

PDBAU 986

ATTACHMENT C

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PA

Form Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE

DEVELOPMENT HANPOWER TRAINING

2. PROJECT NUMBER

660-0068

MISSION/AID/W OFFICE

USAID/ZAIRE

3. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit, e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No., etc., with No. 1 each FY)

4. REGULAR EVALUATION / SPECIAL EVALUATION

PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION

6,300,000

7/81

2,566,000

7/82

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

B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION

C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED

at Director's office. If you cannot discuss, cite those items needing further study. Specify type of document, e.g., program, SPAH, PIO, which will present detailed request.

See executive summary pp 3-4

6. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED PER ACTION DECISIONS

- Implementation Plan
- PI/C
- PI/O/C
- PI/O/P

- Other (Specify):
- Other (Specify):

7. ACTION DECISIONS ON FUTURE

- Without change
- Change amount
- Change implementation plan
- Discontinue project

8. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OFFICER NAMES AND TITLES

Edward Hirabayashi, HRD Officer
Chizungu Rudahindwa, Director of CENACOP

9. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR APPROVAL

Richard L. PODOL

Date

**First Year Evaluation of Project 660-0068
"Development Manpower Training"**

**Conducted by
Stephen H. Grant
HRD Advisor
REDSO/WA**

**Kinshasa
July, 1982**

2

C O N T E N T S

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. INPUTS
- III. OUTPUTS
- IV. FINDING AND CONCLUSIONS
- V. RECOMMENDATIONS

ANNEX

- A. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
- B. PERSONS CONSULTED
- C. CIDEP/CPA
- D. LIST OF PIO/Ps ISSUED UNDER PROJECT
- E. ACRONYMS
- F. SUGGESTIONS FOR EVALUATION AT END OF PHASE ONE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Project 660-0068, "Development Manpower Training," has been operational for less than one year. The goal of the project is to improve the quantity and quality of socio-economic development program in Zaire. The twofold purpose is to assist the GOZ in establishing a development oriented training capacity and to train 1500 Zairians in priority development sectors. Training is centering around a newly created institution, CENACOF (National Center for the Coordination of Training in Development), which is being supported by both AID and GOZ.

Factual Information

1. Project is approximately two years behind schedule; Phase I was scheduled for FY 80-81 but first hiring and ordering took place in October 1981.
2. Less than 40% of the anticipated funds have been disbursed from the AID budget during the first year.
3. \$111,000 have been spent to date from the AID Budget for vehicles, equipment, and materials.
4. There is a wide discrepancy between how GOZ funds were to be spent and how they were spent. Examples:
 - while 42% of the total phase I (two years) expenditures were earmarked for training less than 7% have been spent to this end.

4

- office rental and renovation have absorbed almost one half of project expenses, but no GOZ funds had been planned for facilities.
 - no GOZ funds had been planned for commodities, but 28% of project funds were spent toward this end.
5. 19 Zairians to date have benefited from participant training funds in a wide number of fields. Training has been predominantly short-term and in the U.S.
 6. CENACOF has hired 19 out of its planned 26 staff members.
 7. Participation in several training activities has given CENACOF trainers the opportunity to both teach and learn.
 8. Approximately 500 GOZ rural administrative mid-low level cadres have been trained for approximately one month through project funds.

Positive Aspects

1. CENACOF's three high-level cadres are well trained, experienced, competent, and dedicated.
 2. The CENACOF building complex is nearing completion, is well situated, and now gives the staff adequate facilities in which to plan and carry out training activities.
 3. An open, close, and constructive professional relationship exists between the CENACOF Director and the mission project manager.
 4. CENACOF's present affiliation with the Prime Minister's office provides CENACOF with definite advantages.
- 5

5. The interview process prior to staff hiring is effective, including both GOZ and AID inputs.

6. In addition to CENACOF activities connected to existing AID projects, a number of requests for training services are being received at CENACOF from public and private sources.

Negative Aspects

1. - single weakest project component has been lack of short-term U.S. training consultants (one person/month provided out of a planned sixty-seven person/months during Phase I) to train trainers.

2. only 2 short-term consultants to have completed work to date, did so in an unsatisfactory way

3. GOZ requested termination of service by 1 long-term U.S. advisor

4. CENACOF staff not involved in selection of U.S. advisors/consultants

5. although the project attributed a significant role to the TAC (Technical Advisory Council), the TAC to date has not provided its anticipated services to the project.

6. project phase I is labeled "experimental" but no experimental design is evident either in the planning documents or in the project implementation.

To Look Out For in the Future.....

1. CENACOF hiring department heads in the areas of Evaluation, Information, and Administration.

2. clear signs of increasing institutionalisation of CENACOF, i.e. funding from GOZ national budget rather than from counterpart PL 480 funds.
3. development of an adequate training plan well before scheduled phase 2.
4. CENACOF's ability to satisfy those agencies requesting its training services.
5. successful successor to U.S. long-term advisor
6. complementary training assistance from P.A.I.D. and other African institutions to assist in CENACOF staff development
7. meaningful assistance in training operations of AID activities, i.e. North Shaba project
8. increasing role for the private sector as suppliers and receivers of training services
9. improved information gathering and assembling on the part of both project and CENACOF
10. CENACOF role(s) which is (are) most effective; a) training, or b) organizing/co-ordinating training, or c) assisting other training units.

Conclusion

CENACOF is off to a slow but a promising start. The area of CENACOF actions is an area where the needs are virtually unlimited in Zaire. If assured of competent and productive staff, adequate finances, and able financial management, CENACOF will provide a critically useful service to national manpower needs.

I. INTRODUCTION

The introduction consists of a summary of the project and the purpose of the present evaluation, as they were presented to the evaluator in his scope of work,

The Development Manpower Training Project (660-0068) was authorized on 8/20/80, for an AID grant contribution of \$2,544,000 (FAA Section 105, Education and Human Resources Development). Total life of Project costs are estimated at \$6,300,000. Long-term technical assistance began in June 1981. The goal of the project is to improve the quantity and quality of socio-economic development programs in Zaire. The twofold project purpose is first to assist the GOZ in establishing a development-oriented training capacity; second, to train selected Zairians (1500 by the end of the project) in priority development sectors. Widespread skills deficiencies severely limit effective planning, implementation and evaluation of development programs in Zaire. USAID, through this project, intends to assist the GOZ in addressing this major constraint to Zaire's development.

This is an initial project evaluation after approximately one year of project activity. The principal purposes of the evaluation are to assess the quality, quantity and timeliness of scheduled inputs (commodities, technical assistance, training, etc.) and to measure progress in reaching the project outputs, as stated in the Project Paper. Project achievements to date will be measured against those projected in the Project Implementation Plan. The evaluator will make recommendations for improvements in project implementation and in design of the project as indicated by conclusions drawn in the evaluation. The evaluator will draft the scope of work for an in-depth evaluation to be conducted in 1983.

