

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

Date

9/17/81

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1.		
2. Mrs. Christina Schoux		
3. AFR/DP		
4.		
5.		

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	For Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

Attached is a copy of the evaluation of the Experiment in International Living project that Pat Fleuret did for us. I will be cabling Mission comments as soon as possible.

Attachment
 804 924-7161
 Nassan Tomdequini
 978-5359 in DC
 676-1533
 (Wilson)

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
Craig G. Buck, Acting Director USAID/Kampala	Phone No.

5041-102

U. S. Government Printing Office: 1980-311-188/20

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.806

END OF PROJECT EVALUATION: EIL MANPOWER

TRAINING IN UGANDA

AID Grant AID/afr-G-1565. 15 July 1979-30 September 1981

Patrick Fleuret
13 September 1981

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary	1
II. Methodology	3
III. External Factors	4
IV. Inputs	5
V. Outputs	12
VI. Purposes	19
VII. Goals	26
VIII. Beneficiaries	28
IX. Unplanned Effects	30
X. Lessons Learned	31
XI. Special Comments	33
Appendix 1: Significant Project Events	37
Appendix 2: Preliminary Budget Breakdown	38
Appendix 3: Persons Contacted	40
Appendix 4: Documents Consulted	43
Appendix 5: Evaluation Scope of Work	44

I. Summary

The Experiment in International Living (EIL) received a grant of \$1,012,583 to undertake a manpower training program in Uganda, and activities took place during the period July 1979 to September 1981. (A calendar of significant project events is presented as Appendix 1.)

The goal of the project was to assist in the reconstruction of Uganda by meeting Uganda's most pressing needs for skilled manpower. The project objectives were to organize a number of training activities, institutionalize these in various local settings, and so improve the quality of life and productivity in rural areas. The areas chosen, after much discussion with AID, GOV, and various private Ugandan organizations, were Lira/Apao (BEIRD Program and Rural Productivity Training); Busoga (BEIRD Program/Busoga Multi-Sectoral Rural Development Program); and Masaka (Masonry/Construction Skills Training).

From the beginning problems were encountered, some stemming from the perhaps inadequately appreciated difficulty of working in unsettled political and economic circumstances, and some stemming from disagreements between AID and EIL about the directions the program should take. Permanent in-country staff were not fielded until March 1980. Further political and economic disruptions, along with project revisions required by USAID/U, delayed the beginning of actual training until July 1980 (Masaka), August 1980 (Lira) and January 1981 (Busoga). Once training was underway events proceeded more smoothly. By September of 1981 a total of 703 participants had received EIL-organized training, ranging from one-day special topics courses to a six-month construction skills course. The topics covered ranged broadly over the areas of agriculture, community development, family health and environmental sanitation, handicrafts, business management, and fundamentals of masonry and carpentry building techniques.

The project has only partly achieved its purposes and met its goals, due to a variety of circumstances: continued domestic instability in Uganda, coupled with a very slow economic recovery following the liberation war; the costly and time-consuming necessity to import many commodities from Kenya; the short period elapsed between start of training and project termination (no more than fourteen months); and continued drought, especially in the north.

Overall, EIL has demonstrated a commendable capacity to plan, organize, and implement training courses in a wide range of areas. In many cases, the training provided by EIL was the first that participants had received since the mid-1970's. A case may be made, however, that the training itself and the selection of participants may not have responded to Uganda's "most pressing manpower needs," as required in the terms of the grant agreement. This is because the preliminary EIL needs assessment was incomplete. Further, much of the energy of EIL's Uganda staff has been expended not in training *per se*, but in managing a variety of community development initiatives (organization of village groups, coordination of local implementing agencies, arranging for delivery of agricultural inputs). Although these tasks were to some extent foreseen during project planning, and are linked closely with the various training programs, and although they needed to be done, the result has been to shift the program from an emphasis on EIL's strengths (in training) to an area (implementation of rural development) where the organization's capability is perhaps not well-developed.

The financial aspects of the project are summarized in Appendix 2.

The table indicates costs during the project planning (or pre-implementation) period; during the early implementation period (when only two training projects were in motion and when much disruption was caused by security problems); and during the period of full implementation (when all three country projects were fully staffed and operational). The figures presented represent actual expenditures during the first and second periods, but projected expenditures during the final period. The financial data are not complete; footnotes to the table indicate points of uncertainty.

II. Evaluation Methodology

The task assigned was to conduct an end-of-project evaluation of AID grant AID/afr-G-1565, made to the Experiment in International Living. The evaluation focuses on three major elements of the project: the Lira training program, the Busoga program and the Masaka program. To collect information on each of these the schedule below was followed:

Table 1: Allocation of Time for Evaluation (26 August-8 September, 1981)

Wednesday	Kampala	Thursday	Kampala and Masaka
Thursday	Lira	Friday	Masaka
Friday	Lira	Saturday	Masaka
Saturday	Lira	Sunday	Kampala
Sunday	Kampala	Monday	Write-Up
Monday	Busoga	Tuesday	"
Tuesday	Busoga	Wednesday	"
Wednesday	Busoga	Thursday	"

In these places discussions were held with EIL staff; with local ministry staff associated with EIL activities; with representatives of various church groups involved in EIL activities; with members of women's groups, youth groups and other community-level organizations affected by EIL activities; and with various persons directly or indirectly trained by EIL. The information gathered during these discussions, together with material from various AID and EIL project-related documents, constitutes the basis for the report which follows.

A list of persons contacted is presented as Appendix 3; a list of documents examined is Appendix 4; the evaluation scope of work is Appendix 5. The evaluator is a social anthropologist with previous experience in AID and in Uganda.

III. External Factors

Many factors external to project management have had a profound impact on implementation. These are discussed in turn below.

A. During 1979 movement and communication in Uganda were very difficult. In addition, central ministries were disorganized and almost entirely out of touch with field staff. These conditions hampered EIL greatly during the initial period of needs assessment and project development, which was originally planned to last from July to December 1979, but which eventually continued until March 1980.

B. At the end of 1979 supervision of and responsibility for EIL activities passed in effect from AID/W to USAID/Uganda after arrival of the country mission director. A new set of priorities, developed by the USAID in early 1980, required considerable changes in EIL project plans. One entire activity (Ngora Health in south Teso) had to be dropped entirely, while the Busoga project required extensive redesign. The problems stemmed from a USAID/U decision to focus on agriculture and education in country programming, and to avoid activities in the health sector.

C. The fall of the Binaisa government in May 1980 coincided with a period of increased instability and disorder which curtailed EIL activities in Lira. Restrictions on movement of people and commodities became very harsh, affecting progress in Masaka.

D. The election campaign organized by the Military Commission and especially voter registration (in late 1980) absorbed the energies of EIL Ugandan counterparts and staff to a very considerable extent. Little could be accomplished until after December, when the elections and holiday season were ended.

E. At no time has the availability of commodities in Uganda or the ease of movement improved to the extent which all assumed would be possible. The continued necessity to import both personal and project supplies from Kenya has added to the cost of the program, and the difficulties involved in arranging such imports have taken much time away from direct project operations. Project directors estimate that at least 25% of their time has been devoted to arranging for and shepherding commodity shipments. A single trip to Nairobi for supplies, for example, could take ten days or two weeks, counting travel time and the delays experienced in obtaining customs clearances and arranging transport.

F. The rains were poor throughout 1980, especially in the north. Thus the agricultural training and inputs organized by EIL and delivered to BEIRD satellite schools, youth groups, women's groups and village development clubs are not reflected in increased output or income among rural households. This accounts for the failure to achieve several of the project purposes.

There is no question that the combination of these factors has added greatly to the difficulty of managing the EIL project and accomplishing project purposes. Other factors not external to the project are examined in Sections VI, VII, X and XI.

IV. Inputs

In this section delivery of inputs will be discussed separately for each of the three EIL training projects. Unfortunately no logframe was developed or specifically approved for the EIL effort; but some discussion of inputs is presented in the April 1980 implementation plan for Lira, in the August 1980 plan for Masaka, and in the November 1980 initial project outline for Busoga. These documents provide the basis for the analysis which follows.

A. Lira

1. Administrative/Logistical Inputs

a. EIL to assign a project director and co-director to Lira/Apao.

The project director was hired in January 1980 following November 1979 discussions in AID/W. Subsequent difficulties in resolving project design issues prevented the arrival in Uganda of the director until March 1980. The co-director, although regarded by EIL as direct-hire staff, was paid on a consultancy basis. Both have been present in the field and responsible for project operations since mid-1980, apart from periodic absences due to need to assemble supplies in Kenya and the birth of a child.

b. EIL to provide a project vehicle and four motorcycles for key staff.

The vehicle (4WD Chevrolet LUV) and four motorcycles were provided in mid-1980. The pick-up was out of commission for several months in late 1980 following a severe road accident. Subsequently three other motorcycles and a total of 31 bicycles were made available by EIL. The extra motorcycles were for the use of other key EIL staff (a total of six people), plus the Fatima TTC BEIRD project coordinator. The 31 bicycles were for the use of local staff of the Ministry of Culture and Community Development (MCCD). These consisted mainly of Community Development Assistants (CDA's) trained in EIL-organized courses, who required transport in order to apply their training. Some of the bicycles were also provided to community workers hired by EIL to work under the Anglican Christian Rural Service (CRS) program in Lira.

c. EIL to hire two key staff to augment Fatima TTC BEIRD staff.

One man was hired in August 1980 to develop and supervise the BEIRD carpentry workshop at Fatima TTC. At about the same time a second man was hired to serve as coordinator of the BEIRD/EIL Model Homestead program. The carpentry workshop manager was dismissed in March 1981 for engaging in maondo; at this time the Model Homestead coordinator assumed workshop management duties as well. The original workshop manager was not replaced, partly because the end of project was approaching and partly because the Model Homestead enterprise had not developed sufficiently to require a full-time coordinator.

In addition, EIL paid for basic tools, benches, and cabinets for the carpentry workshop since these were not forthcoming from MOE.

d. EIL to hire directly or have seconded six key staff trainers.

EIL successfully arranged for the secondment of five ministry staff to the Lira program. Four of these were from MCCD, one from the Ministry

of Cooperatives and Marketing (MCM). The MCM staff member was subsequently dismissed for magando and not replaced. A further staff member was obtained on loan from the Lira CRS program, and his salary supplemented from EIL funds.

In addition, EIL hired, trained, and paid the salaries of eight CRS community fieldworkers, beginning in January 1981. The salaries will not be picked up by CRS upon EIL departure. EIL also paid the salary of a carpentry instructor at Aloi Technical Institute from May 1980 to September 1981.

e. EIL to hire as assistant project director the principal of the Lira District Farm Institute (DFI).

This was done. The DFI principal has been a major contributor to the EIL program, providing training facilities, logistical and administrative support, and training staff as well. EIL could have secured such facilities in no other way, since Patima TTC facilities were fully utilized by the teacher training program.

f. EIL to provide necessary training materials and equipment.

This was accomplished, although important constraints emerged with respect to the cost and difficulty of transporting such supplies. A critical early assumption had been that such materials would become available in Uganda as economic recovery took place; the unanticipated slowness of this recovery meant nearly all materials had to be acquired from Kenya until the last few weeks of project operations.

g. EIL to renovate the DFI training site.

This was done indirectly, by reimbursing the DFI on a per diem basis for costs incurred in housing trainees attending the residential courses. The rate was 50 US\$ per trainee per day. Part of this money was used to purchase indoor ~~gamm~~, to buy spare parts for the DFI bus, to repair the DFI tractor, to purchase cooking utensils, diesel fuel, stationery, and to re-wire looted electrical circuits.

h. EIL to provide subsistence for residential trainees at Lira DFI.

This was done at a per-trainee cost of 800-1200 US\$ per week. In addition, EIL supplemented the salaries of six DFI instructors who taught in EIL-organized training courses, as well as the salaries of five DFI kitchen staff.

2. Training Inputs

a. EIL to train BEIRD and MCCD-staff in group work, teaching methods, training skills, needs assessment, and planning.

This was done formally in an August 1980 training program delivered to seven key EIL training staff. However, informal "training of trainers" took place on a nearly continual basis throughout the project, and EIL was of course heavily involved in the development of curricula for the various courses undertaken by their training staff and by DFI instructors.

b. EIL to train CDA's and Youth Assistants (YA's) in group mobilization skills, training skills, needs assessment, and planning.

This was done in a January 1981 program delivered to 32 participants. Of the 32, 26 were MCCD field staff, of whom 15 were CDA's (working primarily with women's groups), and 11 were YA's (working with youth groups). The remaining six were CRS fieldworkers who supervised activities of both women's and youth groups enrolled under the CRS program.

In addition, EIL provided support for a rural survey in late 1980 that helped CDA's identify active community groups and assess their training needs.

3. Coordination Inputs

- a. EIL to establish a coordinating body composed of EIL staff, BEIRD staff, MCCD staff, and local trainers.

This was done early on and functioned effectively throughout the project in planning training courses and organizing the necessary movements of people and supplies. In addition to the representatives planned in the implementation paper, further representation was sought and obtained from MOA and MCM.

- b. EIL to coordinate activities with other BEIRD programs and with the National Curriculum Development Center of the MOE.

This was not done. The overall problems of communication and governmental inertia meant that a good deal of EIL effort would have had to be expended on this component to show any results, and it was judged that the effort needed would be too large for the small pay-off foreseeable. EIL maintained coordination activities with BEIRD at the district level, but not above.

- c. EIL to coordinate activities with MCCD.

This was done to a minor extent, evidenced by the presence of MCCD personnel from Kampala at opening and closing of the Lira training courses. One positive outcome of this coordination is discussed in Section V.B.1.

