of overseas projects funded with AID and non-AID financial resources. The rather modest amount of AID funds utilized by CODEL have been highly cost-effective, largely because of the availability and commitment of overseas personnel of CODEL's members. There are probably few other channels through which AID funds can be used more effectively to benefit the poorest sectors of the population in the developing countries.
 - . It is recommended that AID financial support in the form of both DPGs and OPGs be continued at an expanded level for the three-year period, 1978-1980.
 - . While additional assistance to cover administrative costs to service overseas projects should be provided, it is recommended that the larger portion of any increase in DPGs be earmarked for projects.
 - . CODEL should strengthen its capabilities to make maximum use of OPGs where available.

2. Terms of the agreement between AID and CODEL should be reviewed to achieve a realistic understanding of what CODEL can and cannot accomplish.
3. It is recommended that CODEL employ a trained project analyst at headquarters to assist the present staff in analyzing requests for financial support for overseas projects. The recommended addition to the staff should have had extensive overseas experience at the grass-roots level; be knowledgeable in project design, pre-feasibility analysis, and evaluation techniques; and be sensitive to the intangible costs and benefits of small development projects.
4. It is recommended that CODEL establish a "correspondent" from among the in-country staff of its members in each country in which it has, or expects to develop, a significant number of projects -- especially with OPG funding.
 - . This recommendation is suggested as one means of developing a more effective overseas network by giving CODEL a continuing presence through which the expertise of field staff could be utilized on various projects; communications with headquarters could be facilitated; and potential projects identified.
 - . The present of a "correspondent" would also enable CODEL to have a less passive role in project

development on a collaborative basis, and enhance the effectiveness of CODEL's regional coordinators on their periodic visits to the field.

5. In addition to the establishment of a roster of field staff members with specialized skills, it is recommended that CODEL headquarters establish a similar roster of individuals belonging to church groups that are members of CODEL. Such persons could be used for short periods of time in New York to review proposals, or in the field to provide technical assistance in project design or implementation. The costs should be restricted to per diems and travel. The International Executive Service Corps has found such a program to be attractive to retired professionals, and an effective form of technical assistance to developing countries. This recommendation, if found acceptable, would:
 - . Assist in developing a domestic network by involvement of lay members who would gain first-hand knowledge of CODEL's role; and
 - . Provide expertise to field projects at relatively low costs that would be covered in the project grants.
6. It is recommended that CODEL attempt to achieve wider dispersion among countries in its assistance to projects. This should be done through the regional coordinators and, if an earlier recommendation is accepted, "correspondents" for one or more neighboring countries in which CODEL has little or no presence.

7. On its part AID should recognize the nature of most CODEL-assisted projects -- small-scale, grass-roots, with difficult-to-quantify outputs -- and structure required documentation appropriate for such projects. With limited administrative staff and project carriers unaccustomed to the documentation purpose and process, compliance with standard AID requirement may turn them to other sources for assistance.
8. The senior staff, perhaps with advice from the Executive Committee, should reevaluate staff positions and function with a view to achieving a more efficient utilization.
9. While additional DPG funding is recommended, CODEL should intensify its efforts to secure funds, preferably unrestricted, from non-member sources, including corporate donors and foundations.
10. Finally, it is recommended that CODEL systematize and expand its communications among the New York office, its domestic members, and overseas participants. Specifically, the budget for this purpose should be increased. Overseas, communications with USAID missions, and with potential collaborating agencies in the developing countries should also be improved.

APPENDIX A: PERSONS INTERVIEWED

CODEL Field Evaluation in Africa,
by Organization

Kenya

African Medical and Research Foundation: Dr. Michael Wood;
Mr. Hugh de Glanville; Mr. Douglas Lackey

Anglican Diocese of Maseno South: Bishop Henry Okullu;
Mr. Kefa Musiga

Catholic Diocese of Kakamega: Father John Opiyo

Consolata Fathers: Father John Forestello; Father
Jeremias Carvalho

Holy Rosary Sisters: Sister Marita Malone, M.D.

Kenya Catholic Secretariat: Father Festus Omusolo;
Mr. Enda Byrne

National Christian Council of Kenya: Reverend John Kamau; Mr. Harold Miller

Sisters of Mercy: Sister Teresa Connolly

Society of St. Patrick: Bishop William Dunne; Monsignor John Mahon; Father James Barry; Father Kevin Brehony; Father Thomas MacCracken; Father John O'Calahan

The Friends Church: Mr. Jonathan Darby

USAID Country Mission-Kenya: Mr. Michael Rugh

Tanzania

Arusha Leadership Training Center: Mr. William Kessey

Maryknoll Fathers: Bishop Vincent Durning; Father James Conard

Maryknoll Sisters: Sister Noreen McCarthy; Sister Rachel Kunkler

Medical Missionaries of Mary: Sister Joseph Anthony; Sister Martha Collins, M.D.; Sister Jean Lynch