8

II. INPUTS

A. AID Inputs

1. Technical assistance (\$104,000)

- A two-year PSC contract was concluded with a U.S. Consultant to serve as technical advisor to the GENACOF (National Center for the Coordination of Training in Development) Director. He completed the one year contract and left when he and AID were informed (Annex A no 24) that his services were no longer desired. Although of recognized assistance regarding the physical infrastructure installation of the present Center quarters (e.g. lease negotiations purchase of vehicles and commodities), the consultant was faulted with providing inadequate substantive counsel concerning training matters; with acting independently with little regard for the Director's prerogatives; with insufficient command of French; and with lack of ability to get along with Center colleagues.
PIO/T 00033 \$84,000

- A 3 week consultancy by CIFAD (Consortium for International Fisheries and Aquaculture Development) with headquarters at Oregon State University by two Ph.D. graduate students in the field of fish culture was carried out with the objective of testing the feasibility of aquaculture as a viable training program component on a regional basis: Burundi and Rwanda were also visited. The report turned in by the two consultants was criticized by the Mission, by the Department of Agriculture and by the Peace Corps, with whom the consultants collaborated, as being an unprofessional and relatively weak, training curriculum document. The Center Director has never received a copy of the report.
PIO/T 00032 \$20,000

2. Participant Training (\$163,200)

Twelve PIO/P's have been written to date covering participant training activities. Annex D presents the following information concerning participants funded under the project: No of PIO/P, name, field and degree, duration, University/place of teaching, and total cost in U.S. dollars. It can be noted that nineteen (19) Zairian students have benefited from participant training funded under the project. Four of these are taking long-term (one year) Public Health Administration courses as part of a Master Degree Program. The other fifteen persons are involved in short-term (3-8 week) non-degree related training. The fields of study are varied, and include a regional mapping workshop; family planning; management; statistics; communications; women in management; energy management training; and public health. Sixteen participants have traveled to the States, the others' travel has been to Gabon or Togo.

The evaluator asked the Mission the rather obvious question of the relationship between the participant training activities being undertaken and the functioning of CENACOF. It was explained first, that Project 660-0068 is providing general participant training assistance to the Mission, and second, that the participants upon their return may be called upon, on occasion, and with their employers' consent, to assist CENACOF in its various training operations.

PIO/P 00036	\$ 2,000
PIO/P 00037	\$11,000
" 00038	3,000
" 00040	8,000
" 00042	10,000
" 00043	15,000
" 00046	3,000
" 00047	3,000
" 00054	6,000
" 00055	100
" 00057	100
" 00059	100,000
	<u>\$163,200</u>

3. Commodities (\$111,000)

The first PIO/C below represents the purchase (on waiver authority) of two Peugeot 104 sedans. One was driven by the long-term U.S. Advisor, the other is at the disposal of the Center.

The second is the equipment and materials for the center and the training annex.

The third is the agriculture and rural development manuals on simple farming instructions (in French) to be distributed in all rural development training programs in CENACOF.

1. PIO/C 00044	\$12,117
2. PIO/C 00051	34,000
3. PIO/C 00052	65,000
4. Contingency (\$9,000)	

Grand Total \$387,317

Comparison

Here follows a comparison of the projected first year AID project expenditures with the actual figures.

<u>Category</u>	<u>Projected expenditures</u>	<u>Actual expenditures</u>
technical assistance	720,000	104,000
participant training	144,000	163,200
commodities	77,000	111,117
contingency	20,000	9,000
inflation	39,000	-
total	<u>\$997,000</u>	<u>387,317</u>

The most visible discrepancy consists of the paucity of technical assistance afforded the project (less than 15% of that which was planned). The missing technical assistance has been almost exclusively in the form of short-term U.S. consultants who were to stimulate and organize field training activities and provide supervision and counsel to the CENACOF trainers.

In addition, less than 40% of the anticipated funds have been disbursed. This situation is partially explained by the slow start-up factor.

B. GOZ Inputs

1. CENACOF Personnel as of Jul 1, 1982

	<u>Planned</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Director	1	1
Deputy Director and Head Training	1	1
Head, Finance and Accounting	1	1
Head, Administration and Logistics	1	0
Head, Information Systems	1	0
Head, Evaluation	1	0
Trainer	6	5
Personnel manager	1	1
Secretary	2	1
Typist	2	1
Messenger	2	1
Chauffeur	3	3
Watchman	4	4
	<u>26</u>	<u>19</u>

CENACOF constitutes a fledging institution for the moment composed essentially of three high-level cadres; two U.S. trained Ph.D.s in education and one well trained and experienced financial officer. If any of these three individuals were to leave the institution, CENACOF would be left in a precarious position. Fortunately for the institution the individuals appear not only to be highly trained, but to be competent and dedicated. The dependence of the institution's viability upon a small nucleus of persons, however, is not an advantage in the long term.

Fully one-half of the missing personnel, that is the discrepancy between 19 and 27 persons involves the key mid-level management positions of "Chefs de Service." The work in administrative services and in training is partially accomplished due to the doubling of the roles of the Financial Officer and the Deputy Director, respectively, especially in the latter case, it is an unfortunate situation. In the total personnel picture, the five trainers are the real losers. On one hand, they have not received the training assistance expected from the long-term U.S. consultant, nor have they, until June 1982, seen a short-term American Consultant come to work with them (and even then it was not so much to work with them this time as to set up a schedule for co-training at some later date). On the other, only piecemeal training assistance has been provided by the incomplete CENACOF staff. The trainers have been kept occupied, and do not appear in despair, but they have not been the object of a systematic full training course. They realize and regret this. They feel their training has been piecemeal and improvised; they are anticipating much better things to come. Otherwise, the evaluator can see them drifting off to other more rewarding types of employment. This evaluator has seen this happen elsewhere.

The Center Director is not worried about the personnel picture. He sees no need to hire all his staff now, while he does not yet have full-time jobs for them to perform. He also does not have sufficient office space to house them. A training seminar room able to contain 30-40 persons is currently being built and equipped directly behind the administrative offices in an annex. When these facilities are complete, the trainers will relinquish their front office room which will then accommodate new office chiefs. The Director's two reasons for not having hired more personnel are defensible. What is especially gratifying is that approximately forty individuals have already been interviewed for the remaining positions. An interview is carried out in a serious way and involves normally four interviewers: an AID official, the long-term U.S. advisor, the Center Director, and the Center Deputy Director. The Center Director is particularly thankful for the multi-party and thorough selection process, for it protects him against accepting incompetent but well connected candidates.

2. CENACOF Budget as of July 1, 1982

The GOZ funds derive currently from local currency counterpart funds generated under PL 480 Title I agreements. These funds are requested on a periodic basis from the General Commissariat of the Plan. To date, two payments have been made to CENACOF.

	1.0 million zaires	Jan. 28, 1982
	<u>1.5 million zaires</u>	June 16, 1982
total	2.5 million zaires	

These funds were delayed in being made available, so that when received were used to pay for debts already incurred. In addition, AID advanced 300,000 zaires to CENACOF, of which 100,000 has

14

already been reimbursed and the evaluator was shown the second reimbursement check for another 100,000 zaires that had just been signed.

How have the GOZ counterpart funds been used to date? The Center Financial Officer gave the evaluator copies of financial statements (Annex A, No 15), which the evaluator has left in the AID project files. These statements (through April 20 not July 1) report the following expenses by category.