B. Busoga

EIL inputs in Busoga fall into two categories: those assisting the Church of Uganda Multi-Sectoral Rural Development Program (MSRDP), and those assisting the Kaliro TTC BEIRD program. All of course are predicated upon having an EIL project director on-site, which was not accomplished until September 1980. The long delay in getting started on the Busoga project was due partly to redesign following USAID/U objections to the originally-proposed health component, and partly to the need for the EIL director to complete a stateside course of instruction before coming to Uganda. The director was provided with a vehicle for project duties (2WD Chevrolet '77').

1. MSRDP Inputs

- a. EIL and MSRDP Coordinator to conduct a training course for MSRDP technical staff, in areas of leadership, training skills, survey techniques, and program planning.

This was planned for July 1981 but cancelled when the previously-arranged facilities (a DFI) were appropriated by the government for

Youth Wing activities. As a substitute EIL conducted one-on-one sessions with each staff member. In addition, a one-week study tour to examine small-scale rural development efforts in Kenya was organized for MSRD staff. This took place in July 1981.

- b. EIL to assist in design and implementation of three week-long training courses for representatives of each of three MSRD demonstration villages.

This planned input was expanded to include training for representatives from a total of 18 demonstration communities.

2. Kaliro TTC Inputs

- a. EIL to provide two additional staff members to BEIRD program for 1981 school year. One of these to be a specialist in animal husbandry, the other to be a home economist.

The animal husbandry person was not provided, and the home economist arrived only recently and has not yet assumed teaching duties. Delays were due to difficulty of arranging secondment of staff from MOA to MOE, caused chiefly by lack of follow-through on the part of BEIRD staff in Kampala.

However, EIL was able to provide salaries for nine community workers in the MSRD program. These salaries are being picked up by the diocese upon EIL departure.

- b. EIL to assist in training of BEIRD coordinator and 18 satellite school teachers.

This effort was expanded considerably to provide training for 36 satellite school personnel, 9 Kaliro TTC faculty, and five district administration officials.

- c. EIL to provide motorcycle transport for BEIRD coordinator and will make available for purchase 18 bicycles for BEIRD satellite school teachers.

This was accomplished. A further 54 bicycles were made available for purchase by the MSRD community workers trained under EIL supervision.

- d. EIL to assist in procuring needed training materials.

This was done. The problems of supply and transport which afflicted the Lira project were less extreme in Busoga. This was partly because of physical proximity to Kenya, partly because supplies of all kinds were more frequently to be found in Jinja than in Lira, and partly because the Busoga project director successfully established personal links with a number of Ugandans in a position to make commodities more easily available.

C. Masaka

1. Administrative/Logistical Inputs

- a. EIL will assign a project director to Masaka.

This was done in March 1980. The individual departed unexpectedly in April 1981 for personal reasons, and was promptly replaced in May 1981. In addition, EIL provided a co-director beginning in November 1980, whose

task was to offer additional training in construction-related skills.

b. EIL to provide a project vehicle.

~~Vehicle~~ (and Chevrolet LUV) was on-site from mid-1980. In addition, one motorcycle and two bicycles were provided for use by the training staff.

c. EIL to hire four key Ugandan technical staff to plan and teach the training courses.

During the first training cycle (July 1980-February 1981) training was done by EIL staff and by Brothers of the Bannakaroli mission possessing the requisite skills; no supplementary staff took part. During the second training cycle, EIL has employed four graduates from the first cycle to help teach the trainees. In addition, EIL has employed a cook to prepare meals for the trainees in residence, watchmen to guard construction materials, and has recently hired a local contractor on a part-time basis to assist in training.

d. EIL to form the Kiteredde Construction Institute (KCI) by building a training shed with office and storeroom space.

This was done, although delayed greatly by lack of funds and material, and to some extent by poor management. The training shed was finally completed in August 1981, although two smaller auxiliary structures were built earlier. Work has also progressed on a cookhouse, latrine, well, and demonstration facilities associated with the training shed. These latter structures were not foreseen in the original input schedule, but have been provided to assist in making KCI a viable training institute.

e. EIL will provide health care and subsistence for trainees.

This was provided. Average costs are difficult to assess since a variable share was paid by the Bannakaroli Brothers, but the most likely figure seems to be between 4000 and 7000 US\$ per boy per six-month training cycle (housing has been provided free by the Brothers).

f. EIL to assist in obtaining MOE certification of the KCI as an educational program.

This assistance was provided. The KCI has been granted the standard one-year probational status. Before final approval is granted some issues regarding the duration of the training program will have to be resolved (see Section XI).

2. Training Inputs

a. A full curriculum for the six-month course will be developed.

This was done; the curriculum focuses on masonry construction while providing basics in carpentry, and seems well-adapted to Ugandan circumstances.

b. EIL to institute an apprentice program with local contractors.

No formal apprentice program was developed. However, EIL has managed to place every graduate of both completed training cycles. In large part this is due to an informal agreement among local contractors, many of whom

10

were trained in the past by a key member of the EIL Ugandan staff, to hire KCI graduates as these become available and as the work situation permits.

- c. Special in-service and sandwich courses will be organized, contractor's

This was done in February 1981, when a two-week/course was held during a pause between KCI training cycles. Another two-week course was provided to "day-boys" who work for local contractors as porters but who do not qualify for the full KCI course. Additional training inputs consist of a two-day in-service course organized in June 1981, and monthly discussion sessions held for local contractors on an informal basis.

3. Other Inputs

- a. EIL will provide one technical/architectural consultant to advise on local needs, training, and evaluation.

This was done with good results. In particular, an early attempt to construct the training shed was found to be inadequate and plans were thoroughly revised. The resultant structure is large enough for the program and solidly constructed.

- b. EIL to assist in recruitment and screening of trainees.

EIL and the Bannakaroli Brothers work together to select trainees. The criteria used are competence in English, recommendations from teachers and community leaders, and personal deportment. Generally the 25 trainees for each cycle are chosen from among 40-50 applicants.

- c. EIL to provide a focus on hands-on practical training.

This had been done with considerable impact. The six-month KCI graduates are preferred by local contractors to the four-year graduates of St. Joseph's technical School, who receive a largely theoretical course of instruction.

- d. EIL to support graduates in their apprenticeships and in the formation of small business firms.

As noted earlier, EIL has placed every KCI graduate, most with local contractors but others with Ministry of Works offices in Takai, Masaka and Mbarara. It has proven more difficult to help graduates form small business firms, and predictably so. These boys leave the KCI course as able but inexperienced workers, and it usually takes years of experience in construction before one is able to proceed independently. Nevertheless one group of four graduates from KCI cycle I has been formed into a blockmaking company with EIL assistance.

- e. EIL to establish a revolving fund to provide tools for KCI graduates and local businesses.

The notion of a revolving fund was dropped due to associated difficulties of management, accounting, and loan defaults in a strongly inflationary economy where high interest rates are required. Instead, graduates are provided with a basic tool kit, and KCI has been provided with a large store of construction equipment which will be used for training and made available to members of an "Old Boys" cooperative society with membership drawn partly from the ranks of KCI graduates.

D. EIL Inputs: Conclusion

EIL has made considerable adjustments in delivery of inputs from what was planned as late as mid-1980. These changes were made to adapt the program more closely to local needs, and point up simultaneously the inadequacy of earlier planning efforts and the institutional flexibility of EIL.

The most significant adaptation made by EIL relates to supply of commodities. Earlier project documents state quite definitely that the EIL effort will be focused on training, and that no commodities will be provided beyond the bare minimum needed for demonstration purposes. As a consequence, relatively little money was included in the budget for purchase of supplies. Problems emerged immediately when BEIRD project masters, GDA's, youth assistants, and others attempted to apply their training. Without the appropriate materials, practical application was impossible. EIL responded to the problem by using more money for purchase of supplies than had originally been planned, and by liaising with Ugandan organizations such as the MOA to make more materials available to trainees and groups served by trainees.

Provision of bicycles to community workers (both MCCD and private) emerged as a major EIL input, but this was not foreseen in original planning. The bicycles were needed if the community workers were to apply their training, since they otherwise would have had neither a means of communication with more than a very small number of groups, nor a means of bringing supplies to them.

A significant issue is the inability of EIL to provide program coordination with the BEIRD program at other than a purely local level. This was the only opportunity for EIL to develop linkages with an organization that could sustain the Lira and Busoga efforts in a national context, and it was not exploited. The EIL programs have an exclusively local character, although some EIL staff have maintained personal links with national-level ministry officials.

V. Outputs

The primary output of the EIL project has been training delivered, although a certain number of non-training outputs have been produced as well. Unfortunately it is not possible to compare the outputs produced with the outputs planned. This is because the discussion of outputs presented in the 1980 implementation plans actually deals largely with project inputs and purposes. As noted earlier, no complete logframe was ever developed for the project and this makes proper evaluation difficult. In the sections below the achieved outputs are described and discussed separately for each of the three training programs.

A. Lira

1. Training Outputs

A total of ten training courses were organized by EIL. Relevant information is summarized in the table below.

Table : Lira Training Outputs

Course Title	Date	Duration (days)	No. Participants	Total person-training days
Training for Trainers	Aug. 80	8	7	56
Leadership	Jan. 81	14	32	448
Agriculture	Feb. 81	14	26	364
Agriculture	Mar. 81	7	23	161
BEIRD	Mar. 81	7	13	91
Agriculture	Mar. 81	7	23	161
GDA-Women's Groups	May-June-81	42	19	798
BEIRD	May 81	5	15	75
Agriculture	June 81	5	24	120
Village Women	July-Aug. 81	42	43	1806
Totals:		151	225	4080

Average Duration of Course: 18 days/person.

The paragraphs below offer more detail on each of the courses delivered.

a. Training for Trainers

This course was delivered directly by EIL to their immediate staff who would in future be responsible for the bulk of the training. Topics covered included theory of training, program design, communication to groups, facilitation of group activity, training methodology, needs assessment, and interview and survey techniques.

b. Leadership

This course was delivered by EIL staff to MCCD youth assistants, MCCD field assistants dealing with women's groups, and Christian Rural Service field workers. The training focuses on group building, leadership skills, communication skills, community development, problem solving, program design, and the future duties of these people within the EIL project framework.

c. Agricultural Courses

These courses, of varying duration, were delivered by DFI and Fatima

TTC staff to youth assistants and leaders of youth groups. Topics covered included extension approaches, legume production, animal husbandry, vegetable production, nutrition cookery, fruit production, cotton production, use of fertilizers and manures, cereals production, and marketing.

d. BEIRD

These courses were delivered by DFI and Fatima TTC staff to BEIRD project masters, that is, to teachers at BEIRD satellite primary schools responsible for initiating BEIRD-related activities. The training focused on agricultural topics, BEIRD principles and the Model Homestead concept.

e. CDA-Women's Course

This course was delivered by a wide variety of instructors, including representatives of the MOA, Ministry of Animal Resources, MOH, MCCD, Red Cross, Family Planning Association of Uganda, EIL, MCM, and MOE. Participants were MCCD staff responsible for organizing and supervising the activities of women's groups. Topics covered included community development, marketing, extension, group skills, teaching methods, nutrition, home hygiene, family health care, family planning, animal husbandry, vegetable production, use of locally available substitutes for items formerly imported, home handicrafts, sewing, and first aid.

f. Village Women's Course

This course was essentially identical to the course described in (e) above, except that it was organized and managed entirely by four graduates of the CDA-Women's course, who along with one EIL Ugandan staff member also delivered all instruction. Participants were leaders and members of various women's groups.

2. Lira Non-Training Outputs

a. EIL arranged for the allocation of hoes and seeds to community groups by the MOA. This provided these groups with the opportunity to employ the training they had received.

b. EIL developed the Model Homestead concept at Fatima TTC and provided materials for construction of a pilot Homestead at Amocha P7 primary school. The Model Homestead is designed to introduce concepts of home hygiene and sound construction in a package adapted to local materials and cultural practices.

c. EIL arranged for BEIRD satellite school project masters to receive an allocation of seeds from MOA.

d. EIL brought the BEIRD carpentry workshop at Fatima TTC to completion.

e. EIL project vehicle provided much-needed mobility to many district staff who hitched rides frequently in order to reach places and people otherwise impossible to contact.

f. EIL motorcycles and bicycles provided mobility to MCCD field staff. This output is diminished by the speed with which the bicycles have fallen into disrepair, and by the reluctance of many MCCD staff to work hard without strong supervision (which has not been forthcoming from their superior officers at district level and above).

6. Lira DFI is now the only fully-operational DFI in the country, due to the EIL renovation. Plans are now in train for the DFI to be used extensively by MCCD for in-service training and induction training of field staff from around the country.

7. EIL organized a rural survey in late 1980 which has helped district staff to identify and assist many community groups.

B. Busoga

1. Busoga Training Outputs

A total of nine training courses were organized by EIL. The table below summarizes relevant information.

Table : Busoga Training Outputs

Course Title	Date	Duration (days)	No. Participants	Total person-training days
Kaliro BEIRD	Jan. 81	6	50	300
MSRDP C.W.'s I	Feb. 81	7	57	399
MSRDP C.W.'s II	June 81	4	8	32
Kamuli D. VDC's	June 81	3	40	120
Kamuli D. Women's	June 81	6	40	240
Jinja D. Women's	June 81	4	20	80
Study Tour	July 81	8	10	80
MSRDP C.W.'s III	Aug.-Sept. 81	14	54	756
Chief's Course	?	1	70	70
Totals:		53	349	2077

Average Duration of Course: 6 days/person.