Muhimbili Medical Center, University of Dar es Salaam: Professor Ulrich Henschke (Howard University, USA)

Government of Tanzania, Mara Regional Division of Water:
Mr. D.A. Lumelezi; Mr. S.H Msoffe

USAID Country Mission-Tanzania: Mr. Jake Harshbarger

Uganda¹

Church of Uganda (Episcopal), Coordinating Unit for
Planning and Development: Mr. Kodwo Ankrah

1. Interviewed in Nairobi, Kenya.

CODEL Field Evaluation in Latin America
by Organization

Bolivia

Asociación Ecuménica Para Coordinación y Cooperación en Trabajos de Desarrollo Social (ASEC): Mr. Marcos Nucinkis; Mr. Roger Hurtubise; Mr. Jaime Burgoa

Maryknoll Fathers: Fr. Dudley Connelly

Maryknoll Sisters: Sr. Rita Forbes; Sr. Margaret Haulen

Radio Mensaje, Montero: Mrs. Miriam de Molina

USAID: Mr. Richard Archi

USAID Health and Integral Development Program, Montero: Ms. Marlene Hurtado Villorreal; Mr. Luis Meljar del Gadillo; Ms. Tulema Alvarez de Tudela

Brazil

Banco de Providência: Mr. Orlando Travancas; Mrs. Carlina Ribeiro Gomes

Centro Feminino, Banco du Providência: Mrs. Maria du Carma Resende Neves

Federação de Orgãos para Assistência Social e Educacional (FASE): Mr. Michele Rousseau

Movimiento de Educação de Base (MEB): Sr. Irmã Anne Marie Speyer

Dominican Republic

Caritas: Mr. Ramón Castillo; Mr. Ramón Almont Ramirez (short phone conversation only)

Catholic Relief Services: Mr. Bernard Trombley; Ms. Liliana Cabral Medina

Church World Service: Ms. Elizabeth Enloe

Misioneros Dominicanos del Rosario: Sr. Candrita

Missionhurst Fathers (C.I.C.M.): Fr. Leo Theeuwissen; Fr. Francisco Vanhee; Br. Humberto Vandenbulcke; Fr. Estanislao M. Szarwark; Fr. Jerry Rogmans

Servicio Social de Iglesias Dominicanas, Inc.: Rev. Juan José Félix

USAID: Mr. John Clary; Mr. Frank Miller

CODEL Executive Committee and
Staff Evaluation

Executive Committee

Marist Missions: Reverend Paul A. Chaisson S.M.

Congregational Christian Service Committee: Dr. Alfred
C. Bartholomew

Medical Mission Sisters: Sister Winnifred Pearsall

Mill Hill Missions: Reverend Theodore Feldbrugge

The Episcopal Church: Mrs. Marion Bingley

Lutheran World Relief: Mr. Bernard Confer

United Presbyterian Church - USA: Reverend William
K. DuVal

United Methodist Committee on Relief: Dr. J. Harry
Haines

Catholic Relief Services: Monsignor Andrew P. Landi

Church World Service: Dr. Paul McCleary

Maryknoll Fathers)¹: Reverend Norbert Rans

1. Sister Marilyn Norric (Maryknoll Sisters) the only member of the Executive Committee not interviewed authorized Reverend Rans to speak on her behalf.

CODEL Staff

Reverend Boyd Lowry, Executive Director

Ms. Barbara Wagner, Chief of Operations

Reverend Patrick Cullen, Coordinator for Africa

Reverend Walter H. George, Coordinator for Latin America

Dr. James J. Thomas, Coordinator for Asia

Mrs. Elizabeth Clark Reiss, CODELnews Editor

APPENDIX B: PROJECTS REVIEWED

CODEL Field Evaluation in Africa, by Date,
Project and CODEL Reference Number,
and Principal Contacts

<u>Date</u>	<u>Project and CODEL Reference Number</u>	<u>Principal Contacts</u>
January 17 and 31	South Sudan Primary Health Care Program (AMREF); I-SUD/MD-AMRF	Dr. Michael Wood Mr. Douglas Lackey
January 17 and 31	*East Africa Medical Illustrator, (AMREF) (I-REG-MD/MMS-12)	Mr. Hugh de Glanville
January 18	*Kalokol Adult Education, Turkana, Kenya (I-KEN-ED/J100-SPS)	Mr. Jonathan Darby Father Kevin Brehony
January 19	*Kokise Kenya Village Agricultural Polytechnic (I-KEN-AG/J72-EpCh)	Bishop Henry Okullu Mr. Kefa Musiga
January 20	*Musoma, Tanzania Cattle Dips Program (I-TAN-CD/MM-11)	Father James Conard
January 21	Iramba, Tanzania Village Water Supply (I-TAN-CD/MM-21)	Father James Conard Mr. S.H. Msoffe
January 22 and 23	*Tanzania Cancer Control Project (I-TAN-MD/J88-UMCOR)	Prof. Ullrich Henschke
January 24 and 25	*Hanang, Tanzania Ujamaa Village Health Care Scheme (I-TAN-MD/J31- MMM)	Dr. Martha Collins Sister Jean Lynch
January 26	*Arusha, Tanzania, Leadership Training Center (I-TAN-ED/MS-1-75)	Mr. William Kessey Sister Rachel Kunkler Sister Noreen McCarthy