<u>Category</u>		<u>Expenses (in zaires)</u>
Salaries	Jan 31	5,440.00
	Feb 20	26,174.50
	Mar 20	21,465.00
	April 20	32,531.45
	Total	85,610.95
Training		70,583.00
Office rental		144,000.00
Office rental and renovation		11,442.29
Office renovation		333,016.50
Office equipment		291,173.00
Miscellaneous		109,000.00
Grant total		1,044,825.74

How does this expenditure breakdown compare with the planned GOZ budget? The PP (p. 45) presents a GOZ budget for the first phase (years I and 2) which includes the following:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Project cost (in dollars)</u>
in-country training	614,000
participant training	-
participants' salaries	119,000
commodities/facilities	--
contingency	73,000
inflation	645,000

15

There appears to exist a major discrepancy between how counterpart funds were to have been spent and how they were spent. For instance, while 42% of the total phase I expenditures were to have been spent on training, less than 7% of project expenditures up until April 20, 1982 have been spent on training activities. While the largest cost category planned for phase I was "inflation," the category with the highest cost attached to it in reality has been office rental and renovation, almost half of project expenses. No funds had been planned for facilities at all. Similarly, no funds had been planned for commodities out of the GOZ budget for phase I, but the second highest category of project expenditures is namely commodities in the form of office equipment, 28% of the total budget expended.

A partial explanation of the paucity of funds actually devoted to training lies in the slow start-up of the project especially the non-arrival of U.S. short-term consultants who were to stimulate and organize field training activities.

The present project will be evaluated, in the final analysis, according to its success as a training institution. For only so long in the project history can one justify concentration on office space and equipment. In the very near future, certainly well before the 1983 evaluation, this project must be judged by its training actions, not by one of the means toward fulfilling those actions, infrastructure conditions.

III. OUTPUTS

The implementation Plan (PP p. 60-61) includes the following outputs which should have occurred in the first year:

- TAC formally established
- DTO formally established
- Needs survey for local administrative training
- 500 cadres trained through workshops
- U.S. technical assistance in place
- First wave of participants (cadres and trainers) begin training in US and third country
- Survey of training needs for training plan.

One could add to this list staff training within the GENACOF particularly concerning the trainers.

What outputs have been produced to date? Discussions with Center personnel have resulted in the following list of outputs.

- A. Training needs analysis survey (226 respondents). Purpose: to determine how administrative cadres perceive their roles and training needs.
Conclusion: "certain internal factors, particularly behavioral factors, such as the lack of coordination between territorial administration and the traditional authorities, or between the various technical services themselves were seen as also playing significant roles in retarding development". (Annex A, no5, p.9)

- B. CPA training of 101 local administration agents.
1st two-week session dealt with structural

problems and addressed the need for better understanding of the cadres' role and tasks. A month interval followed. Then the 2nd two-week seminar dealt with issues related to information gathering and analysis in addition to the roles of local cadres as development agents. Training was carried out in Bas Zaira, Bandundu, and Haut Zaira in five towns.

C. PCI training of 120 PVO cadres, Dec 1980.

The training program in project development was considered very successful, and the mission was able to see the concrete consequences in the form of multiple requests for development assistance!

D. Colloquium on Territorial Decentralization for 50 participants, March 1-4 1982. Purpose: to analyze problems of local development and to determine how training can provide a solution.

General recommendations emanated from the colloquium and are included in document 6 referred to in Annex A.

E. Evaluation of CPA Training.

- F. Secretarial training. CENACOF's secretarial staff has trained the executive secretaries of the Eglise du Christ au Zaïre at the latter's request.

- G. Training of CENACOF Trainers workshop at CPA, Jan 20-26, 1982 (see following section on trainers).

- H. Training of 15 doctors gathered in Kinshasa for one week in primary health care (see following section on trainers) at the request of ECZ.

- I. Draft inventory of training needs for training plan (being typed) to which each trainer contributed

- J. Visit of Center Deputy Director to PAID in Douala (report to be submitted to AID mission by Deputy Director)

- K. Training seminar in Lone on management of WID projects carried out by two Zairian consultants from CPA and the General Commissariat of the Plan, and funded from participant training funds.

Participant training and U.S. technical assistance have been discussed in the inputs section. The establishment of TAC and DTO will be addressed in the following pages including the planned role for TAC in formative evaluation, as will the particularly important activities of the trainers. In general, the outputs record for the project to date is not negligible. It has not reached all targets, however; for instance, only about one half of the targeted 500 local cadres have been reached, and not for as much training time as had been planned. CENACOF has kept itself constructively occupied, replying to spontaneous external requests for services where the scheduled appearance of U.S. consultants to work with CENACOF concerning AID project support has been postponed. It should be

noted, however, in conclusion, that several project outputs have included less direct CENACOF input than external participants in major roles (CPA, for example, which consumed 30,000 zaires*)

TRAINERS

The evaluator met four of the five trainers. The fifth was on sick leave, recuperating from an appendectomy. The trainers are all men, have an average age of 31 and an average professional experience of 5 years. They were hired together on Jan. 18, 1982 and on July 18, 1982 terminate their six-month trial period.

Their fields and their academic degrees are included in Annex B. Their academic background is basically social science/humanities. Their profession has been essentially that of classroom teacher. Most have been civil servants, but are no longer. They are not "detachés" from the civil service (as the financial officer is, for example). That is, they have no job to go back to.

What have the five trainers done during their first six months? First, they have become familiar with the Development Manpower Training Project. They have studied the French version of the PP, and have produced a 9-page analysis of the PP (see Annex A # 14) focusing on the tasks to be achieved and the intermediary plus final objectives to be attained. This activity is most worthwhile, and is all too often neglected in project implementation.

Second, the trainers were the target audience of a seminar Jan 20-26, organized by CIDEP/CPA. The CIDEP/CPA trainers led plenary sessions (there were 27 trainees including the CENACOF group) on the following topics: Local Public Administration in Zaire; Local Public Management; Adult Education Methodology; Training by Objectives. Each of the

* Figure quoted by CENACOF Director

five trainers wrote a summary of the training workshop and his impressions (see Annex A, # 8-13). The trainers thought that the curriculum was appropriate for them, but too theoretical and elementary. They were not impressed by the trainers who stifled discussion, and discouraged questions. During their first week on the job, the trainers were exposed to a dramatic expression of professional jealousy. At the introductory training session, the CPA director warned CENACOF that it was encroaching on CIDEF's own territory, which included training public officials in rural areas (see Annex C for a description of CIDEF). CENACOF was told it would not succeed if it tried to go it alone!

Third the trainers spent three weeks at CIDEF/CPA preparing for further workshop activity. In particular they studied the Vengroff report; they analyzed data from the questionnaires administered to the collectivity cadres concerning training areas; they discussed the nature of the collectivity agents to train including their knowledge, aptitudes, and attitudes; they defined desirable aptitudes, attitudes, and knowledge that collectivity agents should possess; and they prepared for the technical colloquium of March 1-4.

Fourth, the CENACOF Director led a week-long seminar (April 7-14) in which each trainer presented a topic: fish culture; family planning; adult education; agriculture; agricultural project management. The independent research the trainers conducted was designed to be personally profitable as well as to inform the group concerning topics which would later be objects of specific training workshops. Each trainer is writing up his presentation. The Director of training developed an excellent form by which listeners evaluate oral presentations made at the Center. Forty of these filled out evaluation forms are filed in the Director's office.

Fifth, the trainers have all participated in various training programs held in Kinshasa. One for example, was a week-long in preventive medicine organized by the Eglise du Christ au Zaire for

15 doctors. One CENACOF trainer intervened to present procedures in communications and group dynamics, such as small group work, that the doctors were to apply during the workshop. A second workshop, organized by the Planning Commissariat, was attended by all five trainers for two days each. Here their role was more passive.

Sixth, the trainers work on a daily basis with the Center's Deputy Director who also directs the training office. The Center Director also participates in these work sessions, as did the USAID consultant Thomas Murray during his one-year stay.