The paragraphs below explain the courses listed.

a. Kaliro BEIRD

This course was delivered by EIL and Kaliro TTC staff to satellite school headmasters and teachers, to other Kaliro TTC faculty, and to various district administration and MOE officials. Topics covered included interpretation of BEIRD objectives, group leadership techniques, familiarization with Kaliro TTC resources and administrative procedures.

b. MSRDP Community Worker's Course I and II

These were orientation courses delivered by MSRDP staff to a large group of newly selected community workers. Instruction was delivered on the role of the community worker, communication skills and group organization, the community worker's responsibilities in the areas of health, agriculture, animal husbandry, youth and women's activities, survey techniques, and administrative duties.

c. Kamuli District Village Development Committee Course

This course was delivered by MSRDP staff to the officers of various MSRDP village development committees from Kamuli District, along with several Church of Uganda lay readers. Topics covered were the relationship between VDC members and the MSRDP program; familiarization with MSRDP resources; and the relationship between VDC's and the community workers paid by MSRDP funds.

d. Kamuli District and Jinja District Women's Courses

These courses were delivered by MSRD staff to women from 14 different villages in the two districts. Topics covered were vegetable preparation and serving, construction of clothing and blankets for children and babies, knitting, home hygiene, construction of latrine covers and muckers.

e. Study Tour

This tour was arranged largely in lieu of a scheduled training course that was cancelled due to unforeseen circumstances. It was conducted by EIL for the benefit of diocesan MSRD staff, to familiarize them with the content and accomplishments of rural development activities in Kenya.

f. MSRD Community Worker's Course III

This was a follow-up to the earlier orientation course, delivered to the same group of community workers. Topics covered included community health, human nutrition, simple health care, construction of improved food preparation and storage devices, drug storage, and maternal and infant needs and care.

g. Chief's Course

This course was delivered by MSRD staff to county and parish chiefs from Kamuli District and the areas served by Kaliro BEIRD satellite primary schools. The instruction was aimed at introducing the chiefs to objectives of the MSRD and BEIRD programs, and discussed the role of the chief in relation to these village development efforts.

2. Busoga Non-Training Outputs

a. As in Lira, EIL motorcycles and bicycles provided much-needed mobility to BEIRD and MSRD staff, who otherwise would have been largely unable to perform their duties.

b. EIL arranged for the allocation of agricultural inputs to BEIRD satellite schools from supplies received by the Church of Uganda.

c. EIL commodity support for Kaliro TTC enabled home economics, agriculture, and handicrafts departments to resume practical training. As a result, requests have been received from two other BEIRD district coordinators to make Kaliro facilities available for training of project masters from these districts (the training to be based on the EIL-developed curriculum for the project master's course delivered in January 1981).

d. EIL provision of 20 mattresses to MSRD assisted in the development of residential training courses, since sleeping facilities were limited.

e. EIL together with MSRD staff established 15-member village development committees (VDC's) in 18 diocesan communities, and supervised the VDC's in their selection of community workers.

f. EIL organized a baseline survey of about 2000 homesteads throughout Busoga; the information collected deals with family composition, food consumption patterns, home sanitation, and agricultural practices. The results are to be used in MSRD program planning, but after a period of nearly a year have still to be analyzed.

C. Masaka

1. Masaka Training Outputs

EIL in Masaka has undertaken eight different training courses. The table below summarizes relevant aspects.

Course Title	Date	Duration	No. Participants	Total Person-Training Days
KCI I	Aug 80-Feb 81	180	25	4500
In-Service I	Feb. 81	14	15	210
In-Service II	June 81	2	12	24
Day Boys I	Jul-Aug 81	14	14	196
Monthly Sessions	Oct80-Sep81	4 hours	15 (ave.)	83
Day Boys II	Dec80-Sep81	Daily	13 (ave.)	2860
KCI I Advanced	Mar-Sep 81	180	4	720
KCI II	Mar-Sep 81	180	25	4500
Totals:		750 ^b	129 ^a	13093

Average Duration of Course: 101 days/person

a. This figure assumes that the men and boys attending the monthly sessions and the day boys's course were the same throughout. This is unlikely to be the case but no estimate can be made of the number of different individuals attending.

b. Excluding monthly sessions.

The paragraphs below describe these courses in more detail.

a. KCI I and II

These were the principal six-month courses delivered to local boys wishing to enter the construction industry. The instructors were EIL staff and Bannakaroli Brothers. Topics covered included use of tools, safety, logistics, site preparation, masonry fundamentals, carpentry fundamentals, concepts of electricity and plumbing, and appropriate technology.

b. In-Service Training I and II

The first of these was sandwiched between KCI I and II; the second was delivered on a weekend. In each case instructors were Bannakaroli Brothers and EIL staff, and the participants were local contractors and construction workers wishing to brush up on their skills.

c. Day Boys Course I

This was delivered by the Brothers and EIL staff to porters (casual laborers) employed by local contractors who wished to acquire basic construction skills. It is termed "day boys" course to emphasize its non-residential character.

d. Monthly Sessions

The Bannakaroli Brothers and EIL staff presented monthly seminars to local construction workers and KCI graduates. Attendance was not required and therefore variable, however, it was constantly increasing during the time period covered. Topics of discussion were also variable but in general the purpose of these sessions was to deal with specific problems

in the local construction industry, and to tighten linkages between KCI and local construction leaders.

c. Day Boys II

From an early point a number of casual laborers employed locally began to congregate around the KCI training site to observe what was taking place. Rather than disperse or ignore them, the instructional staff incorporated them into the training on an informal basis, allowing them to listen to lectures and discussions, and using them to help in the drudgery associated with the training.

f. KCI I Advanced Training

Four graduates of KCI I were employed as teacher-trainees during KCI II. Their task was to assist in the basic training course, but in so doing they received advanced instruction in construction skills and teaching techniques.

2. Masaka Non-Training Outputs

a. As elsewhere, EIL provision of motorcycles and bicycles has increased the mobility and supervisory capacity of local staff.

b. Use of improved construction techniques and of appropriate local materials, together with the principles of good workmanship, have spread to a considerable extent into the local construction industry.

c. KCI I graduates accomplished a number of significant renovations at the Bannakaroli Brothers's mission, including construction of novitiates's quarters, concrete grease pit, concrete water points, chicken and rabbit cages, and construction of water supply and waste disposal systems for various residences.

d. St. Joseph's Technical School, a four-year theory/lecture oriented training course, will henceforth exchange students with KCI so that the St. Joseph's students receive practical instruction.

e. Ministry of Works staff at Mbarara and Rakai have requested KCI to schedule in-service training for their construction employees, a major indication of KCI success in turning out well-qualified workers.

f. EIL has helped form one local blockmaking company.

D. EIL Outputs: Conclusion

The emphasis on EIL training has always been on practical, experiential instruction, and where possible the use of locally available resources to further rural development was encouraged. The courses appear to have been well-organized and well-taught, and the longer ones in particular represent considerable managerial accomplishments. The topics covered provide sound, basic knowledge in relevant areas. One possible exception is the handicrafts component in some of the women's courses. Although beadwork, needle-work and the like are greatly in demand by rural women, the contribution of such efforts to national development is hard to discern.

The most important non-training output is increased mobility as a result of EIL-provided transport. It is difficult for those who have spent little time in rural Uganda to appreciate how serious the lack of

transport really is, or to comprehend the many ways in which lack of transport discourages local development efforts. The EIL response to the transport problem was a significant effort to adapt the project to local circumstances, but overall impact is likely to be lessened because of the scarcity and high prices of needed spares, as well as the lack of initiative with which most bicycle recipients can be expected to perform their tasks (MCCD field staff in particular).

VI. Purposes

A number of purpose statements are made in various EIL project-related documents, primarily the 1979 Grant Agreement and the 1980 implementation plans. These are discussed below.

A. Overall project purposes (from PIO/T as amended in July 1979). The primary purpose statement is elaborated in a series of 10 specific requirements to be met by EIL. Each of these is discussed below.

1. "The purpose of this grant is to provide support for a training program for displaced Ugandans in basic and intermediate skill areas needed to respond to the most pressing manpower needs for the reconstruction of Uganda."

a. "Displaced Ugandans". None of the projects undertaken by EIL can be said to be directed at displaced Ugandans, if by this we mean people who are physically removed from their homes, that is, people who conform to the USAID definition of displacement (see memo by GC/APR, Dec. 28, 1978). The trainees are either local civil servants or local residents. However, this need not be viewed as a major deficiency. EIL makes the argument that nearly all Ugandans have been displaced for at least short periods of time during and since the war, and that, even if the Ugandans trained by EIL do not conform to the physical definition of displaced persons, they certainly are displaced in a moral sense, in that the lives they led before Amin and especially before the war have been utterly disrupted. USAID/U apparently accepted this argument (see Kampala 0576).

b. "Most pressing manpower needs". It is not easy to judge whether EIL has responded to Uganda's most pressing manpower needs. This is primarily because no manpower needs assessment (at least not in the sense this term is used in AID) was ever carried out. The November 1979 EIL report contains no general information on government staffing patterns and training needs, nor on patterns of employment in the private sector. In assessing various project options the EIL team did not look at manpower needs but rather at

the immediacy with which a viable EIL response could be formulated, the existence of a reliable, already-present project nucleus, and the potential for the project benefits to be institutionalized.... (1 November 1979 report, p. 3).

However appropriate these criteria might be, they were not designed to focus EIL efforts on "pressing manpower needs". The only direct EIL statement about manpower needs in Uganda is quoted below.

The overall EIL effort is directed at assisting Ugandans to acquire the skills required for them to provide for their own basic needs with minimal dependence on outside resources. These skills are in the following areas: skilled trades, small enterprise development, primary health care services, and in the establishment of integrated rural development programs (1 November 1979 report, p. 120).

This conclusion is not well-supported by any data offered within the report; the "needs expressed" to EIL by various local groups related primarily to commodities. Some expressions of interest in training were elicited (in Fieldtrips nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9) but these were severely biased by the type of people with whom EIL made contact (see table below).

Table . Persons contacted by EIL in needs assessment phase.

Affiliation of person contacted	number seen	per cent
Church	91	45
Cooperative Organization Staff and Members	46	23
MCCD	13	6
Private Organizations	12	6
U. S. Government	10	5
MOE	10	5
Other GOU	9	4
MOH/	7	3
Private Individuals	4	2
MOA	1	0.5
Other	<u>1</u> 204	0.5

Almost one-half of all individuals contacted were representatives of church organizations; about one-quarter came from private cooperative organizations (nearly all from just three such organizations); with a smattering of representation from other groups. Only one MOA representative was contacted. It is significant that in the place where this MOA employee was seen (Pt. Portal, Trip #7), agriculture training is mentioned as a "need expressed". Thus EIL's eventual focus on small-scale integrated rural development projects cannot be viewed as an objective response to manpower needs. This is because the needs assessment, by and large, focussed on groups and individuals already engaged in small-scale rural development. Had EIL included more representatives of MOA, industry, Ministry of Animal Resources, Ministry of Transport, and so forth in their survey, it is quite likely that different, and possibly more "pressing", manpower needs would have emerged.

2. "The training will be conducted in a framework that allows for a future, large scale, in-country basic and intermediate skills training phase if circumstances warrant."

Without a more precise definition of "large-scale", it is quite impossible to tell whether this purpose has been achieved. On the whole, however, it is fair to say that with continued support all of the EIL projects could continue to train several hundred persons per year, which might be judged "large-scale". The skills imparted qualify as "basic and intermediate", and of course the facilities are in-country.

3. "The orientation and placement of trainees will incorporate a "training of trainers" component, where appropriate."

This has been successfully accomplished in all three projects. The outcome is especially clear in Lira, where EIL trained trainers, who in turn trained trainers, who in turn trained community members in a well-run, formal six-week course.

4. "Training will be provided exclusively for Ugandans and not for other Africans in refugee status. Training opportunities may be provided for displaced Ugandans within the country, when and if, restrictions imposed under Section 108 1/ of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1979 and Section 602 2/ of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1978 have been lifted."

Only Ugandans have been trained by EIL. The training program took place in-country following the lifting of Congressional restrictions. The question whether the Ugandans trained were actually "displaced" has never been clearly examined by AID, although EIL considers that "all Ugandans" have been displaced. In my judgement a history of displacement does not meet the intent of 495F as interpreted by GC/AFR. However, this interpretation was at least tacitly accepted by AID in approving the EIL 1980 implementation plans.

5. "The number of trainees will be expanded from 110 upwards if conditions warrant this expansion. This will mean a focus on shorter, more intensive programs located as close to Uganda as possible. The consequent savings will be directed towards enabling a larger number of individuals to participate."

Total numbers of trainees eventually amounted to 703. The EIL training programs ranged from short, one-day special courses to massive 6-month efforts. The overall average duration was 42 days/person. In all cases the intent, and the result, has been to tailor the training to meet specific needs identified by local communities. Thus, this purpose has been achieved.

6. "The training will focus exclusively on the basic and intermediate skill areas needed for national reconstruction, rather than more advanced subjects. The Grantee can therefore expect that urgently needed basic and intermediate subjects such as bookkeeping, masonry and midwifery should be representative of its training focus."

This has been done (see Section V. D.).

7. "All of the training will be provided within Africa, unless an appropriate training program is not available. The more advanced types of training to take place within the United States described in the original proposal will not be conducted. The reason for this is that the basic training most needed for Ugandan reconstruction is best provided in Africa. Additionally, travel and other savings will allow for a greater number of participants.

All of the training has been provided in Uganda.

8. "The rapidly-changing circumstances in Uganda call for continued in-depth analysis and planning. The Experiment anticipates a major needs assessment and implementation planning effort from mid-June through at least December 31, 1979. This will require the utilization of a needs assessment and planning team not described in the original proposal. This team will have the responsibility for both short-term analysis and most urgently needed basic skills areas, as well as for determining the feasi-

bility for an eventual in-country vocational training program."

The needs assessment and implementation planning effort took place during the time period specified. The required tasks were performed (but see reservations about needs assessment reviewed in (VI. A. 1. b.)).

9. "The larger number of participants and the intra-African training focus suggest the need for a larger number of staff on-the-ground in East Africa than originally anticipated. Present planning suggests that several staff will be needed in East Africa during the duration of the grant. However, the details of this staffing pattern will have to wait for the results of the needs assessment and implementation planning effort."

During the full implementation period EIL fielded a total of five persons in Uganda; two in Lira, two in Macaka, and one in Busoga. Final decisions about staffing were not made until late 1980.