January 27	Meru, Kenya Liliaba Irrigation (I-KEN-AG/TECH-06-76)	Father Jeremias Carvahlo
January 27	Meru, Kenya Inter-Church Seeds Program (I-KEN-AG/J94)	Father Jeremias Carvahlo
January 28	*Kitui, Kenya Primary Health Care Project (I-KEN-MD/J90-SPS)	Dr. Marita Malone Father James Barry Sister Teresa Connolly
January 30	Kenya Small Grants Projects (I-KEN-CD/J46 and 46A)	Mr. Enda Byrne Mr. Harold Miller
January 30	Uganda Church Planning and Development Coordinating Unit	Mr. Kodwo Ankrah
February 1	Kerio Fishing Boat Projects (I-KEN-AG/SPS-5)	Father Thomas MacCracken

*denotes visit to project site

CODEL Field Evaluation in Latin America, By Date,
Project and CODEL Reference Number,
and Principal Contacts

<u>Date</u>	<u>Project (Primary Sponsoring Organization)</u>	<u>Principal Contacts</u>
January 17	37. Ecumenical Collaboration in Service and Development (ASEC), La Paz, Bolivia	Mr. Marcos Nucinkis
January 18 and 19	16. Education for Rural Health and Nutrition (CEPRIFEM--Maryknoll Sisters), Montero, Santa Cruz, Bolivia	Sr. Rita Forbes
January 20 and 23	20. Alternatives Careers for Unwed Mothers (Banco da Providencia) Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	Mr. Orlando Travancas; Mrs. Carlina Ribeiro Gomes; Mrs. Maria du Carma Resende Neves
January 21	36. Collaboration in Community Development Through Information Exchange, (FASE), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	Mr. Michele Rousseau
January 23	26. Training in Rural Radio Education Techniques for the Brazilian Amazon (MEB), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	Sr. Anne Marie Speyer
January 25	24. Study and Seminar on Joint Caritas/SSID Revolving Loan Fund, and	Rev. Juan José Félix;
	33. Joint Revolving Fund (SSID/Caritas), Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic	Mr. Ramón Castillo
January 26 and 27	28. Non-formal Education for the Rural Poor (Radio Barahona--Missionhurst Fathers), Tamayo, Dominican Republic	Br. Humberto Vandenbulcke
January 26	5. Food and Nutrition thru Farmer Organization and Training (Missionhurst), Duverge, Dominican Republic	Fr. Francisco Vanhee

APPENDIX C

Analysis of Current CODEL Project Listing by Category,
Locality, Number of Projects, and Financial Support
December 1, 1974 through December 30, 1977

1. <u>Locality</u>	<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>Community Development</u>	<u>Education, including non-formal or vocational</u>	<u>Medicine</u>
Africa				
Projects	17	10	4	8
Expenditures	\$910,715	\$167,758	\$118,861	\$1,477,288
East Asia and Pacific				
Projects	7	3	--	1
Expenditures	173,249	35,000	--	87,083
Latin America and Caribbean				
Projects	12	12	7	2
Expenditures	400,437	625,555	147,963	37,000
Northeast and South Asia				
Projects	4	6	1	1
Expenditures	62,108	221,031	14,000	52,240
International				
Projects	--	1	--	1
Expenditures	--	10,000	--	8,000
2. Total Projects by Category	40	32	12	13
Total Projects funded by Category	\$1,546,268	\$1,059,344	\$280,824	\$1,661,611
3. Total Projects undertaken in Africa	39	Total Expenditures for projects in Africa		\$2,674,622
Total Projects undertaken in East Asia and Pacific	11	Total Expenditures for projects in East Asia and Pacific		295,332

Total Projects undertaken in Latin American and Caribbean	33	Total Expenditures for projects in Latin American and Caribbean	\$1,210,955
Total Projects undertaken in Northeast and South Asia	12	Total Expenditures for projects in Northeast and South Asia	349,379
Total Projects undertaken, International	2	Total Expenditures for projects, International	18,000

Approved for funding:

From project funds (OPG/DPG sources) AID	\$1,938,645
From foundation/corporation sources	29,964
From member sources	2,579,679
Total	\$4,548,288

Projects to be funded by OPG/DPG sources include projects in the areas of primary health care; agriculture (integrated rural development); rural and community development planning grants.