How can one describe the trainers' attitude concerning their past and future work? They have the feeling they have accomplished little. They point to an activities chart taped to the wall and on which 15 activities are scheduled. "The first activity we were supposed to be involved in is the collectivity training, planned for July. There we would have gone to the field (the trainers have not been into the field once in their trial period). Because of legislative elections, we must postpone collectivity training until October. Except for zone training, all the other activities are AID project activities. We were told AID consultants would come to work with us, one on each subject (fish culture, North Shaba Project, energy management, etc.) but no one comes! Professor Saulnier recently came, but we hear he has come to work with the Agriculture Department, giving courses to agronomists rather than to help us plan training programs."

The trainees are discouraged but do not appear to have despaired. They resent being at the mercy of technical assistants who don't come. They see the value in a long-term T.A. and hope Thomas Murray will be replaced. They do not consider his replacement an alternative to a series of short-term consultants, however. They are very anxious to work with short-term consultants and to improve further their knowledge about the multiple aspects of development activity. Finally, they are expecting to receive additional reading material concerning the selected activities, i.e. grain storage.

22

OTHER PROJECT ELEMENTS

A. TAC (Technical Advisory Council)

The TAC is designed to be a body of eight Zairians in high cadres positions who advise CENACOF staff on their training policies, priorities, plans, and programs. In addition, they should evaluate CENACOF programs, constitute a GOZ monitoring entity, approve the Center's identification of training needs, and specify selection criteria for participant training.

To date they cannot be said to have done any of these things. In fact, they have not officially been named as a group*. Despite the existence of a condition precedent (PP, page 70), the TAC is considered by the Center presently as a group of potential but not actual advisors. The representative of the TAC whom the evaluator interviewed was introduced to him by the Deputy Director of the Center as a TAC advisor "candidate." Discussions with persons who have attended the three TAC meetings (two of them luncheon meetings) which have occurred agree that they have consisted of individual presentations of training methodologies and perspectives (not at all useless, but only the precursor to a viable counseling role) rather than guidance based on focused dialogue.

The TAC representative selected by CENACOF to meet the evaluator may not be representative, but he neither knew where the Center's office was nor knew what training programs it had been involved in. The representative was interested in CENACOF, however, as a giver of services. As Principal Advisor in the Agriculture Department the representative recognized the need for training agricultural agents and had in fact requested that CENACOF furnish a training plan for the Department of Agriculture. He claimed to be waiting for a response. If there were a collaborative effort between CENACOF and the Department of Agriculture to mount a training plan, then the Principal Advisor saw a role for himself as evaluator as well as advisor. An evaluation role concerning

*The CENACOF Director has preferred to postpone the official nomination of the advisory group due to an anticipated cabinet reshuffle.

a CENACOF program which did not address the Principal Advisor's own department did not strike him as being in the offing.

The evaluator's conclusion is that the TAC has some potential (certainly some members, such as the Training Director of the Union Zairoise de Banques and the representative of CEPAS among others, represent impressive wisdom and experience in training Zairians), but that to date it has been a marginal asset to the project objectives. Its mandate appears to have been grossly exaggerated. Just the gathering of training professionals is a significant accomplishment and exchanges of information are vital. With a much more modest list of responsibilities, the TAC could continue and be of moderate value.

B. DTO (Development Training Office)

The DTO is supposed to organize and coordinate all training activities. The DTO formulates and executes training policy, with the advice of the TAC. The DTO should also perform principally the following tasks: contact third country training institutions; provide accounting services for the project; recruit candidates for participant training; conduct workshops to train managers, trainers, and high-level decision makers; and design and maintain the project's Development Information System.

In the CENACOF Deputy Director's eyes, the DTO is nothing other than CENACOF itself. That is, it is not a third-party entity such as the TAC. According to the list of tasks above, what has CENACOF's record been to date? The record is mixed, but largely positive. It does formulate and execute training policy in collaboration with other institutions. It has contacted third-country institutions, for example P.A.I.D. in Douala with an interest in the training that P.A.I.D. could dispense at the Center. CENACOF provides accounting

24

services for that portion of project funds that derive from counterpart assistance. CENACOF has not been involved in the recruiting of participant trainees under project funds. This task has been performed exclusively by AID/Kinshasa. The CENACOF Director does not understand why the Center has not been consulted in the recruitments. CENACOF has conducted workshops to train managers and trainers, but has refused to become involved in training program designed for high-level cadres. Finally, CENACOF has not yet designed a Development Information System (see next item).

C. DDB (Development Data Bank)

DDB is supposed to constitute the data generating and assembling entity within CENACOF which furnishes data on training plans and activities. The data bank would consist of such elements as the following: participant training opportunities; direct beneficiary profile; inventory of training resources; logistical and financial information.

In the words of CENACOF's Deputy Director, nothing has been accomplished to date concerning the DDB. This is not to say that CENACOF personnel have not generated documents or that CENACOF shelves are bare; it is to say that existing data have not been organized in a systematic or useful way, and the volume of information assembled is meager.

Formative Evaluation

It has been difficult for the evaluator to discern what formative evaluation, if any, has taken place.

One reads in the PP that "the manner in which the TAC will function embodies the main features of formative evaluation" (p. 67). Three TAC meetings

have taken place to date, and a written report of only the second (January 27, 1982) was made available to the evaluator.

First of all, the TAC representatives are labeled "candidates" in the report, that is they have (still) not yet been identified as advisors. In reading the minutes of the meeting, one learns how each participant described the institution he worked for (by means of a questionnaire). The luncheon/meeting also included presentation by CENACOF concerning its training activities planned for 1982. An oral account of the third TAC meeting reported that Father Didier Defailly showed slides of the INADES training methodology. TAC meetings appear to consist of unilateral "show and tell" performances rather than guidance based on focused dialogue; moreover, there is no indication that TAC plays any role akin to that of formative evaluation.

"Formative evaluation" does not "produce a continuous flow of information that will assist the GOZ/TAC and USAID to monitor the project" (PP p. 67). A flow of information is produced by individuals. It is not clear from the PP which individuals are responsible for generating formative evaluation data (in what form -- oral, written, etc.) or whether formative evaluation just happens, that is, takes place automatically within the project. This evaluation has worked in African institutions which included two physical units: one, an external or summative evaluation office, attached to the Director; and the other, an internal or formative evaluation office attached to a lower official responsible for production. Whether this or a different system is adopted, evaluative responsibilities, even on-going short-term feedback operations, must be clearly defined in terms of individuals and form/frequency of evaluative reporting.

IV. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. The fact that CENACOF was not the first training institution with a national mandate (or at least national ambition) has resulted in some jealousy. The first press release that announced the creation of CENACOF appeared in December, 1979. It declared that CENACOF would be a part of IZAM within the General Commissariat of the Plan. IZAM, an institution which catered only to high-level or executive management, suddenly declared it would also become involved in lower level rural development training, apparently because it was aware of the planned AID funding in this area. This conflict situation dissolved when in August 1980 IZAM withdrew from the General Commissariat of the Plan and established itself as a "profit making" management consulting firm.