10. "The Experiment would propose to submit to the designated USAID project officer a detailed program report as well as a 12-month implementation plan and budget. Since a June 15 project commencement date is envisioned, reports and revised implementation plans would be submitted on November 1, 1979, and April 15, 1980."

The required reports were submitted to AID/W. However, see further comment on reporting in Section X.

B. Lira project purposes.

These are discussed below as they are presented in the April 1980 Implementation Plan.

1. "Augment...existing [District training] staff and raise...the level of training expertise among staff."

EIL did augment existing staff and delivered to them considerable training, thus achieving this purpose.

2. "Strengthen...formal and non-formal rural skills training and services for rural adults and youth;"

By effectively training CDA's and other local fieldworkers EIL has accomplished this purpose.

3. "Improve...the relevance and effectiveness of both primary education and teacher training, as well as education and training for the out-of-school population;"

EIL partly accomplished this purpose by training of BEIRD project masters (who work in primary schools), by training CDA'S and other community workers who work with the "out-of-school" population, and by making a carpentry workshop available at Fatima TTC. Since no teacher trainees have yet benefitted from the workshop, EIL has not yet had an impact on Fatima TTC teacher training. No training was delivered to Fatima tutors apart from the BEIRD coordinator.

4. "Enhance...cooperation and resource sharing between participating institutions;"

EIL has achieved this purpose by successfully organizing cooperation among MOE, MCCD, MOH, MCM, and local church groups.

5. "Create...broad community participation in the work of schools, and other formal and non-formal education and training programs;"

EIL has not achieved this purpose. The vehicle for doing so was to have been the Model Homestead Concept, as implemented at BEIRD satellite primary schools. The idea was that local parents would cooperate in the construction of the Model Homestead, which would then serve as a training site for both parents and students. In this way broad community involvement in schooling was to have been engendered. However competing needs and lack of materials resulted in just one Model Homestead being constructed (at Amocha P7 School), and that only partially.

6. "Providing training opportunities for village-level adults and youth in appropriate rural skill fields, leading to improved quality of life, income generating projects, and increased self-sufficiency for schools, groups and communities."

The first part of this purpose--training opportunities--has been achieved, but the second has not been to any considerable extent. Some few community groups appear to have initiated income-generating projects, but most continue to do little. This is mostly because of lack of inputs. The few projects in motion have accomplished little, due to drought or to lack of markets for manufactured articles. Some schools have planted gardens, but with meager results, also due to lack of inputs and drought. EIL here has been up against the fact that training by itself can do little in an environment that allows few opportunities to put the training into effect. This issue is discussed further in Section X.

G. Busoga Project Purposes.

The purpose statements are taken from the November 1980 Busoga project redesign paper. This document states that "EIL involvement with Kaliro and the MSDRP is designed to strengthen, and expand their present development efforts in the following areas:

1. "Basic home agricultural education, including vegetable growing, poultry raising and small animal husbandry."

This purpose has been partly achieved. MSDRP now has a training staff and over 50 GV's equipped to offer some advice on these topics. EIL has not, however, attempted to provide any support to Kaliro TTC in these areas, apart from assisting BEIRD satellite schools to obtain some agricultural inputs received from Church of Uganda sources.

2. "Family nutrition and home management, including processing, preparation and preservation of nutritious foods; family nutritional education programs with special emphasis on nutritional needs of infants, children and women; appropriate low-level technology improvements to upgrade the quality, safety, and hygiene levels of homesteads."

This purpose has been achieved with regard to MSDRP. Efforts were made to provide support for Kaliro TTC in these areas by providing a small quantity of teaching materials, but the effect has been minimal. Other attempts to second a MOA home economics teacher to Kaliro were unsuccessful until recently; the person has not yet done any EIL-related training.

3. "Home handcraft production, both for home use and as a source of cash income, to include furniture-making, needlework, sewing, sisal/banana/papyrus crafts."

This purpose has been partly achieved with regard to both MSDRP and Kaliro TTC, through provision of training supplies and artisanry handbooks. No efforts have been made to strengthen either organization's capabilities in furniture-making.

4. "Through a series of technical training seminars in the above mentioned areas, provision of qualified field staff to both institutions, and coordinated efforts with appropriate Ministries (Agriculture, Education, and Culture and Community Development), the EIL project will link the presently separate, but overlapping activities of the two institutions to ensure increased, sustained impact on the target population."

EIL has achieved this purpose to a very minimal extent. In one location only is there overlap and coordination between a BEIRD satellite school program and an MSDRP village development program. To a very large extent these programs remain separate entities, neither one benefitting from the strengths of the other. This issue is discussed further in Section X.

D. Masaka Project Purposes.

These are listed as "objectives" in the August 1980 implementation plan.

1. "To train young men in the technical skills required for the construction of houses and other buildings."

This purpose has been fully achieved. The KCI course of instruction turns out well-qualified young men who are in demand by local builders. Their starting salaries are substantial, in the range of 1,000-1,500 US\$ per month.

2. "To provide advanced levels of skills training in masonry and small business management to the most promising candidates."

This purpose has been achieved to the extent that a total of four KCI I graduates have received advanced training in construction methods. No advanced program in small business management has been offered.

3. "Placing trainees in paid apprenticeships and jobs with contractors in the area upon completion of training."

This purpose has been partly achieved. Every KCI graduate has been placed with local or government builders, but no formal apprentice program has been instituted.

4. "Forming one or more small business firms in the construction field, made up of successful trainees and more experienced construction personnel;"

This purpose has been achieved in so far as EIL has helped set up one small block-making company, and has assisted in the development of a local builders' cooperative society.

5. "Training students, tutors, contractors and others in the use of locally available materials for construction."

This purpose has been fully achieved. Use of local substitutes for cement in particular is spreading widely.

E. EIL Achievement of Project Purposes; Conclusion.

Overall it is fair to say that the EIL project purposes have been only partly achieved. The Masaka effort has probably come nearest to achieving all purposes, while the Lira and Busoga projects lag behind. Lira and Busoga are hampered not by any failure of training, but by lack of opportunity and resources with which to implement the training. The failure fully to achieve these purposes relates partly to the difficulty of the Uganda environment, and partly to EIL's inexperience in managing on-the-ground rural development. The transport and commodity problems which have affected EIL were foreseeable. Also, both these projects put a premium on organizing cooperation among local groups and government entities, which is never easy to achieve. Masaka, by contrast, focuses on one or two local groups and does not seek to bring all local organizations into the program. Moreover, the emphasis there on using local materials has shown some results. The other projects have focused on local materials as well, but to a large extent their commodity requirements (cloth, seed, hoes, insecticide, sewing machines, needles, etc.) have no suitable substitutes.

Regarding the project as a whole, the most serious issue is the failure to ground project development on a sound assessment of Ugandan manpower training needs. The project was meant to be a response to national needs, but because no complete assessment was made the effort wandered off in the direction of small-scale rural development. EIL's strengths are in training, which is not the same thing as planning rural development.

VII. Goals

The overall goal of the EIL project was to contribute to "the reconstruction of Uganda" (PIO/T as amended 28 June 1979) by alleviating "the most pressing" manpower needs. More specific goals for the component projects are as follows (from 1980 implementation plans):

- 1. Lira: "To increase productivity among the rural population of... Lira and Apac Districts in the areas of basic agriculture, rural works, and income generation through skill training."
- 2. Busoga: "To increase productivity among the rural population, especially women and youth, through training in basic agriculture, home management, and technical skills required to create and carry out income generating projects."
- 3. Masaka: "To assist in the reconstruction of the severely war-damaged region of southwestern Uganda."

It is difficult to judge whether and to what extent any of these goals has been met, given the absence of previously-agreed-upon verifiable indicators. However, it is probably fair to say that EIL has contributed to the overall goal of "reconstruction" by delivering training, by paying salaries to local people, by importing some commodities, and by living off the local economy. It is not possible to say that the training supplied has responded to Uganda's "most pressing" needs. This is because the original needs assessment, while extensive, was not well-planned so as to truly reveal manpower deficiencies. On the whole, it seems unlikely that a more rigorous needs assessment would have identified, as the Ugandans most in need of additional training, individual farmers and community workers, which has been the principal aim and outcome of the EIL project, apart from the Masaka activity. Thus the overall goal has not been fully achieved.

The Masaka project has clearly assisted in the reconstruction of southwestern Uganda, by creating a cadre of workers with the skills needed to rebuild damaged or destroyed buildings. In earlier project documents the Masaka effort was intended to focus on low-cost rural housing, but this has not happened. Nearly all the graduates have gone into commercial and government construction, partly because this is where funds are available for building investments and partly because rather few local homes were actually destroyed during the liberation war. The skills learned by the Masaka graduates are, however, finding some application in rural villages, since they engage in home improvement in their own villages and since other local people are able to observe and apply the techniques used to their own building projects. Thus the Masaka project has met its goals to a significant extent.

The Lira project has so far not "increased productivity" among the rural population, at least not to any significant extent. As noted before, this is due to the general shortage of essential commodities in Uganda, which EIL was not in a position to correct; to the drought, which severely affected the results achieved with the few inputs which were provided; and also to the relatively short duration of the project. Even under the best of circumstances it would have been difficult to increase rural productivity in the time allotted. Both EIL and AID should have hesitated before proposing or approving such obviously inappropriate goals.

A secondary goal in Lira was to institutionalize a training program by coordinating the efforts of many local groups involved in community development. As noted on page 33 below, this institutionalization is unlikely to occur. Thus the Lira project, while succeeding in training substantial numbers of people, has not met its goals to any appreciable extent.

The Busoga project, like the Lira effort, has not accomplished its goal of increasing productivity, although this goal might be thought a bit optimistic since it was presented in November 1980 when the project had only ten months to run. The close alignment of the Busoga activity with the Church of Uganda, however, means that institutionalization of the EIL program is more likely to take place (see page 33 below). Thus the Busoga project has met its goals at least partially.

VIII. Beneficiaries

A. Direct Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries of the EIL project are the people trained. A complete discussion of the training delivered is presented in Section V. A summary is offered below.

Training Type	Lira	Busoga	Masaka	Total	Per cent
Leadership	32	135 ^a	0	167	24
Agrioulture	96	0	0	96	14
BEIRD	28	50	0	78	11
Community Development	62	154 ^c	0 ^d	216	31
Training of Trainers	7	10 ^b	19 ^d	36	5
Basic Construction	0	0	110	110	16
Total	225	349	129	703	101

- a. includes MSDRP community workers' orientation courses and chiefs' course.
- b. Kenya study tour
- c. includes women's courses, VDC course, and second MSRDW CW's course.
- d. includes KOI I boys used to instruct KOI II class, and attendance at monthly sessions.

1. Overall, the emphasis has been on training to improve smallholder agricultural productivity, to increase opportunities for employment, and to improve family health and nutrition.

2. It is also important to know what kind of people were benefitted by the EIL project. The table below summarizes.

Participant type	Lira	Busoga	Masaka	Total	Per cent
Civil Servants	69	51	0	120	17
Church Staff	16	36 ^a	0 ^b	52	7
Community Leaders	0	94 ^d	15 ^b	109	16
Local People	140	168	114	422	60
Total	225	349	129	703	100

- a. includes some civil servants on loan to MSRDW.
- b. local contractors attending monthly sessions.
- c. includes all group leaders and members, as well as construction trainees.
- d. chiefs and VDC members.

As this table shows, the principal beneficiaries of the EIL project were local people--farmers, women's and youth group leaders, and boys eager to learn construction skills. Subject to the constraints imposed by the narrow limits of the project areas in which EIL activities took place, trainees were selected in a more-or-less equitable way. The Lira project made special efforts to include people from distant Apac areas, while Busoga, despite an overall focus on Kamuli District, has included representation from all Busoga districts in various training programs. The first cycle of trainees at Masaka came predominantly from the area right around the Institute, but conscious efforts were made to broaden the catchment area in recruiting for KOI II and III.

B. Indirect Beneficiaries

It is extremely difficult to offer a sound assessment about the extent to which people have benefited indirectly from the EIL program, because it is impossible to judge how many people might ultimately be affected by the training delivered. However, a very rough approximation may be arrived at as follows:

1. Local people; this category is composed mainly of the leaders of women's and youth groups (308) and of construction trainees (114). If we assume an average group size of 50 members (which would be an optimistic figure for active membership), then some 15,400 people may possibly benefit indirectly by receiving advice from the trained leaders.

No firm estimate of the number of people who may benefit from the application of construction skills learned by KCI graduates is possible.

2. Community leaders. These are principally local chiefs and village development committee members. If we assume these people are able to influence behavior of 300 people each (very approximately the number of households in a village), then some 32,700 people will benefit indirectly from this aspect of the EIL effort.

3. Church staff and civil servants. Most of these people are GDA's in the MCOCD, private community workers assuming the same duties, or BEIRD primary school teachers. If we assume (optimistically) that these people can each, on the average, effectively supervise activities in three different communities, then a total of some 154,800 people may indirectly benefit from this aspect of the EIL project.

4. Total indirect beneficiaries therefore come to something over 200,000 people. This assumes that all the categories of indirect beneficiaries outlined above are completely additive, which is unlikely. However, the unavoidable crudeness of the beneficiary calculations makes such small sources of error relatively insignificant. It is nevertheless clear that the indirect beneficiaries of this effort could have been far more numerous had EIL elected to focus their activities on people in positions where the "multiplier" effect could have been larger. Such people would include, for example, district level and national level officers in ministries and in private cooperative organizations. Working at the "grassroots" level has allowed EIL to directly benefit a relatively small number of Ugandans, and the same may be said of indirect benefits.

IX. Unplanned Effects

The principal unplanned effects of this project are four.

A. People everywhere in the areas served by EIL activities have received an enormous psychological boost from the knowledge that others are interested in and working hard to solve their problems of economic and social development. As in the case of the USAID Ag. Sector support project it is difficult to assess the magnitude of the morale-building involved, but it has an appreciable contribution to make to national development.