It should be noted that CODEL has provided \$9,000 from DPG/Program funds for additional planning studies; and medical surveys (Zambia and Kenya) that are not reflected in project analysis.

Material for this analysis was provided by:

Attachment C
CODEL Projects Committee Meeting
January 12, 1978

APPENDIX D. DESCRIPTIONS OF PROJECTS REVIEWED
IN FIELD VISITS

Africa

South Sudan Primary
Health Care

A Sudanese government-sponsored program envisages training 800 Community Health Workers (CHWs) by 1984 to meet primary health care needs at the village level throughout southern Sudan. The African Medical and Research Foundation (AMREF) of Nairobi, Kenya was requested by the government to develop and execute a program to prepare a cadre of tutors to train CHWs, and to supervise and evaluate the first CHW training activities. CODEL provided financial assistance of about \$41,000 to the AMREF to help repair and operate the Health Centre and first CHW Training School at Rejaf (West Equatoria) Sudan. AMREF has subsequently proposed the full scale South Sudan Primary Health Care CHW training program through 1982 for USAID OPG support. Total cost of the program will be about \$4 million, of which the OPG will provide about \$2.24 million. CODEL members will participate in the overall program by assisting in the selection and training of tutors and CHWs, and in setting up grain-grinding

mills in cooperation with village health staff to stimulate attendance of village women at project activities.

East Africa Medical
Illustrator

CODEL has provided \$5,000 to fund partial transport and living expenses of a trained medical illustrator belonging to one of its member organizations, the Medical Mission Sisters. This specialist assists the African Medical and Research Foundation (AMREF) in illustrating rural health training manuals and health education publications and aids, for use in AMREF programs throughout East Africa.

Kalokol, Kenya, Adult
Education

In Turkana, Kenya, several church bodies (including CODEL members), the Government of Kenya and the Turkana Fishermen's Cooperative Society have joined together to form a unified adult education program. The program presently involves 14 classes and over 200 students, meeting three to five times per week. It centers on Turkana and Swahili literacy, arithmetic, English, hygiene, cooperative knowledge and civics. With a grant of \$5,000 CODEL has supported the cost of construction and equipment purchase for a study center, and has contributed to the program's operating costs through June, 1978.

Kokise, Kenya, Village
Agricultural Polytechnic

Under the sponsorship of the local Anglican diocese, the village of Kokise, Kenya has established a village

polytechnic school, complete with agricultural, masonry and wood-working programs. The polytechnic's agricultural program involves students working on both school lands and individual home plots, using modern agricultural techniques learned at the school. Fathers of students are also involved in the program, both by periodically attending school sessions and by recording and comparing yields from sons' home plots with yields from other family lands. CODEL's support for the project has totalled about \$56,000 and has funded the purchase of various equipment, the partial construction cost of buildings, and some operating expenses.

Musoma, Tanzania, Cattle
Dips Program

In the Mara Region of Northwestern Tanzania, local Zebu cattle are being upgraded by cross-breeding with imported stock. The upgraded animals, while far better in milk yield than unimproved stock, are highly susceptible to tick-borne diseases. Local Maryknoll Missionaries -- a CODEL member organization -- and the government veterinary officers have developed a project to construct 20 cattle dips as part of a general animal health program. CODEL has provided funding for eight dips, about \$24,000 in all.

Iramba, Tanzania, Water
Supply

The Government of Tanzania drilled a bore hole in Iramba Village in 1971, but funds were unavailable to develop fully a water supply to utilize the source. Through local Maryknoll

Missionairies, CODEL provided financial resources amounting to \$10,000 to construct the village system which now supplies 535 families and the local hospital. The government's Water Department and the village undertook construction of the system and have assumed its operation and maintenance costs.

Tanzania Cancer Control Project

The project is an expansion of an assistance program which has been provided to Muhimbili University by Professor Ulrich Henschke of Howard University since 1968. It involves six components: training of Tanzanian physicians and technologists in cancer control; development of a cancer control referral network for Tanzania; organization of a cancer prevention program; organization of a cancer detection program; cancer research, and creation of a cancer survey. The project's activities will be implemented by joint efforts of Muhimbili Medical Center and government and mission hospitals -- many operated by CODEL members -- throughout Tanzania. The project has been approved by USAID Tanzania for OPG funding, effective December 1, 1977. Total project costs over six years will run \$810,000 of which OPG support will account for nearly \$500,000. CODEL will serve as project holder for the OPG and will provide about \$70,000 toward project management.