The second jealous training institution was CIDEP/CPA. This institution is part of the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. African institutions of higher learning are not known for their commitment to and labor on behalf of training needs of mid-low-level rural cadres. Nevertheless CIDEP, through its affiliate CPA, includes rural cadres among its target beneficiaries (see Annex C). CPA's rural training effort was funded and assisted by AID and consultants from Texas Tech and Laval Universities. The CPA director publicly warned CENACOF in January (Annex A, # 8-12) not to try to usurp its mandate! The CENACOF Director laughs at these two jealousy incidents and considers them trivial. He believes CPA is content because it has been remunerated 30,000 zaires from Project 068 for its training assistance. Clearly, the country is big enough and the training needs serious enough to absorb all potential contributors.

B. One is at first worried that the CENACOF Director is not a full-time Director. His Deputy,

who is in a good position to know, says he is present perhaps 60% of the time. This means obviously that the Deputy Director is constrained in the time he can spend as training Director. The Director's part-time presence is compensated for by the stature of his second position, namely advisor to the Premier Commissaire d'Etat. This position has enabled CENACOF to have certain advantages: the Prime Minister's ear and access to the Executive Council; a gift from the Premier Commissariat to CENACOF of substantial quantities of office equipment; and hopefully a favorable response to the up-coming CENACOF request for 25% of the next GOZ contribution to come not from counterpart funds but from the national budget (see next item).

C. Institutionalization of CENACOF after its years of direct AID funding should constitute a growing concern. While it appears inappropriate and certainly is unusual to find a training institution attached to a Prime Minister's office, as is mentioned above, there are distinct advantages. Probably the key element to institutionalization, more important than the reputation of the organization or the actual value of the services it renders, is reliable financing. The Center Director's well thought up plan for obtaining finances to permit the desired institutionalization is to inscribe in the next national budget a line item for 25% of CENACOF's recurrent expenses, the following year 50%, and the third year 75%. The financial officer agrees that a request for 100% funding after AID withdrawal would be doomed to failure. The CENACOF Director is confident he will be successful. As for the proper affiliation of CENACOF, the General Commissariat of the Plan apparently felt uneasy with a training center under its roof, whereas it was much more comfortable with macro-industrial considerations. CENACOF is currently attached to a man, the Director, who is attached to another office, that of Premier Commissaire d'Etat. Everyone admits that is potentially an unstable house for CENACOF. Perhaps the Agriculture and Rural Development Commissariat would be more appropriate. It should be noted however

28

that the Mission HRD Chief believes this would destroy CENACOF! At any rate, it is dangerous to attach institutions too close to persons. As Lee Braddock says, it is perhaps a good idea to launch projects within the Prime Minister's office, where there's clout, and then to have them move over to more appropriate ministerial homes.

D. Another intention of the CENACOF Director is to obtain much larger permanent headquarters. He believes that in three years, when the current lease for his office building runs out, the premises will not be sufficiently large for his staff. The Director has also experienced a laborious litigation regarding occupancy of the current premises, and he would like to be free from such potential liabilities.

E. The CENACOF Director is puzzled concerning the participant training component of the project. Not only is CENACOF, or the TAC, not consulted concerning participant training activities (with the exception of the P.A.I.D. trip), as is stipulated in the PP, but the Director does not comprehend the fashion in which participant training has been associated with or has advanced the cause of CENACOF. The Director has not seen, thus far, that the CENACOF is a part of a larger project, i.e., 660-0068 Development Manpower Training. The Participant training component has supported training in the general integrated rural development sector in which AID is collaborating with other Ministries.

F. The single weakest project component to date has been the input of short-term U.S. training consultants in priority AID fields. Of '67 person/months planned during Phase I, as of July 1, 1982, less than one person/month has been provided.

G. The evaluator has seen nothing in documents developed since the project got under way which recognizes the importance of or comments on the project effect on women. The evaluator suggests

that someone be named to start recording women-related project information. Certainly P10/Pa.00040 and 00047 resulted in some useful data that could provide initial input (see annex D).

H. The evaluator has been asked to comment on the timeliness of inputs. There is not much to say, save that the inputs have been slow to arrive especially concerning the U.S. short-term consultants and the establishment in quasi-permanent headquarters. The scheduled timing of the project has been shifted approximately two years later. The project was supposed to contain a Phase I in FY 80-81 or Oct. 1, 1979 to Sept. 30, 1981. It was not until Oct. 1981 that the first orders were sent in for CENACOF equipment and materials and the first recruitments were carried out. From Oct. to Feb., the Center was established in unsatisfactory, temporary housing.

I. The project Phase I is labeled "experimental" on page 64 of the PP. There is no experimental design, however, as a component of the project. A stipulation is made that Phase I include "testing" of training activities. Some training activities were carried out but no sign of any testing or comparison of testing strategies is in evidence. The project manager's intention is to compare the PCI, P.A.I.D., and Vengroff CPA training methods but no attempt at a comparison has been made in fact as yet. The Vengroff/CPA training has been evaluated by CENACOF. P.A.I.D. training is on the evaluation schedule. The PCI training has been delayed in AID/W and has yet to be conducted.

J. The evaluation asked whether it was a common practice in Zaire to have an external donor set up a new organization and see it taken over (in the sense of institutionalization) by the government. He was told that the FAO-UNDP financed project "Intrants Agricoles" was such a case. The other alternative, of course, to setting up a new organization or structure, and an alternative that is normally preferred, is to work within an existing framework. This issue was not investigated in the present

30

evaluation regarding the creation of CENACOF as opposed to, say the reinforcing of CIDEF, but the issue still appears a valid one. The mission project manager has stated that the HRD office spent two years working with CIDEF without getting anywhere - so the USAID Director requested a change. PLAN was then approached and designing continued with this Ministry. However, objectives could not be achieved after over a year of negotiating, and finally the move to the Prime Minister's office was made at the Prime Minister's inauguration. It is worth noting that in this process of finding a "home" for the Center, Agriculture and Rural Development was looked at very thoroughly. The obvious disorganization therein made it prudent to seek a place elsewhere.

K. Much emphasis is placed in the PP on the development of a "Training Plan". This output is not due until near the end of phase 1, but during the first year "priority areas for the comprehensive training plan should be determined" (PP, page 61). Nothing of a concrete nature relating to this training plan was made available to the evaluator. Since the mutual acceptability of the training plan is to be a condition precedent for the start of phase 2, the development of such a plan should constitute a priority endeavor over the next six months.

L. A number of requests for CENACOF training services have recently been extended to the Center. Examples of organizations asking for CENACOF assistance are the following:

1. REGIDESO to train personnel in extension
2. IDIOFA to train personnel
3. Zone Franche d'Inga to train technical and administrative staff for the trade center
4. Kivu cadres to train cooperative personnel in management
5. Kasai Centre Chrétien de Santé to train personnel
6. General Commissariat the Plan to train planners

Such requests imply that a real need for staff training is felt and also that CENACOF has already at its tender age established a certain credibility.

As a matter of fact, the CENACOF Director insists that his credibility be established through word of mouth following concrete actions; he has refrained from using the mass media for publicity. As requests come to CENACOF directly from national or private agencies or as channeled through AID, CENACOF will have to learn how to deal with them effectively. CENACOF will have to adjudicate among AID-related requests and those from other sources, for instance. CENACOF will have to refuse some requests, not only because they might concern non-priority areas such as executive management, but because CENACOF staff is sufficiently committed at a particular time. CENACOF's ability to respond quickly and effectively to external requests will have an impact on the Center's future credibility.

M. The CENACOF Financial Officer in the near future must prepare quarterly financial statements according to a new format recently required by the mission's Controller's Office.