B. I was very impressed by the good feelings many Ugandans have about the work done by EIL, about the EIL people themselves, and about the U. S. government, by virtue of its support for EIL efforts. This store of good will will undoubtedly help to smooth the way for future USAID initiatives in rural Uganda.

C. The EIL staff at Masaka were successful in obtaining for the KOI an \$18,000 grant from CIDA to install a water supply system at the training site. This system will be of great value to KOI, and would not have been possible without the presence of EIL staff at Masaka.

D. EIL had not originally planned to provide transport facilities to community workers trained by the project, but it quickly became apparent that this was a major necessity without which little practical application of the delivered training would take place. Both Lira and Busoga furnished large numbers of bicycles to participants, with the effect of vastly increasing their mobility and therefore their potential to accomplish their tasks. In addition, EIL project pick-ups have benefitted many district officers not directly associated with the EIL project, but who were better able to perform their duties as a result of being able to hitch rides on the vehicles.

X. Lessons learned

USAID/Uganda should regard this project as a reconnaissance effort, which has revealed points of strength and points of weakness in the institutional and economic fabric of rural Uganda. The specific successes and failures of EIL are not particularly important in themselves; rather, it is the light these experiences may shed on needs, problems, and opportunities in rural Uganda that is significant. A careful look at the EIL experience can assist USAID/Uganda in planning future development assistance efforts. Below, some particular issues are examined from this perspective.

A. BEIRD. This has proven a weak reed. In both Lira and Busoga the EIL project directors have been unable to forge strong links with this institution. This is due to lack of strong leadership among BEIRD staff in Kampala and also due to lack of support for BEIRD within the MOE as a whole. In addition, proper implementation of the BEIRD program in satellite schools would require enormous amounts of agricultural inputs and building supplies, which are likely to be scarce and expensive for some time to come. Future support for BEIRD would probably not be very rewarding.

B. Commodity support. The EIL project has demonstrated that development efforts in Uganda must be accompanied by strong commodity support if success is expected. No reliance can be placed in the availability or affordability of local supplies, apart from the most basic items. This statement pertains to commodities needed for project operations and also personnel. Much time and effort was expended by EIL in obtaining relatively minor amounts of such supplies. As a training program, EIL efforts met with some success, but as a rural development program the results have been generally meager (apart from Masaka). This is due partly to the commodity supply problem in Uganda, and partly to EIL's relative inexperience in managing rural development (as opposed to training) programs. USAID/Uganda should take this issue fully into account when planning projects that may involve long-term expatriate personnel or large-scale on-the-ground implementation activities.

C. Public vs. private sector. In Masaka EIL has implemented a training project that responds very directly to needs of private enterprise. Consequent strong support from the local building community has contributed very considerably to the success of this project. The Busoga project has been aided very much by support coming from the Church of Uganda, which has been able to supply many needed commodities; at the same time, little has been forthcoming through official government channels. In Lira, where no strong private source of support for the project could be found, dependence on official channels for commodities was greatest and therefore great difficulties in obtaining needed inputs was experienced. These facts point up the continued vitality of the private sector in Uganda, and suggest that where possible USAID/U assistance should be designed to link up with, benefit from, and lend support to private initiatives.

D. District Farm Institutes (DFI's). The Lira project has demonstrated that with good management and moderate amounts of material assistance the DFI can once more become a useful training center at the district level. The DFIs were largely supported by AID in the late 1960's and early 1970's, are now jointly managed by MOA and MCCD, and are viewed by many local people and groups as a natural focus for future USAID

assistance. If USAID/U wishes to further its involvement in the agriculture sector, rehabilitation of the DFIs may be a manageable starting point.

E. Secondment. EIL has had considerable success in obtaining personnel on loan from government ministries, especially MOA and MCGD. The staff acquired seem generally to be very capable in their areas of expertise. Since the various ministries seem to be responsive in this regard, USAID/U may wish to keep this procedure in mind as a tool for building up core local staff to advise and assist in the implementation of future on-the-ground projects.

F. Reporting. According to the terms of the grant agreement, EIL's sole reporting responsibility was to AID/W offices; to FM for contract reporting and to AFR/DR for project reporting. This was inadequate. EIL should have been required to submit updates to USAID/U at least quarterly, to keep the USAID aware of EIL activities and problems. Failing such a contract requirement, either EIL or USAID/U could have initiated an informal reporting procedure. Improved communication along these lines would have avoided many of the misunderstandings that have marred the USAID-EIL relationship.

G. Dispersion of program effort. EIL instituted three separate in-country programs, each operating more-or-less independently of the others. An early idea to provide and staff an office in Kampala for central coordination was vetoed by USAID/U on grounds of cost and personal security. Inevitably there has been much duplication (and triplication) of effort in bringing supplies into the country, in maintaining contacts with GOU offices, and in performing the multitude of management tasks needed to keep the training programs functioning smoothly. The question of organizing a single national-level training program was not explored seriously by EIL or AID during the project planning phase, primarily because central ministries at the time presented a picture of near-hopeless disorder. Once the decision was made to operate at the regional level, political considerations indicated a balance should be sought, and so several locations were chosen.

Thus circumstances at the time led EIL (with eventual AID approval) to develop a very management-intensive project. This could have been avoided had it been possible to put off implementation for a period of about 18 months, by which time the central ministries had firmed up to the point where a single national-level program would have been feasible, but EIL in mid-1979 was anxious to proceed with activities under the AID grant.

XI. Special Comments

Two topics are discussed here: institutionalization of project achievements, and cost-effectiveness.

A. Institutionalization

An important issue is whether EIL efforts will have any effect in Uganda after the departure of EIL staff and the withdrawal of EIL inputs. Each project is considered separately.

1. Lira

The Lira effort attempted to link the activities of a number of disparate organizations: Fatima TTC, the DFI, the Anglican and Catholic Churches, and representatives of NCCD, MCM and MOA. Two coordinating bodies were set up, one (headed by the Anglican vicar) to serve as an advisory group with broad linkages to the local community, and one (headed by the EIL project director) to serve as a planning group with direct linkages to implementing organizations. The latter group must remain intact and functioning if the Lira project is to be institutionalized, but prospects are not hopeful. The active, officious principal of the DFI, who as assistant director of the EIL project might be expected to assume the chairmanship of this group, is not well-liked in the community and would experience difficulty in a leadership position. The BEIRD representative, another strong EIL supporter, has already been transferred elsewhere. The Catholic church linkage was never substantial, and is likely to disappear with the disappearance of EIL funds. The Anglican linkage has been substantial in the past, but none of the Anglican community workers whose salaries were paid by EIL have been picked up by the diocese. Finally, no one expects the various ministries involved to show any initiative or commit any resources to the training program. Given these circumstances, the prospects for continuation are poor. A further problem is that EIL was the only group with money to pay the subsistence costs of trainees in residential courses. These amounted to 800-1200 US\$ per person per week, and no individual or local group can afford such sums.

2. Busoga

In Busoga EIL has aligned itself firmly with a powerful, well-established institution, the Church of Uganda. The church has the funds and the staff (under its MSROP program) to maintain the EIL training program if it chooses to do so. The other aspects of the EIL program, incorporating a tentative linkage with Kaliro TTC and BEIRD, are extremely weak now and unlikely to survive EIL's departure. Whether the church will maintain the training program at its current level is a matter of conjecture, but there is little doubt that the diocesan bishop is committed to the effort and will give it what help he can. Thus, the EIL Busoga effort may be partly institutionalized.

3. Masaka

The Masaka project has created a viable training school, the KGI. EIL helped KGI apply for certification as an educational institute in November 1980, and probationary certification was received in July 1981. Full certification will follow if the one-year term of probation is satisfactorily completed. One outstanding issue is the duration of the course of instruction. MOE is apparently unwilling to grant accreditation to any program less than one year in duration, and it remains to be seen whether the Bannakaroli Brothers will be able to successfully expand the

course. It would have been preferable for EIL to expand the course during KCI II, since the need was known before the end of KCI I, and this would have improved the overall chances of institutionalization.

Another issue has to do with the cost of the training, of which a major component is subsistence and medical care for the boys in residence. It was not possible to obtain any reliable estimate of the expense involved here, but it seems to be at least 4000 US\$ and perhaps as much as 7000 US\$ per boy per six-month term. To this must be added some small amount for the cost of local training materials, but accountable staff costs are nil (being supplied nearly entirely by the Brothers) and enough tools are in hand to last KCI for many years.

There is apparently enough cash in hand to finance the training of the third cycle of boys, due to begin shortly, but it will not be possible to provide for the fourth cycle. Tuition currently stands at 1500 US\$ per term and may be raised to 2000 US\$, and so KCI will have to provide between 2500 and 5500 US\$ worth of food and medical care to each of the boys of KCI IV if that cycle is to take place. The Brothers are aware of the coming crunch, and have taken steps to meet it by opening up new church land for food crops. If all goes well, they will harvest enough to meet KCI IV needs; but if either rains or management fails there will be no KCI IV. It would have been better for EIL to encourage greater self-reliance on the part of the Brothers; a start could have been made on producing food crops for KCI II, which would have been a useful trial run for the Brothers, with an EIL cushion to fall back on.

4. Conclusion

Overall, the prospects for institutionalization of EIL efforts in Uganda are only moderate. It would perhaps have been easier to institutionalize a single national-level training program, rather than a program which is dispersed in several different directions, but this possibility was not seriously explored.

B. Cost Effectiveness

This section explores the costs involved in the EIL training project. Aspects of the project as a whole are considered, as well as aspects of the three regional components. At the time of writing no complete breakdown of the EIL budget is available, but a fair amount of information is contained in the table presented as Appendix 2. Since the table is incomplete, computations based upon it must be regarded as preliminary. Nevertheless the cost measures derived below are unlikely to diverge greatly from the final figures.

1. The Project as a Whole (\$1,012,583)
 - a. Overall cost per trainee: \$1440
 - b. Overall cost per person-training day: \$53
 2. Lira (total operations budget = \$118,661)
 - a. Operational cost per trainee: \$527
 - b. Operational cost per person-training day: \$29
- (4). Excludes salaries of director and co-director (approx. \$60,000 total).

3. Busoga (total operations¹ budget = \$67,171)

a. Operational cost per trainee: \$192

b. Operational cost per person-training day: \$32

(1). Excludes salary of director (approx. \$20,000).

4. Masaka (total operations¹ budget = \$111,566)

a. Operational cost per trainee: \$865

b. Operational cost per person-training day: \$9

(1). Excludes salaries of director and co-director (approx. \$55,000)

5. Average for Field Operations (Total Operations Budget = \$297,398)

a. Average operational cost per trainee: \$423

b. Average operational cost per person-training day: \$15

6. Average for Field Projects including Approx. Director's Salaries (Total Field Project Budget = \$432,398)

a. Average field project cost per trainee: \$615

b. Average field project cost per person-training day: \$22

7. Conclusion

These figures make it plain that U.S. administration costs, EIL overhead, and project planning costs amount to a considerable sum:

Contribution of non-operational costs to overall cost/trainee =

$$\frac{1440-423}{1440} = 71\%$$

Contribution of non-field costs to overall cost/trainee =

$$\frac{1440-615}{1440} = 57\%$$

Costs not directly attributable to field operations therefore accounted for between 57 and 71% of the cost of training the average EIL participant, depending on how the field costs are assessed. Many of these costs were incurred during the project pre-implementation period, that is, from 15 July 1979 to 31 March 1980. During this period about \$271,988 (including overhead) was spent, or about 27% of the entire grant.

These costs were due largely to salaries, consultant's fees, international travel, and overhead on these (see Appendix 2). A six-member EIL team spent six weeks in Uganda during the initial needs assessment. Following a month of write-up time in the U.S. and initial project review in AID/W, a second four-member EIL team went to Uganda for five weeks in late 1979. A total of 56 person-weeks were thus expended during initial planning, which seems out of proportion to a one million dollar project. Further costs were incurred during a six-week delay in early 1981, when AID/W and USAID/W raised issues concerning the EIL implementation plans and progress

achieved under the grant to that date. At this time EIL had already recruited several project field staff, who were unable to proceed to their postings and begin work until mid-March 1980. In addition, EIL had to field another two-man team for several weeks in early 1980 to resolve USAID/U issues on the spot in Kampala.

EIL has said that the planning costs are not out of proportion, since they were incurred under the expectation of a three million dollar project (this was the amount of the original grant). However, the P10/T amendment incorporating the one million dollar figure was prepared in June 1979, almost a month before the first EIL team left the U.S. Another view advanced is that EIL had to invest heavily in planning in 1979, when it was thought that the project would terminate in September 1980; had EIL known in 1979 that they would have two years in which to work they would have spent less in the planning phase. However, the issue of project duration does not bear directly on the basic imbalance between planning expenditures and implementation expenditures.

Throughout this project salaries, administration and overhead have accounted for a very high proportion of total expenditures. This is largely due to the extremely management-intensive mode of operations which was adopted, which necessitated five in-country staff, various local Ugandan staff, and back-up staff in the U.S.

Appendix 1: Significant Project Events

1979

- April: Initial PIO/T for a three-year \$3,000,000 grant signed.
- June: PIO/T amended to fund a one-year, \$1,012,583 project.
- July: Six-member EIL begins needs assessment in Uganda.
- Nov.: Original implementation plans and budgets reviewed in AID/W.
Four-Member EIL team returns to Uganda to do baseline studies, more ~~imp. mentation planning~~, and to obtain country agreement.

1980

- Jan-Feb: EIL begins recruiting project staff.
Many EIL-AID/W meetings held to discuss issues impeding further project development.
Two-member EIL team returns to Uganda to resolve USAID/U issues.
- March: EIL project directors arrive at Lira and Masaka.
Revisions to Busoga project begin.
- May: PIO/T amended to extend completion date to 30 September 1981.
- Apr-June: EIL country director assigned (total of four staff in-country).
Security deteriorates badly; Lira director withdrawn to Kampala.
- July: EIL presents final implementation plans to USAID/U.
First training begins at Masaka.
Lira director returns north.
- August: Training begins at Lira.
- Sept.: Busoga project director arrives.
- Nov.: EIL co-director arrives in Masaka. (Total of five staff in-country).