Hanang, Tanzania Ujamaa Village Health Care Scheme

The Hanang Ujamaa Village Health Care Scheme involves training Village Health Leaders (VHL) to work in 250 villages

throughout the Hanang District of Northern Tanzania. The VHLs will be prepared to lead a range of village health activities: health education, organization of clinics and surveys, surveillance of infectious diseases, birth and death registration, community hygiene and health record-keeping. Training for VHLs is to be provided at a project center in Babati, Tanzania, and will be conducted by expatriate staff from CODEL member organizations (Medical Missionaries of Mary and Maryknoll Sisters) and Tanzanian medical personnel. The project has been developed through lengthy planning and pilot phases, during which CODEL provided \$103,000 in financial support including about \$70,000 in USAID DPG funds. Effective December 1, 1977, the project has been approved by USAID Tanzania for OPG support amounting to about \$340,000 over two years, with CODEL as project holder.

Arusha, Tanzania, Leadership
Training Center

Owned by the Catholic Diocese of Arusha and operated by lay staff and Maryknoll Sisters, the Leadership Training Center aims to foster leadership skills among local people, with a focus upon leadership for social and economic development at the village level. Leadership training is provided through seminars, conducted both at the center and in the villages by the center staff. Women's groups, government teachers and health workers, and groups drawn from general village populations are among the beneficiaries

of the center's program. CODEL has pledged over \$80,000 toward operating costs of the center, over a three-year period 1976-1978.

Meru, Kenya, Liliaba
Irrigation Scheme

This project is currently under construction and calls for creation of a system to pipe water from the site of a river dam to a new settlement area which is currently grazed only during the wet season. Some new piping will be installed and integrated with an existing line, which will be renovated. The ensuing water supply will serve both human and farm consumption; it is believed that it will make possible a permanent settlement and mixed farm economy of cropping and livestocking in the new settlement area. CODEL's support has amounted to \$14,000 to purchase materials.

Meru, Kenya, Inter-Church
Seeds Program

Based on a similar project which has been successfully implemented elsewhere in Kenya, this project encourages farmers to plant dry area crops such as sorghum and millet, yams, beans, cow peas, peanuts and other oil seeds, and chillies. It involves provision of improved seeds to selected farmers, who will grow the seeds in demonstration plots, and will return part of their yields for expanded distribution the next year. The project will also feature training activities both at a farmer training center, and through field extension. CODEL has approved \$21,000 to support purchase of materials and project operation.

Kitui, Kenya, Primary Health Care Project

The project envisages delivery of primary health care services to rural areas of Kitui District by five mobile health teams. Services to be provided will include mother-child health care, immunizations, health education, family planning and curative care. Women's groups will provide a major channel for service delivery, and instruction will be provided to leaders of women's groups. CODEL's member organizations in the Catholic Diocese of Kitui (Sisters of Mercy, Society of St. Patrick) will provide supervisory and technical expertise to the project, which will also draw upon local community health personnel trained in the Mutomo Hospital Nursing school. CODEL has funded a planning and pilot stage of the project, amounting to about \$45,000 in all. The fully operational project will be proposed to USAID Kenya for OPG support and is projected to require funding of \$340,000 over three years, with CODEL as project holder.

Kenya Small Grants Projects

CODEL has provided \$25,000 each to the Kenya Catholic Secretariat and the National Christian Council of Kenya to be awarded in the form of grants or loans in response to proposals for small-scale projects developed at the village level. CODEL has stipulated that the maximum grant or loan amount to be awarded should be \$2,000. Both the KCS and the NCKK consider small grants requests on a regular basis, sitting in committees made up of district or diocesan staff

with responsibilities in development work. Though CODEL's funds have been commingled with others, in general small grants monies have supported food production, water supply and small cottage industry projects.

Uganda Church Planning and
Development Coordinating
Unit

In 1976 the Church of Uganda established a planning and development advisory office to coordinate and better focus its overall strategy and approach to development work throughout the country. The office is made up of four sections: a Coordinator's Unit to direct the office and in general to oversee Church activity in development fields; a Research Unit to assist individual parishes and dioceses to assess development problems and resources; a Project Unit to advise and assist parishes and dioceses on planning and implementing development programs; and a Training Unit to strengthen the skills of development workers at the parish or diocesan level. The total program will cost \$360,000 over three years of which the local church will contribute \$90,000. CODEL has agreed to provide funding for the Coordinator's Unit at a level of \$14,000 annually for a three year period. These funds provide salary and operating costs for the Coordinator and staff.

Kerio Fishing Boats Project

Along Lake Turkana of Northern Kenya, a Fishermen's Cooperative has been established over the past few years through the efforts of missionary groups and others. To

facilitate marketing, transportation is required to haul fish catch from remote points on the Lake to a central collection station. Since overland transport is virtually impossible, it was recommended that five shallow draft in-board diesel boats be constructed locally, and be used to assemble fish catch along the lake. Total cost of building the five boats was estimated at \$12,000 and CODEL has contributed \$4,600 of this sum.