N. The evaluator was particularly impressed by the close professional relationship existing between

27

the AID project manager and the CENACOP Director. The Director praised the project manager's openness and constructiveness, among other qualities. The evaluator was pleased to see that the evaluation debriefing meeting, held in the Director's office, took place in the presence of and with substantive participation by the CENACOP Director.

V: RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The CENACOF Director and one or two of his trainers should make a presentation to the entire AID/Kinshasa staff, perhaps when they are gathered immediately following a regular staff meeting. After a presentation of what the CENACOF has accomplished and how it anticipates responding both to training requests directly from or channeled through AID and to requests emanating from other sources, a discussion should be held regarding improved use of the CENACOF by AID project managers.

B. The new USAID/Kinshasa Director should visit CENACOF in the very near future. The visit should not consist of a quick stand-up, walk-through visit, but should involve a sit-down session with executive staff as well as with the trainers.

C. Priority should be attached to the recruiting of a successor to the previous long-term U.S. advisor. This should be done not only because the position is on the books and the funds available. It should be done because there is a crying need for the trainers to be supervised by a person who can play a close liaison role with AID project managers as well as guide the trainers in their ever-increasing responsibility in training activities. Victor Barnes, ex-PCV in Zaire and completing Stanford PhD in Education & HRD, might be considered for a possible role. Both the CENACOF Director and the evaluator are favorably impressed by Barnes.

D. Project management should turn its attention more actively to African institutions, P.A.I.D. in particular, for providing complementary training expertise to assist CENACOF. One reason for following this option is that the institutions exist, are less costly, and in the case of P.A.I.D. has been funded by AID for two decades for just this purpose. Another potent reason is that it has proven so difficult to obtain U.S. consultants.

E. The CENACOF Director considers that fully one-half of the training workshops organized through CENACOF will be held in its new seminar hall. The evaluator recommends that during the life of AID project financing, in order to respect AID's priorities and goals, no more than 25% of the workshops should be held in Kinshasa.

F. The single weakest project component being inputs from short-term U.S. consultants to plan and carry out training activities with CENACOF, project management's top priority must be the resolution of the consultant recruitment problem.

G. The programming of U.S. consultants to assist the CENACOF must not completely give way to the programming of U.S. consultants to further various AID projects. That is, the CENACOF's weaknesses and needs must not be forgotten as consultants appear with perhaps a more principal mandate of assisting X or Y AID project. CENACOF requires skill training in organizational management, in administrative support, and in communications. As U.S. consultants are directed to CENACOF before reaching their ultimate project site destination, they must take great care in involving CENACOF staff, particularly trainers, in every step of the training program planning process. The U.S. consultant must not incidentally involve CENACOF trainers, as has happened, and go off and prepare "his own thing". Time must be set aside for discussion and deliberate planning together with CENACOF staff. This constitutes a laborious exercise. Without it, however, consultants' training function of CENACOF staff will be hypocritical and self-defeating.

H. As an example of U.S. consultant training activity, the evaluator strongly supports the planned collaboration with the North Shaba project. The U.S. consultant should initially spend no less than one week in a mini-planning seminar with CENACOF trainers. Then, perhaps, the Training Director and the Kiswahili speaking trainer should leave with the consultant for the Ngaba training

center. The group should report back to the trainers at the end to make a presentation of the field work accomplished. Project management must be sure the consultant does not return from the field and take the following plane back to the States. Involvement of CENACOF staff must be planned for at all steps of the training process; otherwise the institution will never obtain its full quota of expertise.

I. If CENACOF's skills are more fully known and recognized at AID, then project managers will call on CENACOF as an automatic process, rather than waiting until an unfavorable evaluation alerts them to the urgent need for such a service.

J. During the CPA training of 101 administrative agents, information was gathered not from observation, but from verbal claims. That is, local cadres "said" they used participatory behavior when dealing with visitors. This demonstrates an age-old predicament in field research. What confidence can one have in such statements of local administrators? Being able to actively observe cadres-villager encounters involves more careful planning, more financial resources and logistics, and even then not necessarily a high degree of validity, due to the possible contrivance of the situation. What to do? Another alternative is to lean rather heavily on institutions that are in the field, with their "noses to the ground". These may or may not exist in the desired locality. They may be public or private; denominational or not. Such groups as INADES-FORMATION have constituted such a resource elsewhere. Upon request, and often with small cost to the project, field organizations can be consulted to give their opinions and in a manner corroborate or deny behavioral claims of interviewed participants.

K. Private training groups may be found who can assist project evaluation as described in the last paragraph. The contribution to the project-- and more importantly to the aftermath of CENACOF

36

institutionalization--from the private sector was not brought up in the PP but may present a real opportunity. The TAC includes some representatives of the private sector who have training interests. Other examples are UNILEVER-PLZ, Goodyear, General Motors, and Construction Inga-Shaba. Project management should analyze seriously the possibilities for collaboration with the private sector, both in the supplying and receiving of training services. Funds generated from private sources could increase CENACOF's chances of institutionalization.

L. Both the AID project management and CENACOF staff should make a more concerted effort to keep complete project files in an accessible place. The evaluator was given, for example, only one of the quarterly reports of the long-term U.S. consultant, whereas two more were admittedly "around here some place". The single quarterly report available was informative about Center development in its organization and activities, but did not at all identify what the consultant's particular input had been. The evaluator had some difficulty in access to CENACOF Director's files because "the secretary has moved the papers around". What was available, the Director very willingly put at the disposal of the evaluator, however. It is especially important in a project such as this to keep both in CENACOF and in AID multiple copies of written "outputs" such as accounts of training programs organized or given by Center staff. Future evaluations will certainly be easier to conduct if heed is paid to the recommendations in this paragraph.

M. As another example of missing project data, the evaluator refers to the PP, page 66, where it is stated that "baseline data will be collected on the following aspects of the project..." Nowhere were such baseline data made available to the evaluator. First, responsibility must be designated concerning the generator of such data. Secondly, when available, these data will

also be of great value to future evaluators.

N. It still makes sense to envisage the next evaluation as one which, in approximately one year's time, makes a go or no-go decision concerning a phase 2 of an additional two years.

O. The next evaluation should closely involve one of the CENACOF trainers. In the line of this evaluator's previous recommendation to involve trainers closely with short-term U.S. consultant activity, the same should be true of the evaluation process. The CENACOF and AID should determine which trainer is the most qualified or the most apt to become proficient in evaluation. The three most impressive trainers appear to be Ante Mbongo, Bokisila Ndasho, and Mweze Runiga; but the "evaluation specialist in training" need not necessarily be one of them. At any rate, it is important to build up and to add new skills to the trainers' repertory. The Evaluation Director may be on staff at CENACOF by then, and would be able to oversee an assistant or this one trainer who will participate in the end-of-phase 1 evaluation. The trainer should perform functions such as the following: plan evaluation schedule with team; make appointments for team; be instrumental in assisting team in developing evaluation instruments, such as questionnaires; accompany team to field and administer evaluation instruments; assist in analysis of collected data. One of the reasons for singling out the trainers for on-the-job training is that their CENACOF related training to date has been disappointingly insufficient. There exists currently a huge gap* in professional competency and confidence between the trainers and the PhD Director and Deputy Director. Yet the latter are the most vulnerable to being called or lured to new positions and it is on the qualifications of the former that the reputation of CENACOF will ultimately be based. If the trainers are not strong and confident leaders in their field, CENACOF will not subsist.