1981

- Jan.: Training begins at Busoga.
PIO/T amended to change indirect cost rate.
- April: USAID/U conducts mid-project assessment.
Original Masaka director departs.
- May: Replacement director arrives.
- Sept.: USAID/U conducts end of project evaluation.

Appendix 2. Notes

- a. Based on actual expenditures.
- b. Based on projected expenditures. Some reallocation of funds has taken place within projects by adjusting line items, but the project totals remain the same.
- c. This figure should be attributable among the various line items but the needed data are absent. The figure itself is a residual, computed by subtracting all known and projected expenditures from the sum of the total grant.
- d. This is money expended by the project but not yet accounted for by EIL HQ. It should be attributable to each of the three field projects as well as U. S. operations but the necessary data are unavailable.
- e. Differs from grant total due to rounding errors.

Appendix 3: Persons Contacted

USAID

Craig Buck, USAID/U Acting Director
Fred Perry, AFR/EA
Helen Socs, REDSO/EA

EIL

Don Batchelder, EIL overall project director
Michael Silberman, EIL Lira project director
Lisa Sparrow, EIL Lira project co-director
Carol Jaenson, EIL Busoga project director
Sigurd Hansen, EIL Masaka project director
Robert Caiola, EIL Masaka project co-director

Lira

Ministry staff:

Sylvia Awor, MCCD, district officer for youth groups
Charles Omony, MCCD, youth assistant
Okoth-Owar Domitian, MCCD, CDA
Rosa Attu, MCCD, CDA
Beresi Amongi-Ojoni, MCCD, CDA
Esther Tarapkw, MCCD, CDA
Menya Albert, MOA, district agricultural officer
John Ebinu, MOA, DFI principal
Dur-nesa Charles, MOA, DFI farm manager
Augustino Awoko, MOE, BEIRD project master
Wilfred Obuga, MOE, Fatima TTC workshop manager
Raymond Agaraoyo, MOE, BEIRD project coordinator
John Okello, MOE, headmaster

Christian Rural Services:

Rev. Yokoyadi Opolo, diocesan vicar
Rev. Moses Olum, CkS youth coordinator
Rev. Ogwal David, subcounty minister

Other:

Kea Abubakar, subcounty chief

Youth Group Members:

Moses Odongo
Adura Alfred
Okiao Tom
Omara
J.B. Okeng
Nikol Odem
Owari Terence
Francis Adula
Roccoe Adima
Nelson Ocwir
Peter Omaru
Paul Otim

Women's group members:

Joyce Abwas
Rose Ogwang

Jdyce Molo
 Filda Enyang
 Sofia Enyema
 Joyce Okil
 Mary Owinu

Busoga

MSRDP:

Bishop Cyprian Bamwoze . .
 Bawube Eliot, fieldworker
 Kayanga Edinansi, fieldworker
 Kubusaizu Samuel, fieldworker
 Dr. Tom Tuma, MSRDP coordinator
 E. Kemba, MSRDP agricultural adviser

Fatima TTC:

Bataire Paul, BEIRD project coordinator
 J.W. Mayende, headmaster Kaliro demonstration school
 S. Wanyagala, tutor
 H.R. Mukiili, tutor
 Nincent Wandera, farm manager
 Ademson Consolate, tutor
 Higwira, P. Deputy Principal
 Ilokot Eunice, tutor

Kasokwe Village Development Committee:

Stanury Mukunya
 Disoni Salamuka
 Jwani Waguha
 Musulube James
 Perusi Kutono
 Florence Bakamile
 E.M. Kasajja
 Bazirasoole Jonathan
 Bawuba Erlot
 Lovisa Wakwesa

Kisozi Village Development Committee:

Denis Kitamirike
 Lasitoni Kasolo (subcounty chief)
 Benon Magulu
 Yeseri Mabeka
 James Woire
 Jackson Were
 Joyce Woire
 (plus many other members)

Masaka

Bannakaroli Brothers:

Br. Emiliano, Brother-Superior
 Br. Claudio, deputy superior
 Br. Cosma, KCI staff
 Br. Borgia, KCI Staff
 Br. Domina, KCI staff

Local contractors:

Mr. Kasozi

Mr. Antony
Mr. Lukwata
Mr. Magombe
Mr. Ssali

Others:

Henry, Peter, Edmund, Zachary: KOI I graduates
Gakwandi George, ADC Rakai
Muleto Frederick, DEO Rakai
Mr. Musoke, MOW foreman Rakia
(plus various local construction workers and KOI trainees)

Appendix 4: Documents Consulted

1. Original PIO/T and Grant Agreement, April 1979
2. Amended PIO/T and Grant Agreement, June 1979
3. Needs Assessment and Implementation Plans, November 1979
4. EIL Report to AID, April 1980 (revised implementation plans)
5. EIL Report to AID, July 1980 (update on security situation)
6. EIL Report to AID, December 1980 (revised implementation plans)
7. Summary of Lunoga project for Paul Miller
8. USAID/U mid-project assessment, April 1981
9. Original EIL proposal to AID (no date)
10. Amended EIL proposal (May 1979)
11. Various internal EIL reports, curricula, and evaluations
12. Various AID cables and memoranda

EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING (EIL) REFUGEE TRAINING

OPG-698-0422.4

END OF PROJECT EVALUATION

EIL has been providing training assistance in basic and intermediate skills in Uganda under USAID Project Grant Agreement No. AID/afr-G-1565.

EIL is nearing the completion of its original grant agreement calling for an End of Project Evaluation. Defined herein are the criteria for evaluating EIL activities in Uganda.

EIL END OF PROJECT EVALUATION

Background

The original purpose of this grant was to provide support for a training program for displaced Ugandans in basic and intermediate skill areas needed to respond to the most pressing manpower needs in the reconstruction of Uganda. Under the original agreement no less than 110 Ugandans were to be trained outside of Uganda; however circumstances changed enabling E.I.L. staff to work directly in Uganda.

Once it became apparent that EIL could work in Uganda a needs assessment was conducted by EIL, identifying key training/manpower development needs in Uganda and potential projects from which current EIL sub-projects were identified. The current ongoing EIL sub-projects in Uganda are located in Masaka, Lira and Busoga.

Pro Ag Implementation Criteria

The following were to be given due consideration during project implementation as agreed to in the Proag. The following issues should be given due consideration in all aspects of project evaluation.

1. The training will be conducted in a framework that allows for a future, large scale, in-country basic and intermediate skills training phase if circumstances warrant. The orientation and placement of trainees will incorporate a "training of trainers" component, where appropriate. This is a long-time focus of the Experiment in International Living.
2. Training will be provided exclusively for Ugandans and not for other Africans in refugee status. Training opportunities may be provided for displaced Ugandans within the country, when and if, restrictions imposed under Section 108 1/ of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1979 and Section 602 2/ of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1978 have been lifted.
3. The number of trainees will be expanded from 110 upwards if conditions warrant this expansion. This will mean a focus on shorter, more intensive programs located as close to Uganda as possible. The consequent savings will be directed towards enabling a larger number of individuals to participate.
4. The training will focus exclusively on the basic and intermediate skill areas needed for national reconstruction, rather than more advanced subjects. The Grantee can therefore expect that urgently needed basic and intermediate subjects such as bookkeeping, masonry and midwifery should be representative of its training focus.
5. All of the training will be provided within Africa, unless an appropriate training program is not available. The reason for this is that the basic training most needed for Ugandan reconstruction is best provided in Africa. Additionally, travel and other savings will allow for a greater number of participants.
6. The rapidly changing circumstances in Uganda call for continued in-depth analysis and planning. The Experience anticipates a major needs assessment and implementation planning effort from mid-June through at least December 31, 1979. This will require the utilization of a needs assessment and planning team. This team will have the responsibility for both short-term analysis and most urgently needed basic skills areas, as well as for determining the feasibility for an eventual in-country vocational training program.
7. The larger number of participants and the intra-African training focus suggest the need for a large number of staff on-the-ground in East Africa. Present planning suggests that several staff will be needed in East Africa during the duration of the grant.

Although this project is funded for one year, there will be approximately 50 participants finishing their training at the end of this period. In order to allow for their return from training as well as the phase down of EIL's activities, the full term of the project will be approximately 15 months.

Scope of Work:

1. Evaluation team should familiarize themselves with EIL philosophy, management, organization and operation. Project documents and reports should be reviewed. Documents that should be reviewed are listed in attachment I.
2. A preliminary work plan should be outlined to schedule an agreed scope of activities which will permit a thorough evaluation of EIL activities based on Evaluation Criteria as will be defined later in this paper.
3. Conduct interviews with USAID/Kampala staff.
4. Conduct site visits to EIL field operations, and meet with EIL field staff representatives.
5. Meet with, and discuss project activities with the following Ugandan counterparts.

Lira and Busoga Projects

- a. Director of BIERD Uganda
- b. Interviews with directors of participant teacher training colleges
- c. Interviews with heads of participant church dioceses and their project coordinators
- d. Random sample of 5 program trainees at each EIL site.
- e. Random sample interviews with 5 project recipient community members from three communities per EIL site.
- f. Interviews with EIL field representatives.

Masaka Construction Project

- a. Interviews with EIL field staff in Masaka
- b. Interviews with heads of staff at Bannokaroli Brothers' Kiterredde Institute
- c. Interviews with EIL trained Ugandan staff

- d. Interviews with 5 construction graduates and 5 construction trainees
- e. Interview with/^arespective member of the Ministry of Reconstruction pertaining to current and potential impact of EIL construction training activities in Uganda.

CRITERIA FOR END OF PROJECT EVALUATION

I. The team should review and evaluate how effectively the project has adhered to Proag Implementation Criteria, as prescribed earlier in items 1-7.

II. Training

- . The principal thrust of EIL activities has been to impart practical knowledge in construction, agriculture, nutrition, child care, and cottage industries. Thus the principal quantifiable objective of EIL would be the numbers of individuals trained.
1. Most of EIL's activities in Busoga and Lira have been oriented towards training trainers who in turn train community members in agriculture, cottage industries and health care techniques. In Masaka, teachers have been trained in construction techniques, and they combined with EIL staff, train Kiterredde Institute students in construction techniques. Thus evaluators should look at:
 - A. The number of trainers and teachers trained.
 - B. The number of individuals trained by teachers or trainers in extension activities.
2. Ideally the effectiveness of EIL training activities should be measured through levels of retention. However, given the current situation and time constraints this would be difficult. One good indicator of levels of retention though, would be the numbers of people effectively working within field of training. i.e.: Number

of construction workers trained and working effectively in the construction field. Number of people trained in agriculture and compared to those using new agriculture techniques in the field. Number of people trained in household management and those using new household management techniques, etc.

B. Specific areas and methods of training should be reviewed in relation to resolving the problems of Uganda. e.g.:

1. Is the construction training imparted by Kiterrede Institute appropriate technology to meet the reconstruction needs of Uganda in light of the type of structures that need be repaired and in light of the construction materials to be used in country?
2. Is the Ag training imparted through the Lira and Busoga projects specifically relevant to the food production and nutritional needs of the targeted population?
3. Do the crafts being taught/^{Provide}viable means for generating income or producing util cost effective household products?
4. Is training practical in light of: local production supplies; levels of village technology for absorption of new concepts and procedures; markets for new skills and/or household/garden produce? e.g.: a) training of construction technicians, yet are there viable jobs and materials to work with for construction workers? b) training in vegetable production is/^{provided} yet are there seeds, insecticides, fungicides, fencing, etc available to work with on the local market? c) training in health care is provided yet are supplies such as soap, medicine, etc. available on the local market?

d) are the new concepts being presented comprehensible in light of community levels of technology?

III. Cost effectiveness of the Project should be reviewed in terms of inputs in relation to outputs and goal realization both current and projected.

- A. Masaka Project had an overall cost in excess of \$330,000. Could more than 61 people have been trained in the construction trade for this amount of money? Could these 61 individuals have been trained just as effectively through some other means? (Cost per trainee in excess of \$5410.00) Was there institution building that will result in reduction of cost in a future training effort?
- B. Will change in agriculture/cottage industry production resulting from project-provided training significantly outweigh the cost of EIL training efforts in Busoga and Lira?

Proag Budget

The estimated financial requirements are as follows:

	1st Year 7/15/79-6/15/80	Phase-Out Period 6/15/80-9/30/80
I. Personnel	\$113,754	\$ 27,989
II. Vehicles/Rent	37,600	10,966
III. Supplies/Material	4,800	1,400
IV. Communication	7,200	2,100
V. Training	153,000	37,500
VI. Travel/Per Diem	76,500	22,312
VII. Consultants	148,000	21,000
VIII. Audit/Outprocessing/ Evaluation	-----	25,933
	<u>\$540,854</u>	<u>\$149,200</u>
Contingency (15%)	81,127	22,380
Overhead (27.6)	171,666	47,356
	<u>\$793,647</u>	<u>\$218,936</u>

Project Total

\$1,012,583

IV. Host Country Counterpart Contribution

A. What have been the levels of host country contribution? To be measured in terms of :

1. Manpower inputs
2. Procurement of supplies
3. Financing and general support of project's administrative functions

B. What initiatives has H.C. taken to assume responsibilities in project financing and management functions, guaranteeing continuation of project activities with EIL phase-out.

IV. a. National Infrastructure

Referring to Proag Implementation Criteria #1, should EIL efforts have been oriented towards a national program tying into national institutions for long term national projects, and using site activities as pilot projects? Or has the given past, current and potential situation in Uganda mandated EIL's working with isolated projects where feasible?

V. Long term effectiveness of EIL project activities

- A. Is there long-term employment or sufficient rewards to insure trainers continued activity in the field of training and trainees continued productive and health care activities?
- B. Is there sufficient institutional structure to insure the continuation of project activities where financial and supervisory support is necessary?
- C. Will trainees have continued access to supplies used in EIL training, at affordable rates?