Latin America

Ecumenical Collaboration in Service and Development, Bolivia

La Asociacion Ecumenica Para Coordinación Y Cooperación en Trabajos de Desarrollo Social (ASEC) was founded in 1976 with a Board representing a number of Protestant and Catholic churches and organizations. Initial leadership is from German Bread for the World and the German Lutheran Church. ASEC currently provides staff and other support for rural community development projects near La Paz. ASEC recently sponsored a meeting to consider the establishment of a Bolivian development fund for community projects. The meeting was attended by representatives of a number of Catholic development groups in Bolivia; objectives and guidelines for the fund were agreed upon. CODEL approved funding of \$15,000 (project No. 37) to support staff persons and administrative expenses directed to building the ecumenical network of ASEC.

Education for Rural Health
and Nutrition

Centro de Promocion Integral Feminina (CEPRIFEM) is a program serving 27 community women's groups in the Santa Cruz region. It is sponsored by the Maryknoll Sisters, who made the contact with CODEL through the U.S. office of the order. CEPRIFEM's priority is nutrition education and it continues to prepare a daily radio program broadcast over a small station operated by the Methodist Church. CODEL approved funding of \$17,000 (Project No. 16) is for hiring a local professional staff person and for administrative expenses.

Alternative Careers for
Unwed Mothers, Brazil

This home provides a residence, training in various job skills, and health care for poor unwed mothers. It is part of the much larger program of the Banco da Providência, an organization providing social services and training, mainly in the Rio area. The total program is sponsored by the Catholic Diocese of Rio. Funding for the Banco comes from a large fair, organized mainly by socially prominent women in Rio, which brings in over \$1 million annually. The CODEL funds of \$40,000 (Project No. 20) are being used to build an extension to the home, which will increase capacity from 26 to 41 persons.

Collaboration in Community
Development Through
Information Exchange,
Brazil

This project to provide education and training to development groups through Brazil is sponsored by the broad national organization of the Federacao de Orgaos para Assistênci[^]a Social e Educacional (FASE). Mainly, FASE promotes various projects of community organization, non-formal education and increased productivity, working with many other organizations operating more on a regional or local basis. About 30 percent of the approximately \$700,000 budget is raised locally, partly through pledges from individuals; the rest comes from more than 20 overseas agencies. The CODEL approved funding of \$12,940 (Project No. 36) is for support of the quarterly journal, Proposta, which presents articles on community organization and development issues.

Training in Rural Radio
Education Techniques
for the Rural Amazon,
Brazil

The training in rural radio education techniques is an integral part of the total program of the Movimento de Educaç[~]ão de Base (MEB) which provides assistance in adult education programming to rural radio stations of the Catholic Church in many areas of Brazil, especially in the Amazon Basin. A unique feature of the program is the organizing of listening groups in each locality. The programming includes classes for elementary and high school

degrees, as well as non-formal education topics. The main funding of over \$1.5 million comes from the Brazilian government, as MEB has become the main private implementor of the national legislation on adult education. Private funds provide for program flexibility. CODEL funding of \$15,000 (Project No. 26) is for conducting courses for the staff members of the rural radio stations.

Joint Revolving Fund SSID/
Caritas, Dominican Republic

CODEL has encouraged Caritas Dominicana (the Catholic Relief Services counterpart) and Servicio Social de Iglesias Dominicanas (the Church World Service counterpart) to cooperate in the administration of a loan fund for community projects. The initial proposal came from Caritas, which already operates such a loan fund, especially for groups of farmers. CODEL has already funded an evaluation of the past Caritas work in the fund and a conference of all agencies in the Dominican Republic which are administering funds. CODEL is now seeking the approved \$50,000 (Project No. 33) from CRS and CWS.

Non-formal Education for the
Rural Poor, Dominican
Republic

Radio Enriquillo is a station operated by the Mission-hurst (C.I.C.M.) Fathers in the poor rural area of south-eastern Dominican Republic near the town of Barahona. Programs include entertainment combined with encouragement; for women

in nutrition, for men in agriculture, and for everyone in health, as well as religious programming which seeks to animate community development. A feature of the station in its first year of operation is that programs make frequent use of interviews in the communities. Also, mailboxes are placed throughout the communities and questions and messages for the various programs are submitted daily. Operational costs are covered by selective advertisements. CODEL approved funding of \$38,763 (Project No. 29) was slow in being implemented and is intended for the station facilities; an expansion of broadcasting power is planned.

Food and Nutrition Through
Farmer Organization and
Training, Dominican
Republic

This program is really a consortium of a number of local farmer groups in the poor area in the southeastern Dominican Republic near Duverge. Initial formation was through Catholic Relief Service and the Missionhurst (C.I.C.M.) Fathers, who continue to assist. The consortium has set up a small revolving fund for loans to the local organizations. In order to assess applications, the consortium has developed a set of indicators of capability and adequate functioning for the local community farmer organizations. CODEL funding of \$5,500 (Project No. 5) actually came from the Missionhurst organization in the U.S. which channeled it through CODEL as an indication of support.