*The evaluator agrees with the CENACOF Director that the gap should be filled not by Ph.D. training but by a strong program of on-the-job training.

P. The evaluator suggests that the CENACOF Financial Officer, despite his current cumulative duties, be asked by the Director to give CENACOF trainers briefing sessions in accounting and financial management. Three of many reasons for this suggestion are the following: the trainers all have only fuzzy notions of accounting and financial management; the trainers' future training of zone and collectivity agents should include precepts for managing public funds; CENACOF should increase its use of the principle, peer teaching. The evaluator has made this suggestion orally to the Director, the Financial Officer, and the trainers.

Q. Because of the unsatisfactory record to date of U.S. technical assistants (see II.A.1.), special care must be taken in the future to insure that CENACOF is satisfied with its U.S. consultants. One logical and common way of achieving this end is to involve CENACOF personnel in the selection of external consultants. In this evaluator's experience, it is much more prevalent in West Africa to see host governments insist on approving the CVs of long-term advisors than to see the absence of any host government role. An extreme but in the long run rewarding case of host government approval is evidenced in Liberia where AID has flown government officials to the U.S. on study tours which have coincided with selection panels for U.S. long-term assistants. In the CENACOF case, this evaluator was appalled to learn that neither before nor during the year-long stay of the U.S. advisor was a copy of his CV shown to or filed with the Center Director.

R. Some one staff member at CENACOF should have responsibility over the next six months for producing a draft training plan. Due to its inclusion as a condition precedent for phase 2, prompt attention to the development of a training plan, involving both CENACOF and AID staff, must be given.

8. One of the central issues in CENACOF's development is the issue of its central purpose or purposes. CENACOF trainers affirm CENACOF's role is double: to train and to coordinate training. Other people would add to this assisting other training units to become more effective rural training units, although there is no consensus about a strict dosage of one as opposed to the other. This evaluator recommends strongly that CENACOF pursues equally assiduously all three purposes during the next twelve-month period. At that time, during the end-of-phase 1 evaluation, a comparative assessment can be made. The better co-ordinators of training are those persons who have inside knowledge of what training is all about. Being exclusively a broker between trainers and trainees does not appear to have unlimited professional appeal. The CENACOF trainers themselves have affirmed their preference for direct training roles. Judging by the construction of a 60-seat seminar room, it is very much one of CENACOF's objectives to furnish active participants in its own training activities, and not just be on call for outside work. It must be remembered that CENACOF trainers are just learning to be trainers. They do not yet have capability to do organization development (OD) work at all. Thus intervention with ministries and agencies currently will be done by consultants in conjunction with the CENACOF Director and the Deputy Director. Currently, Center Trainers appear to be more effective as trainers than as training organizers. Feedback from ECZ states that CENACOF trainers were very helpful in training doctors in the notions of group dynamics, communications, and problem solving, but that they were presently at a loss concerning the organization and logistic support for the training activity. This later job will eventually be that of CENACOF's administrative unit, relieving trainers from such activities.

Finally, concerning a direct training role, the question arises as to the fields in which the trainers would engage in. Their current fields of

YD

expertise are quite limited: agricultural marketing; teacher training in a fairly academic sense, some management; some administration; communications; and interpersonal relations. Experience in such areas militate toward a role of group discussion leader and facilitator with subject matter specialists, i.e. medical personnel, as co-trainers completing the teaching team. With the strengthening of current CENACOF staff's skills and with the possible recruitment of new staff as the CENACOF develops, it is possible that CENACOF acquire competency in a few subject matter fields itself. On the whole, however, this evaluator believes CENACOF should remain fairly "polyvalent", and complement each other's skills to provide general training and counsel.

T. A skill which the Center should concentrate on developing is leading potential users of Center services through the steps of defining training needs. CENACOF has responded to more than one recent request for its services by replying with another query on the order of, what exactly do you want us to do for you? It must be realized by all parties that defining an institution's training needs is not a commonplace skill. The training institution has a responsibility to take the leading role in pursuing a dialogue with the user service. It is very probable that CENACOF presently feels uncomfortable in such a role. Nevertheless, this evaluator believes CENACOF must accept responsibility and that the project should help CENACOF seek ways of acquiring the skill.

U. In the current initial external appraisal of the project, the evaluator's attention was turned to a moral issue: was CENACOF being created for AID or for GOZ? The issue arose mainly from an observation regarding AID mission training needs. Of the 15 training items on CENACOF's agenda at the present time, 13 of them are AID project interventions (e.g. North Shaba, fishculture, ag. statistics, etc.). The mission is looking to CENACOF for coordinating

and providing training inputs to its projects. The mission recognizes that training inputs have been lacking in the past. By the creation of a special training center capability, the mission hopes its projects will all benefit. The question at the present time is the following: does CENACOF have such a perspective concerning its role? This question was discussed at the evaluation debriefing. The CENACOF Director accepts whole-heartedly the services of AID project interventions as being priority items for CENACOF. He added "especially because GOZ has not yet had time to define its training needs".

The evaluator was heartened to hear of CENACOF's acceptance of the strong AID presence in its list of up-coming activities. The evaluator is obliged, however, to look toward the future. The evaluator points out that CENACOF has a role to play in helping GOZ ministries and agencies identify and define their training needs. If during the course of the project, CENACOF ignores this responsibility the evaluator will consider that the creation of a functional national training center has been jeopardized. To the extent that AID involvement is so demanding to the young institution that CENACOF fails to respond to other demands which may allow the institution to develop in new, complementary and constructive ways, the evaluator will consider that AID may have taken unfair advantage of its role in the creation of CENACOF. In addition, as CENACOF grows and matures as an institution, and as it approaches the time when AID support will disappear, it will be exceedingly important for CENACOF to be master of its decision-making responsibilities. The evaluator suggests that future evaluations attempt to assess the decision-making role in CENACOF management and to ascertain the implications of CENACOF decisions as to what activities will be performed and whose requests for services will be favorably accepted.

42

Annex A List of Documents reviewed

	<u>Title</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Date</u>
1.	Project Paper	-	June 7, 1980
2.	Project Authorization	-	unreadable data
3.	Project Grant Agreement	-	Sept. 30, 1980
4.	Project Agreement Amendment Nol -		Aug. 11, 1981
5.	Evaluation of the Center for In-Service Training's Project, "Local Administra- tion and Rural Development"		Dec. 1981
6.	Quarterly Report, Jan-Mar 82	Murray T.	April 5, 1982
7.	Rôle du Facilitateur (2 pages)	5 Trainers	April 5, 1982
8.	Rapport sur le séminaire de formation organisé à l'intention des formateurs	Mweze B.	
9.	"	Ante B.	
10.	"	Bokisila N.	
11.	"	Kabelani K.	
12.	"	M'fumungani K.	
13.	Rapport Synthèse des rapports 8-12	5 Trainers	
14.	Analyse de l'historique du CENACOF selon le modèle systématique (summary of PP)	5 Trainers	n.d.
15.	Liste de paie du 31-1-82		
	" " " 20-2-82	Chizungu R.	
	" " " 20-3-82		
	" " " 20-4-82		
16.	Prévisions budgétaires 1982	Chizungu R.	Dec. 21, 1981
17.	Collection of 40 critical evaluations by CENACOF staff of oral presentations made by staff members April 7-14, 1982 on family planning, group dynamics, definition of objectives.		
18.	Hirabayashi-Chizungu memo of April 8, 1982 regarding CENACOF participation in Extension Training Curriculum Development for Project North Shaba.		