VII. Have there been additional benefits realized through EIL activities, such as a community institution building through community clubs and

and committees, intercommunity organization through BIERD and BUSOGA

Church Diocese and has a long term construction institute been established in Kiteredde? *that will continue to train Ugandans in construction skills once EIL departs?*

VII. Benefits to Uganda at large in ^{terms of} improvements ^{of} on the economy, reconstruction needs of the nation, improved food supplies, etc, need be assessed. A) Will the numbers trained in construction training program have a significant impact on Uganda's reconstruction needs. B) Will the food produced through the Ag training activities increase the food supply significantly to meet national food production needs and resolve national levels of malnutrition? C) Will the culmination of increased cottage industry production learned through the EIL program have a significant impact on strengthening Uganda's ^{overall} economy? at large?

IX. What impact has training made on the lives of the targeted population?

A. Have household food supplied increased significantly?

B. Has household nutrition improved?

C. Have new skills, craft production or agriculture production been applied ^{have they} and resulted in significant increases in household income?

X.

One final consideration needs be made about EIL's administrative, back-continuation of stopping capacity in determining if EIL funding should be increased for/project activities in Uganda. This area of consideration is the ability for EIL to continue to operate in Uganda give current and potential circumstances. Problems being encountered by EIL project coordinators in early April were 1) Security in transport on the Rd to Lira, 2) Difficulties procuring sufficient gasoline for project related travel, 3) Inability to procure and deliver to site necessary personal supplies s

4) Difficulties procuring and delivering necessary supplies for project support.

Project Evaluation Team

The end-of-project evaluation team should consist of three representatives. The first of whom should be an economist who can measure both the macro- and micro-economic impact of applied EIL training in Uganda. This individual must be able to measure current and projected production trends that have been and will be generated as a result of EIL activities. The economist should also be involved in analyzing the overall cost effectivenesses of EIL activities in Uganda. The second individual should be a general Rural Development Officer capable of analyzing^{the}/impact of training on community lifestyles, community development and the projected rural develop, impact of EIL activities for Uganda at large. This individual must have a general background in rural economic development, education, health and nutrition, agriculture and knowledge of basic construction techniques. The third individual on the team should be an appropriate representative of EIL's U.S. coordinative staff, who has intimate knowledge of and worked with the Uganda project from start to finish. All individuals on the team should be responsible for the collection and analysis of project related data. In areas of project evaluation where team members feel they are not qualified to fully evaluate the services of REDSO/EA should be sought for expert analysis of data collected. Areas where expert analysis may be sought are details pertaining to construction (REDSO engineering), nutritional/health (REDSO Health/Nutrition consultation), and Agriculture (REDSO Agriculture Officer).

The team will be expected to place a minimum of 10 days visiting all Uganda sites and collecting pertinent data in Uganda. An additional 10 days in Nairobi should be allowed for synthesis and evaluation of data, consultation with REDSO

speciality backstops and drafting of final report. Final report should be
in
presented in typed form with 25 days of initiating evaluation.

ATTACHMENT I

DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

1. Grant Agreement and Amended Agreement
2. EIL Needs Assessment and Training Implementation Plan Nov. 1, 1979
3. EIL Report April 15, 1980
4. EIL Report July 25, 1980
5. EIL Report Dec. 1980
6. Implementation Phase April 1, 1980 - Sept. 30, 1981 Masaka construction training and Lira Apac BEIRD Program
7. EIL Report Feb/March 1981? (Most recent status to implementation reports)
8. Summary of EIL Busago Project for Paul Miller, USAID March 30, 1981
9. EIL Mid-Project Assessment April 7, 1981

Christina
This is a little sketchy, yet it may be useful for scope of work in EIL evaluation.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

memorandum

DATE: May 26, 1981

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: AFR/DR/EAP, Paul Miller

SUBJECT: Criteria for EIL End of Project Evaluation

TO: AFR/DR/EAP, Christina H. Schoux

Per your request the following outline of the areas to be reviewed in End of Project Evaluation for EIL in Uganda has been drafted. The criteria for end of project evaluation was drawn up jointly between respective members of EIL staff and AID. Please review the following in conjunction with the mid project assessment of EIL activities dated April 7, 1981.

Criteria For End Of Project Evaluation - EIL Uganda

A. Number of individuals trained under EIL projects. The principal thrust of EIL activities has been to impart practical knowledge in construction, agriculture, nutrition and child care, and cottage industries. Thus the principal quantifiable objective of EIL would be the numbers of individuals trained.

(1) Individuals trained should be categorized in terms of trainers trained and targeted population trained.

(2) First the number of trainers trained should be determined. Once the number of trainers trained has been determined (in specific areas of training) then their activities should be evaluated in the numbers of targeted population trained.

(3) Ideally to determine the effectiveness of EIL training activities, retention should be tested among the individuals, trained; however given current circumstances this would be difficult.

B. Specific areas and methods of training should be reviewed in relation to resolving the problems of Uganda. e.g.:

(1) Is the construction training imparted by Kiterrede Institute appropriate technology to meet the reconstruction needs of Uganda in light of the type of structures that need be repaired and in light of the construction materials to be used in country.

(2) Is the Ag training imparted through the Lira and Busoga projects specifically relevant to the food production and nutritional needs of the targeted trainees.

(3) Are the crafts being taught viable means for generating income or producing util cost effective house-hold products.



Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

OPTIONAL FORM NO. 10
(REV. 7-78)
GSA FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.6
5010-112

(4) Is training practical in light of local production supplies; levels of village technology for absorption of new concepts and procedures; markets for new skills and/or household/garden produce. e.g.: a) train construction technicians, yet are there viable jobs and materials to work with for construction workers. b) train in vegetable production yet are there seeds, insecticides, fungicides, fencing, etc available to work with on the local market. c) train in health care yet are supplies such as soap, medicine, etc available on the local mkt d) are the new concepts being presented comprehensibly in light of community levels of technology?

C. Cost effectiveness of the Project should be reviewed in terms of inputs in relation to outputs and goals realization both current and projected.

(1) Masaka Project had at an overall cost in excess of \$330,000.00. Could more than 61 people have been trained in the construction trade or could these 61 individuals have been trained just as effectively through some other means? (Cost per trainee in excess of \$5410.00.) Was there institution building that will result in reduction of cost in future training effort with continued capacity to train?

(2) Will change in Ag and cottage industry production significantly out weight the cost of EIL training efforts in Busoga and Lira?

D. Long term effectiveness of EIL project activities

(1) Is there long term employment or sufficient rewards to insure trainers continued activity in the field of training and trainees continued productive and health care activities?

(2) Is there sufficient institutional structure to insure the continuation of project activities where financial and supervisory support is necessary?

(3) Will trainees have continued access to supplies used in EIL training, at affordable rate?

E. Have there been additional benefits realized through EIL activities, such as a community institution building through community clubs and committees, intercommunity organization through BIERD and BUSOGA Church Diocese and has a long term construction institute been established in Kiteredde.

F. Benefit to Uganda at large in improvements on the economy, reconstruction needs of the nation, improved food supplies, etc. need be assessed. 1) Will the numbers trained in construction training program have a significant impact on Uganda's reconstruction needs. 2) Will the food produced through the Ag training activities increase the food supply significantly to meet national food production needs and resolve national levels of malnutrition. 3) Will the culmination of increased production learned through the EIL program have a significant impact on strengthening Uganda's economy at large? 4) Should EIL

efforts have been oriented towards a national program tying into national institutions for long term national projects, and using site activities as pilot projects. Or has the given past, current and potential situation in Uganda mandated EIL's working with isolated projects where feasible.

G. Has applied training made any difference in the lives of the targeted training populace in terms of 1) Better nutrition 2) Increased food supplies 3) Increased household income through household craft production 4) Marketable trades.

H. One final consideration need be made in determining if EIL funding should be increased for project activities in Uganda. This area of consideration is the ability for EIL to continue to operate in Uganda give current/potential ~~extra~~ circumstances. Problems being encountered by EIL project coordinators in early April were 1) Security in transport on the Rd to Lira 2) Difficulties procuring sufficient gasoline for project related travel. 3) Inability to procure and deliver to site necessary personal supplies such as food, soap, etc. 4) Difficulties procuring and delivering necessary supplies for project support.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
U.S.A.I.D. MISSION TO UGANDA

UNITED STATES POSTAL ADDRESS
USAID/KAMPALA
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20523.

INTERNATIONAL POSTAL ADDRESS
P. O. BOX 7007
KAMPALA, UGANDA.

April 22, 1981

Note to Mr. A1. Ford, AFR/EA
Washington, D.C. 20523

Dear A1:

Attached is a report that Paul Miller did on the Experiment in International Living project. You may wish to share this with DR. Since this was drafted, George Young, one of the EIL representatives in Masaka, has decided to leave the project (personal reasons) and is now in country packing out. Don Batchelder said that they would be bringing someone on a short term basis to fill in for George until project completion in September.

Don and I had several conversations on the likelihood of a project extension, but I was not sanguine of the possibilities. While I am interested in seeing the project evaluation, I pointed out that we would be focusing our resources on agricultural production and I did not foresee us getting involved with the BEIRD program. Furthermore, the security situation argued for us to keep the number of US personnel in Uganda to a minimum. In this regard we have given careful consideration to asking that EIL be withdrawn from Uganda, but have held off for the moment. George Young's departure along with his wife's has kept their presence down the past week or so. Also, Mike Silberman and his family are on another extended trip to Nairobi. Carol Jaenson in Jinja appears to be in secure surroundings, at least for the moment.

Don and I talked about the timing of the project evaluation, and he suggested that it be as late as possible so that the impact of current programs would be most visible. As you may know, Helen Soos from REDSO will participate in the evaluation and, while we have not yet agreed with EIL, I suspect they will want to be included. We would welcome AID/W thoughts on the composition of the evaluation team as well as the timing. If there are plans to extend this project the evaluation should be sooner rather than later in order to have time to prepare the necessary information.

Sincerely


Craig G. Buck
Acting Director

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

File EIL

TO : Mr. C. G. Buck

FROM : Paul Miller

SUBJECT: EIL Mid-project Assessment

DATE: April 7, 1981

Per your request I am submitting a mid-project assessment on EIL activities to date. This mid-project assessment is based on meetings with EIL representatives from the three project sites, interviews with Don Batchelder, Coordinator of EIL activities and review of EIL implementation plans and progress reports. Visits were planned for all three EIL sites, however, due to security problems the visit to Busoga was the only on-site evaluation possible.

Busoga and Lira Projects

The Busoga and Lira projects are similar in project design and project implementation and can be compared equitably. The 2-day trip to Busoga was made possible on March 30th and 31st. Upon arrival at Busoga site EIL representative presented me with a summary of EIL Busoga project dated March 30, 1981. Having reviewed this summary in conjunction with the site survey, I found it to be accurate in reflecting EIL activities to date. Please refer to report for present activities and accomplishments.

On-site observations were as follows:

The Busoga and Lira projects appear to be grassroots development projects oriented towards benefitting the poorest of the poor through activities in agriculture, health, animal husbandry, home economics and community development. EIL in Busoga is successfully working through three forms of organizations -- 1) MSRDP of the Busoga Diocese, 2) BEIRD of the Min. of Education, and 3) direct community development. Project activities are oriented towards training individuals to better modes of Home Agriculture, Health, Animal Husbandry, Home Economics and Community Development. Most of the individuals who are being trained under this project are being trained as extension



Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

Mr. C.G. Buck

- 2 -

workers who will disseminate information learned to the members of their respective communities. Dissemination of information takes place by the following means:

BEIRD Program:

At Kaliro College, EIL instructs teacher trainers in the defined development fields and advises how these subjects can be integrated into the rural curriculum. Teacher trainers at Kaliro in turn instruct future teachers on practical concepts of development and how these activities can be applied to a normal school curricula programs in rural Uganda. Future teachers are also instructed in how to work with their respective community development at large. Theoretically, teachers having been trained through this project will work towards community development through their schools with the support of BEIRD, EIL and coordinated support of MSRDP.

MSRDP:

EIL has found that it can successfully work through local church diocese in the Multi Sectoral Rural Development Program (MSRDP). EIL assistance to MSRDP is as follows:

- 1) EIL staff in conjunction with Church of Uganda representatives meet with members of interested communities and instruct communities how to set up community organization through the selection of local committees and official community workers (CW).
- 2) EIL staff trains CWs in pertinent village technology through a week long course followed by one day follow-up courses. CWs are in turn employed by the diocese with approval of respective communities.
- 3) CWs return to their communities to disseminate information among members of the established community club.
- 4) EIL staff visits communities and provides on-site support to CWs through community courses and assist in the procurement of necessary supplies.

The activities of Community Workers are coordinated directly by EIL technical staff who include 2 senior Agricultural Officers, 1 Veterinary Officer, 1 senior Health Officer, 1 Senior Home Economics Officer and 1 Senior Youth Officer. The efforts of the senior technical officers are coordinated through the planning and training implemented by EIL project

directors and their Ugandan counterparts. Once activities are planned and extension workers are trained, it is estimated that extension workers can work with the community of no less than 100 and not exceeding 200 each.

Defined Areas of Development:

EIL objectives are to train and set up a system for dissemination of development information. It is felt that through the projection of development ideas, the life styles of members of the respective communities will improve with the practical application of the new knowledge.

Areas of Teaching

(a) Agriculture - Basic household agriculture is being taught. New concepts being taught are the cultivation of new vegetables which will hold potential to generate income and also provide greater nutrition sustenance than crops currently being raised.

(b) Health - General methods of household maintenance, practical hygiene, child care and nutrition are being imparted directly to outreach workers and to members of respective communities by EIL staff. Need for such training was clearly evidenced by the presence of Kwashikor; Head Parasites, Festering Sores and other maladies I witnessed frequently in the Busoga communities.