APPENDIX E. SYSTEMS AND FORMS FOR PROJECT ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

A system and accompanying forms for project analysis and evaluation have been developed for and by CODEL. We can look at these systems and forms in comparison with current practice. The system and the practice can then be reviewed in terms of the purposes and of the actual work and relationships of CODEL.

In its intended or proposed form, the CODEL system for analysis and evaluation would include the following steps:

1. Informal visits to potential project locations and observation of the social situation, organizational goals and experience, and network relationships.
2. Submission of project application to CODEL, according to whatever format the submitting agency chooses.
3. Transfer of information to CODEL Project Nomination Form; and request for additional information needed; Nomination Form completed when information received.
4. Staff review and decision.

5. If decision is positive, preparation of Project Summary.
6. Projects Committee review and decision.
7. If decision is positive, preparation of Project Design and Evaluation Form by CODEL.
8. Preparation of letter notifying submitting agency of grant and evaluation requirements and requests; transmittal of Project Design and Evaluation Form.
9. Conduct of mid-project evaluation.
10. Conduct of final evaluation.
11. Incorporation of evaluation results into CODEL self-evaluation; assessment of replicability and incorporation into CODEL planning and programming; communication of results where useful (through field visits, correspondence, newsletters, reports to the membership, and conferences).

Under an AID-sponsored contract, Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI) has worked with CODEL in designing the system for project analysis and evaluation and in developing the forms, especially the following:

- . The Project Nomination Form;
- . The Project Summary Form;
- . The Project Design and Evaluation Form.

(A Project Tracking Card has also been designed for internal management purposes.)

Current Use of the System

There is general recognition among the CODEL staff that the assistance by DAI has improved both awareness of and procedures for project analysis and evaluation, even though the system is not used in a precise or fully consistent way to date.

Currently, there is usually no separate preparation of both a Nominating Form and a Project Summary Form. A project proposal is often received in a form suitable for staff review perhaps with the addition of the Project Summary Form¹ and/or a logical framework. After the staff review and approval, a Project Summary is prepared, according to the CODEL-originated outline.¹ The outline calls for the attachment of both the Log-Frame and the analytical Project Summary, although both are not included in most instances.

After approval of the project, the Project Design and Evaluation Form is not used by the CODEL staff and is not sent to the grantees. Grantees are now informed that an evaluative report by the grantee is expected at the mid-point and the end of the project. Reports received from the field may provide an indication of progress toward goals, or at least of completion of expected inputs and outputs. At present, there is no organized use or analysis of these reports by CODEL.

1. These are two kinds of project summary. The "Project Summary Form," also called the "Analysis Form," developed by DAI, which rates or "grades" a project; and the "Project Summary" a guide for descriptive presentations to the Projects Committee, which constitutes the first page of the CODEL-originated projects description form.

Comment on the System and Forms

For project analysis

1. At present, there is little felt or actual need for a system which would help distinguish among proposed projects, because CODEL is not faced by difficult choices among a number of projects, all of which would ostensibly be suitable. The review of proposals, usually submitted with initial sponsorship from a member agency, determines whether the basic project activity appears to be in line with CODEL guidelines of serving the poor and whether it has an ecumenical aspect. When such qualifications are lacking -- usually in the case of an inadequate ecumenical dimension -- an effort is made to develop a more acceptable project activity, to obtain more information on the ecumenical nature, or to expand the ecumenical participation.

2. At some time, CODEL may be faced with more good proposals than it can handle. Even with a modest surplus, decisions would probably be made on basic intuitive comparisons of which projects were of greater interest to CODEL by virtue of a special relationship to development of poor people or of a strong contribution to ecumenical network building.

3. If the number of proposals being received is so great that a comparative rating system is desired, the approach suggested by DAI would be useful. The following modifications should be considered.

- a. The Project Nomination Form should be keyed and organized parallel to the Project Summary and the Evaluation Form. In this way, transfer of information from one form to another and preparation of draft summaries and evaluation forms can be a clerical task.
- b. The identification of detailed funds and behavior changes by functional areas within a given project is certainly too arbitrary to provide useful information for subsequent analysis. The project can be typed in general according to its main thrusts. This typing may include considerable overlap; for example, between agriculture and community development.
- c. The discussion of the sponsoring organization could include a statement of its experiences and interest in evaluation and its likely commitment to such a process in the proposed project.
- d. In general, CODEL's analysis should be in awareness that projects are not "CODEL" projects. Rather, they are projects to which CODEL relates. Therefore, CODEL's responsibilities and its knowledge and analysis do not have to be exhaustive, but can rather focus on those aspects of greatest significance and interest to CODEL. For example, in describing "Other Organization and Association Involvement" (pp. 6-7), CODEL can focus on which

are most important from CODEL's viewpoint; a detailed typing by district and region and by type of association does not appear necessary.