19. Murray-Sweet memo of Sept. 14, 1980 concerning rental of CENACOF offices and other elements of the file on the CENACOF office litigation, construction, and renovation.
20. CENACOF (4 pages) CENACOF n.d.
21. Colloque technique sur l'administration locale et développement rural: objectifs organisation, et commissions, CIDEP Jan. 1982
22. Plan des communications à faire au colloque CIDEP Feb. 1982
23. Etude des besoins de formation au sein d'une entreprise Kabaya N. CIDEP/CPA March. 1982

in collection of 20 other documents prepared for or emanating from the colloquium, March 1-4 1982
24. Chizungu - Murray letter of June 3, 1982 requesting termination of services of U.S. long-term advisor
25. Katunda-Grant memo of June 28, 1982 breaking down Project 660-0068 Inputs by category and cost to date
26. Rapport Colloque CPA/CENACOF sur la Décentralisation Administrative et Développement Local du 1 au 5 mars 1982 (15 pages) Chirume M. n.d.

Annex B Persons consulted

CENACOF STAFF

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>Field</u>
Chizungu Rudahindwa	Director	PHD	Educ. Sociology Ed. politics
Chirume Mendo	Deputy Director/ Head of Training	PHD	Agricultural education
Muhigiri Bashavire	Financial Officer Acting Administrative Services Director	Masters	Economics, Insit. Relations, Business Adm.
Bosikila Ndashao	Trainer	Masters	Agronomy (Marketing)
Mfumungani Kukota	Trainer	Graduate*	French-History Guidance
Kabelapi Kisolomoki	Trainer	Graduate*	Teacher Training
Mweze Runiga	Trainer	Graduate*	Social Science Teacher, Management

TAC

Kingata Munsial

Principal Advisor
Department of
Agriculture (MBA)

ECZ

Ralph Galloway

Training Coordinator

USAID

Edward Hirabayashi

HRD Officer and
Project Manager

Katunda wa Nkambwa

Program Specialist
HRD Assistant

Lee Braddock

Design and Evaluation
Officer

Anne Williams

Evaluation Assistant

Massila Nkwa Nkazi

Training Officer

David Soroko

Nord Shaba Project Manager

*Graduate = 3 years of university studies.

**ANNEX C. CIDEP (Centre Interdisciplinaire
pour l'Education Permanente)**

CIDEP was created in 1972 by departmental decree as a university related training entity within the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. It is charged with the training of public and private employees urban and rural; for this purpose four sections have been created within CIDEP.

1. CPA* (Centre de Perfectionnement de l'Administration);
staff training
2. DEBA (Développement à la base) : rural training
for region to collectivity level
3. City: evening courses
4. RDP (Recherche, documentation, publication)

*Note: CPA staff was trained in 1976 by PCI.

No of PIO/P	Nama(s)	Field Degree	Duration	University/ Place of Training	Total Cost in US Dollars
00036	Yampani Musungayi	<u>Non-Degree</u> Geography Regional Mapping Workshop	3 Weeks	Libreville Gabon	\$2,000
00037	(1) Mia Luzaki (2) Sendwe-Ngalula	<u>Non-Degree</u> Family Planning (CEFPA)	1 1/2 Month	CEFPA Washington D.C., U.S.A.	\$11,000
00038	Mbualungu Ganuma	<u>Non-Degree</u> Population, Family Planning Nutrition in Developing Countries	1 Month	Columbia University, New York	\$3,000
00040	(1) Gatarahiya (2) Lukalansoni	<u>Non-Degree</u> Co-training Experience in Management	7 Weeks	Lome, Togo	\$8,000
00042	(1) Katompua Tshiamu (2) Mwamba Muteba (3) Nlaba-Nsona	<u>Non-Degree</u> Management in Family Planning and Public Health	6 Weeks	IPS: Univ. of Connecticut Hartford Connecticut U.S.A.	\$10,000
00043	Okito Onia	<u>Non-Degree</u> National Economic Accounting (Statistics)	6 Months	Dept. of Commerce, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.	\$15,000
00046	Siteke Ubiel	<u>Non-degree</u> Population Communication Education Administ. Workshop	1 Month	Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	\$3,000

00047	Ngalula Muika	<u>Non-Degree</u> Women in Management (CEPPA)	5 Weeks	CEPPA Washington DC, USA	\$5,000
00054	Mobula Meta	<u>Non-Degree</u> Regional Agricultural Resource Development	1 Month	Florence, Alabama, U.S.A.	\$,000
00055	Simanga Ngovi-	<u>Non-Degree</u> Energy Management Training Program	2 Months	IER:State University of New York, Stony Brook, N.Y., U.S.A.	\$100
00057	Kazadi Polondo	<u>Non-Degree</u> Communica- tion for Social Develop- ment (Population)	1 2 Month	Community and Family Center Chicago, Illinois, USA	\$100
00059	(1) Massamba Matondo (2) Kalambay Kalula (3) Kahozi Sangwa (4) Saidi Misangu	<u>M.PH.</u> Public Health Planning Administ. and Educ.	1 Year	Tulane Univ. Tulane, New Orleans, USA	\$100,000

ANNEX E. Acronyms

1. DDB	Development Data Bank
2. DTO	Development Training Office
3. CENACOF	Centre National de la Coordination de la Formation au Développement
4. CEPAS	Centre d'Etude pour l'Action Sociale
5. CPA	Centre pour le Perfectionnement de l'Administration
6. CIDEF	Centre Inter-Disciplinaire pour l'Education Permanente
7. ECZ	Eglise du Christ au Zaïre
8. INADES	Institut Africain de Développement Economique et Social
9. IRS	Institut de Recherche Scientifique
10. IZAM	Institut Zairois de Management
11. PAID	Pan African Institute for Development
12. PCI	Practical Concepts Inc.
13. PLZ	Plantation Lever au Zaïre
14. PP	Project Paper
15. TAC	Technical Advisory Council

ANNEX F. Suggestions for evaluation at end of Phase One

Evaluation Team:

1. Mission Evaluation Assistant or other mission representative
2. Training Specialist from AID/W or REDSO/WA
3. Local hire consultant from IR, CEPAS, etc
4. CENACOF staff member as evaluation assistant and facilitator
5. Part-time services of mission controller or delegate

Duration: one month

Period: some period between May and October 1983
which is convenient to all parties

Primary Purpose of Evaluation: recommend to mission cessation of the project, or advancement to phase two.

Scope of work:

- initially spend an adequate amount of time being oriented on the project in particular reading the PP and the first-year evaluation and holding discussions with mission and CENACOF staff
- assess quality, quantity, and timeliness of inputs
- assess project outputs and achievements
- compare scheduled inputs and outputs with actual inputs and outputs
- contrast CENACOF's performance in its three roles assisting other training units to become more effective; coordinating/organizing training activities; dispensing training directly
- assess progress CENACOF has made toward institutionalization

50

Note 1:

CENACOF staff members should follow the evaluation process in as many of its stages as possible, as attached in the Recommendations Section. They should also be responsible for the logistics of the mission including the following tasks

- prepare individual dossiers of major project information before arrival of team members
- arrange schedule, make appointments

Note 2:

If possible, timing of evaluation should coincide with some CENACOF related training activity: the team can observe.