(c) Home Economics - Home Economics is oriented towards basic household financial management and means to generate new income through household crafts. Household crafts being taught are for the most part basketry, rope making, and use of other local materials to make desirable util products which can be sold.

(d) Community Organization - This is oriented towards developing cadres of leadership within each community. To work with this project, communities must select committees whose members hold specific responsibilities such as treasury, record keeping, buying, censusing, presiding, coordinating and instructing. These are skills which were previously deficient within the respective communities and vital for coordinated community development.

EIL activities in Busoga and Lira hold the potential to make a very positive developmental impact in the respective communities. This project holds potential to make a significant development impact where applied due to the following reasons. Community responsiveness to learning new ideas that will improve their life

Mr. C.G. Buck

- 4 -

styles through EIL was very enthusiastic as evidenced through our site visits. The Busoga Church Diocese requested EIL assistance and is enthusiastically working with and supporting this development project. This information was specifically referenced to in an interview with the Bishop of the Busoga Diocese. The BEIRD program appears to be very positive about EIL's participation. This is reference to an interview with the Principal of Kaliro Teacher Training College and Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Education, in charge of BEIRD. Much of BEIRD's interest in this project was evidenced from classroom activities such as several hectares of land being cultivated at school site, handicraft production and teachers' enthusiasm to conduct other related courses at Kaliro, TTC.

Problems with the Lira and Busoga projects appear to be in three separate categories:

1. National support coordinated through the Ministry of Education is vital to project success on a national scheme. EIL needs to negotiate levels of project support with the Ministry of Education for the BEIRD activities. Support should come as follows:
 - a) Mandatory participation of teachers in BEIRD practical education.
 - b) Supervisory checks of all teachers participating in BEIRD program.
 - c) Special compensation for teachers effectively participating in BEIRD program. Compensation should be substantial in material or monetary rewards.
 - d) Ministry of Education needs to consistently commit material support for school and community project activities such as poultry, fencing, seeds, insecticide, etc.
2. EIL is currently acting as a buyer of many of the necessary materials for community project activities. If this project is to have any long term success, communities must develop methods of allocating and procuring vital materials independent of EIL assistance.
3. Initial cost appears to be very high. Divided project grant equally among three project sites, over \$330,000 were used per project. This cost appears exorbitant for one year of actual project implementation in relation to salaries and supplies needed in program support. Please note, however, that EIL representative in Busoga states that her needs for project continuation for an additional year would not exceed \$75,000.

Mr. C.G. Buck

- 5 -

The above problems must be resolved before AID considers continued support to the EIL activities in Busoga and Lira.

EIL in Masaka (Refer to February newspaper article for general background on Masaka program)

EIL in Masaka is training Ugandans in basic construction techniques. The project is designed to help Uganda meet manpower needs to reconstruct war-torn parts of the country. To date Masaka has trained 25 men new to the construction field in construction techniques. The skills of 11 men already in the construction trade, were refined through an interim mini course. An additional 25 young Ugandans are currently being trained through the second phase of this project. Total trained in one year's time will be 50 young men new to the trade and the refinement of skills for 11 men already working within the construction field. Training of individuals has been implemented directly by EIL staff and also members of the Bannakarori Brothers working at Kiteredde Institute.

Merits of the Program

Merits of the program fall into principally three categories. They are as follows:

- 1) Ugandans are being trained in a useful trade that will provide them with rewarding employment.
- 2) Through application of the skills learned at Kiteredde Institute, these newly trained Ugandans will be meeting the nation's reconstruction needs.
- 3) The Kiteredde Institute facilities have been expanded and teaching staff have been trained by EIL staff. Should the Bannakarori Brothers continue to support the Institute, then Kiteredde will continue in a tradition of training Ugandans in the construction trade.

For the above reasons the program holds significant value in that it not only trains Ugandans to a useful trade, yet will also help meet Uganda's reconstruction needs which are immense.

Problems that exist within project are:

1. The project cost in relation to the number of trainees appears to be very high. An excess of \$330,000 was used to

Mr. C.G. Buck

- 6 -

train a total of 61 individuals in basic construction techniques. Cost per trainee is in excess of \$5,000.

2. The project has been designed as a secular project benefitting a limited region in Uganda. Training should have been more oriented towards a national scheme through national institution such as the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Public Works or the PVOs such as Church of Uganda and using Kiteredde as an official pilot project.

Please note that the Masaka project director estimates that cost to continue his project for an additional year would not exceed \$125,000.

If AID is to continue to support the Masaka project, the aforementioned problems should be resolved. The Masaka project should be looked upon as a pilot project to be expanded upon on nation wide scale by a government or Ugandan PVO institution. Reconstruction needs are not limited to the Masaka region alone, rather there are reconstruction and renovation needs throughout Uganda.

Schedule for Paul Miller, USAID Kampala - Visit to EIL Busoga
March 30, 31, 1981 Project

Monday, March 30

- 9:00 - thereabouts - Arrival
- 11:00 - Meeting with Bishop Cyprian Bamwoze, Bishop of Busoga, and Mr. A. Bamuzibire, Acting Coordinator of MSRDP (Diocesan offices - Jinja)
- 1:00 - Meeting with Bishop Bamwoze, Mr. Bamuzibire, and Miss Betty Amooti, Senior Home Economics staff member of MSRDP and co-director of EIL Project
- 3:00 - Visit to Bufaula, EIL-sponsored MSRDP community
- 5:30 - Meet with Mr. M. Kafecero and family (Deputy Director of BEIRD, Ministry of Education, Kampala)

Tuesday, March 31

- 10:30 - Meeting with Mr. N. Mafabi, Principal, Kaliro TTC, and Mr. Paul Bataire, Coordinator of Kaliro BEIRD project (at Kaliro TTC)
- 1:00 - Visit to Kasokwo, EIL-sponsored BEIRD/MSRDP community, to meet Village Development Committee and Community Workers

The Experiment in International Living



CABLE CHURCH KAMPALA UGANDA

POST OFFICE BOX 2831

KAMPALA, UGANDA

TELEPHONE 802-257-7751

CABLE EXPERIMENT BRATTLEBORO VERMONT

TWX 710-3636774 FAPER

BRATTLEBORO, VERMONT 05301, U.S.A.

March 30, 1981

Summary of EIL Busoga Project for Paul Miller, USAID

The Experiment's Busoga Project is linked to two Ugandan institutions: the BEIRD program at Kalliro Teacher Training College, and the Multi-sectoral Rural Development Programme of the Church of Uganda, Busoga Diocese. The EIL role is three-fold:

- 1) to provide training to key staff in each program and selected target populations which will increase successful program implementation and achievement of stated goals. Course content is determined jointly by MSRDP and BEIRD staff and the EIL Project Director, and involves such topics as community organization skills, group management, technical training in home agriculture, home economics, domestic hygiene, and cottage craft production.
- 2) to assist in linking the MSRDP and BEIRD programs to increase the impact and outreach of the programs in Busoga. A pilot scheme in Kasokwe, a village six miles from Kalliro TTC, is designed to achieve this objective.
- 3) to provide assistance in obtaining those material inputs essential to the implementation of each program's training goals.

The Multi-sectoral Rural Development Programme (MSRDP)

MSRDP is a comprehensive integrated rural development program operating in 18 of the more than 200 sub-parishes of Busoga Diocese. The Programme was originally conceived by the present Bishop of Busoga to address what he considered critical need among Busoga's rural population: 1) inadequate curative health facilities and poor preventive health care knowledge and practices; 2) inadequate nutritional intake, especially among women and children, aggravated by a significant reduction in the availability of protein- and vitamin-rich foods due to drought conditions for the last three growing seasons, and large scale destruction of cattle and other animals during the liberation war; and 3) the need to stimulate greater economic self-reliance through the production of tools, furniture, and other craft items using locally available resources. The Programme began operation in 1979 and is expected to continue for a minimum of three years.

The overall aim of the Programme is to improve the quality of life at the homestead level of Busoga's rural population. Specifically the Programme has three objectives:

- 1) to increase the yield and nutritional quality of agricultural production for home consumption;
- 2) to improve the health and nutritional status of rural families through training courses for women in food preparation and preservation, differing nutritional needs for family members, and health/sanitation improvements in the homestead;
- 3) to increase economic self-reliance by the encouragement of and technical training for craft production for home use and sale.

The MSRDP is directed by a diocesan-level team of eight technical specialists (in Agriculture, Veterinary Medicine, Health, Youth, Home Economics, and Education), headed by a Coordinator. All are Ugandan nationals. In each of the 18 communities participating in the Programme, there is a 15-member Village Development Committee (5 men, 5 women, and 5 youth representatives), plus three locally chosen Community Workers. The Committee and CW's work with the diocesan team to assess local needs and priorities, plan and implement specific projects, and evaluate Programme activities. Community Workers are full-time paid employees of the Programme; Development Committee members serve voluntarily.

BEIRD Programme

Sufficient description of this program has already been provided.

Project Staff

The Project has 13 senior staff. They are:

- Miss M. Carol Jaenson - EIT Project Director
- Dr. Tom Tuma - Coordinator, MSRDP
- Mr. Ayazika - Senior Agricultural Officer, MSRDP
- Mr. Kamba - Senior Agricultural Officer, MSRDP
- Dr. Kukwana - Senior Veterinary Officer, MSRDP
- Mrs. Ayazika - Senior Health Officer, MSRDP
- Miss Elizabeth Amooti - Senior Home Economics Officer, MSRDP, and Co-director of the EIT Project
- Rev. Wandera - Senior Youth Officer, MSRDP
- Mr. Bamusibire - Senior Training and Education Officer, MSRDP (on leave from Kaliro TTC faculty for 3 years)
- Mr. N. Kafabi - Principal, Kaliro TTC
- Mr. P. Bataira - BEIRD Project Coordinator, Kaliro TTC
- Mr. Kayende - Principal, Kaliro Demonstration Primary School
- Mr. V. Wandera - Farm Manager, Kaliro Demonstration Farm

In addition, there are 36 professional staff for the BEIRD program (18 headmasters and 18 project teachers), and 54 village level Community Workers in the MSRDP. Each MSRDP community also has a 15-member Village Development Committee which has decision-making powers regarding project activities.

Project Locations

In the year 1981, MSRD has targeted project implementation in the following 18 sub-parishes:

Jinja Archdeaconry

Bwidhabwangu
Buweera
Bodondo
Bufuula

Iganga Archdeaconry

Bunyiiro
Kigandaalo
Kaluuba
Busimo
Bogobi
Kasokwe

Kamuli Archdeaconry

Bukanga
Namisambya
Ifaminage
Bugulumbya
Kisozi
Kigingi
Bugeywa
Budhatemwa

It is expected that 5-10 new sub-parishes will be added in 1982. In addition to the training and follow-up of the 54 Community Workers from the above-listed communities, EIL bears specific responsibility for project activities in Bufuula, Budhatemwa, and Kasokwe.

The BEIRD project operates in 18 villages in the Kamuli and Kaliro areas. EIL has trained Primary School Headmasters and Project Teachers from each of the 18 villages. In addition it has assumed specific responsibility for project implementation in Kasokwe, the pilot community where a direct linkage of BEIRD and MSRD is being attempted.

Training to date

EIL has conducted two formal, week-long residential training courses:

- 1) BEIRD project staff, Kaliro TTC
January 5-11, 1981
50 persons including 36 headmasters and project teachers from 18 satellite primary schools, 10 faculty from Kaliro TTC, and 3 District and national education officials.

It is expected that the outreach of these persons will directly affect a population of more than 9000 rural Busoga residents.

- 2) MSRD Community Workers, Mukono District Farm Institute
February 15-21, 1981

60 persons, including 50 Community Workers from 18 MSRD target sub-parishes. The CW's in turn work with over 36,000 fellow sub-parish residents.

In addition EIL has assisted with specific technical training activities in Bufuula, Kaliro TTC, and Buckley Primary School (Iganga). EIL has also assumed responsibility

for training the senior MSRD staff in effective non-formal, adult teaching techniques.

Projected Activities

- Follow-up residential training course for BEIRD headmasters and project teachers.
- Regional day-long seminars in selected BEIRD communities to orient District administration officials, gombolola and village chiefs, and village elders.
- Follow-up residential training course for MSRD Community Workers
- 5-day residential training course for diocesan lay leaders concerning goals and activities of MSRD
- Technical training courses in each of the three EIL-sponsored MSRD communities. Among those planned are three 5-day nutrition and home improvement courses for women.

MSRDP Baseline Data Collection

The following survey is now being conducted by the 54 MSRDP Community Workers to obtain baseline data for each of the 18 communities. It is being administered to every homestead in the community, and is expected to be completed by mid-May.

1. Who lives in your home? (Men, women, children)
2. Who goes to school? (Boys, girls)
3. How big is your farm?
4. What food crops do you grow?
5. What vegetables do you grow?
6. Do you sell any crops for cash?
7. What cash crops do you grow?
8. What fruits do you grow?
9. What animals do you keep?
10. What storage facilities do you have?
11. Where do you get the seeds you plant?
12. What tools or machines do you use?
13. What labor do you employ on your farm?
14. Do you use drugs or chemicals?
15. Who gives you technical advice?
16. What are your farm needs?
17. What suggestions do you have for meeting your needs?
 1. What do you do (i.e. job, employment, etc.)
 2. Does your spouse work (other than on the farm)?
 3. What is the staple food in your home?
 4. What sauce do you eat?
 5. What did you have for dinner last night?
 6. What did you have for breakfast this morning?
 7. What will you have for lunch today?
 8. Do your children eat lunch at school?
 9. What body-building foods do you eat regularly?
 10. Do you drink milk regularly?
 11. What do you do in your leisure time?
 12. Do you sell any of the things you make?
 1. Where do you go for health care?
 2. Where do you get drinking water?
 3. Do you boil your drinking water?
 4. Are your children immunized?
 5. What are the most common diseases in your community (adults, children)?