- e. If project intent and results are to be discussed in terms of the behavior changes of participants, such behavior changes should also include the project leaders and the key officials and elites in the social and economic environment of the target population. Perhaps, the behavior modification language is too different from the way the most sensitive project sponsors conceptualize development and should be dropped altogether.
- f. The nomination form and the summary should include a qualitative description of what is the larger significance of the project;¹ unique and experimental approaches being tried; and the greatest problems in implementation and in the structures within which the program is trying to operate or which it is attempting to change. This discussion should also point out aspects of the project which do not conform closely to the CODEL guidelines.
- g. If a scaled evaluation of different aspects of a proposed project is to be used, it should be noted that the suggestion of the introduction

1. See the section on "Performance Versus Significance" in John C. Summer, Beyond Charity, U.S. Voluntary Aid for a Changing Third World, Overseas Development Council, 1977, pps. 82-85.

that the individual numerical ratings or "grades" should be added (statement of January 12, 1976, p. 2) is not appropriate unless the various aspects being rated are first weighted by the CODEL staff. Otherwise, a high rating in less important aspects may give a biased indication of the overall project "grade."

Project Evaluation

The system and forms developed by DAI and CODEL are attractive in many aspects. There is a creative formatting which allows the results of the mid-point and final evaluations to be recorded on the same sheets as the initial listing of purposes, goals, outputs and inputs. Nevertheless, we consider that no more than 10 percent of the projects visited in the field evaluation would be likely to use the draft Project Design and Evaluation Form of February 28, 1977, if it were mailed to them with only the current introduction for explanation. A significant proportion of the projects visited would not only avoid using the form, they would react negatively, dismissing it as inappropriate. The RRNA persons conducting this evaluation of CODEL do not believe that the kind of evaluation being asked is inappropriate. However, a skilled and personal presentation of the process and forms, along with simplifying the forms themselves, will be necessary if the forms are to be accepted and useful on the field.

1. The proposed system, which represents a considerable change in procedures for most overseas PVOs cannot be introduced effectively by mail. Some kind of personal presentation and discussion will be necessary in almost every case.

2. The brief statement of benefits in the introduction is good in its emphasis on the grantee choosing its own criteria for evaluation. The personal presentations should follow-up on this idea that the suggested system can assist the grantee in its own efforts to better serve the target population. In this regard, the system proposed should itself induce a consideration of how the participants themselves can participate in the evaluation. Clearly, grantees cannot efficiently provide a unique evaluation or carry on a unique process for each of a number of grantors, so the system suggested by CODEL must be incorporated into their own efforts.

3. This personal presentation can eliminate the proposed double formatting of every table, in which CODEL is to place its perceptions on one half and the grantee its own perceptions on the other. The double formatting procedure is both unwieldy and likely to appear overbearing to the grantee. If the full evaluation system is to be used, the final statements of purposes, goals, outputs and inputs can best be defined in a joint work session of a CODEL representative (not necessarily the regional coordinator in every case) and the leadership of the grantee.

4. Some of the comments on the project analysis system apply to the evaluation form as well.

- a. An effort is made to allow enough lines for the most complex project but is unlikely to deal with 15 indicators of purpose achievement, and projects should not try to monitor such a number. Rather, it is more realistic -- and

probably more beneficial -- to encourage projects to define the few most appropriate indicators.

- b. Again, the language of modification of behavior and value may seem inadequate to many grantees to explain what they are attempting, especially for those grantees trying to achieve significant change in community structures and the parameters faced by the target population.
- c. In general, it would be preferable to avoid technical language where it is not essential. For example, the "Purpose Matrix" can be a "Statement of Purpose."
- d. Space should be allowed for the qualitative evaluation of significance; that is, does the project add up to more than the sum of its outputs?

5. The strategy for implementation should aim at gaining acceptance and successful use of the process by one or two key projects in each region. Additionally this would provide a useful testing and evaluation of the evaluation process and form. Further presentation of the process could be, not in terms of a CODEL suggestion or requirement, but rather of a sharing of a process and format which other overseas church-related programs have found useful.

6. Until such experience is gained, a simpler format should be available for making suggestions to grantees.

This could be built on the logical framework with addition of appropriate questions relating to the timing of outputs and inputs. Despite its comprehensiveness, the draft evaluation form does not provide for a monitoring of such timing and schedules as well. Since this deficiency has been pointed out by the CODEL staff, it appears that they also can correct it by adding the appropriate dimension of relating outputs and inputs to previously established schedules. This dimension is already included in the financial reports of some grantees to CODEL.