

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Official File Copy

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Development Manpower Training			2. PROJECT NUMBER 660-0068	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE Kinshasa
			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <u>86/08</u>	
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>80</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>80</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>87</u>	A. Total \$ <u>5.3 m</u>	B. U.S. \$ <u>2.5 m</u>
7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION			From (month/yr.) <u>Sept. 1986</u> To (month/yr.) <u>May 1986</u>	
8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR			Date of Evaluation Review <u>June 1986</u>	

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; also those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airmgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. The GOZ and CENACOF will strengthen financial management in CENACOF by: (a) elaborating and enforcing procedures for controlling and accounting for the use of budget resources and revenues and, for establishing well maintained records and clear audit trails on all expenditures; and (b) subject to available budget, engaging a qualified CPA, at least half time, to serve as CENACOF financial manager.	CENACOF DOP	Dec. 1986
2. Should the current Director decide to leave, the GOZ will recruit a replacement. He should be capable of leading CENACOF to full organizational and financial sustainability over the next three years; resolving the inter-personal conflicts that have affected the operations of the EMC; and ensuring the necessary strategic planning required if CENACOF is to be effective and viable.	CENACOF DOP	Dec. 1986
3. USAID will authorize salary increases for CENACOF employees, with retroactivity as soon as CENACOF and the DOP agree on the level of these increases and as soon as these increases are formally requested by CENACOF and PLAN (see Mission Comments No. 2).	CENACOF DOP USAID/HRD USAID/PRM	Dec. 1986

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS	10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles) Mr. Albert Baron, Devres, Evaluator Mr. John Anderson, Project Officer	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval Signature _____ Typed Name <u>Mr. Arthur S. Lezin</u> Date _____ Acting Director
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|
| 4. GOZ and CENACOF will fix the legal status of CENACOF, preferably as a non-profit <u>société</u> (foundation) in the public interest with its Board of Directors including representatives of the GOZ and cooperating donors. This will be done within the next twelve months. | CENACOF
DOP | July 1987 |
| 5. CENACOF will formulate a three year staff training program as part of the management plan. Provision will be made for participant training. | CENACOF | Dec 1986 |
| 6. If it is possible to do so within the 1987 budget availabilities, CENACOF should hire three persons over the next six months to be trained on the job, in formal seminars and in third-country training during 1987. CENACOF will plan to hire local consultants as necessary to help develop and carry out its research, studies and evaluation program (see Mission Comment No. 4). | CENACOF | Dec 1986 |
| 7. CENACOF will collect information and undertake research on the impact of the TOTM program. | CENACOF | July 1987 |
| 8. Research will focus on studies and consultancies to determine organizational training and development needs. | CENACOF | July 1987 |
| 9. CENACOF will determine modalities for providing training to PVOs (who are heavily engaged in development in key sectors). | CENACOF | July 1987 |

2

On-going*

1. USAID should program AMDP funded seminars to be carried out with CENACOF taking into account limitations of CENACOF to conduct these seminars and carry out other necessary activities at the same time.
2. USAID should organize more third country training under project 068 by sending Zairian participants to other African training programs and arranging by participants from other African countries to participate in Zairian training programs.

*Recommendations without specific dates by which the recommended actions are to be completed are included under this heading.

Mission Comments

1. Recommendation C*: DOP and USAID should agree early, in consultation with CENACOF, on appropriate and adequate support for CENACOF in 1987 to permit it to plan its activity program for 1987 realistically.

Recommendation F: Over the next six months, USAID, GOZ, and CENACOF should agree on a specific program of actions and objectives to complete project 068, and including by December 1986 a detailed action plan for TA inputs for consultants, participant training and necessary commodity procurement. The plan should provide an increased role by CENACOF in deciding the use of TA under the project.

USAID agrees that CENACOF has made substantial progress under Project 660-0068: five competent trainers have trained over a 100 Zairian mid-level executives in management practices. CENACOF itself, however, has not implemented sound management practices. Financial controls have been inadequate and a long-term strategy or action plan has not been prepared. It is difficult for USAID to verify where money has been spent and at the same time, help shape the future direction of the organization. USAID has discussed these problems with the Secretary General of the Department of Plan. Thus, USAID's policy for the remaining eighteen months of project assistance, is to disengage from CENACOF, hiring them as needed for logistical support of project related training courses.

2. Recommendation E. USAID should act early on a forthcoming GOZ CENACOF request to fund authorized salary increases for CENACOF employees, with retroactivity.

USAID agreed to salary increases for CENACOF's employees several months ago. However, USAID asked CENACOF to obtain the Department of Plan's approval for the level of increases and then submit a formal request to USAID for this additional funding. Such a request has not yet been received.

*These letters refer to Mr. Baron's recommendations as they appear in his report.

3. Recommendation M: USAID and CENACOF will plan a comprehensive training impact evaluation to be conducted in 1987 using tested measures for assessing impact on participants' on job performance.

USAID agrees that such an evaluation is appropriate and has been considering conducting a mission-wide participant training evaluation; however, the heavy FY87 evaluation schedule (14 evaluations are scheduled) may not permit this training evaluation to be conducted in 1987.

4. Recommendation I. CENACOF should hire three persons over the next six months to be trained on the job, in formal seminars and in third-country training during 1987. CENACOF should plan to hire local consultants as necessary to help develop and carry out its research, studies and evaluation program.

USAID believes that while additions to staff probably can be justified, the budget implications in 1986 and 1987 should be carefully assessed by CENACOF. Also CENACOF should incorporate revenues received for training programs into its budget to provide funding to cover additional requirements.

5. Recommendation Q. USAID should consider a host government contract between CENACOF and an American firm to provide technical assistance, training and commodity procurement. TA should include a carefully selected development advisor to work with CENACOF over a two year period.

USAID does not agree that a host country contract with an American firm, at this stage in project implementation, would serve a useful purpose.

6. Recommendation D. USAID and CENACOF should take interim action as soon as possible to provide interim TA requirements for the next 5-6 months to assist CENACOF staff to: (a) implement the 1986 training plan; (b) research and develop training materials for 1986 and 1987 training; (c) develop a marketing strategy and plan for training and other services offered by CENACOF; (d) formulate a 1987-89 management and activities plan; and (e) carry out necessary feasibility studies and planning for the proposed training center. Four consultancies of 2-3 months each will be required.

Recommendation F. Over the next six months, USAID, GOZ and CENACOF will agree on a specific program of actions and objectives to complete project 068, and including by December 1986 a detailed action plan for TA inputs for consultants, participant training and necessary commodity procurement. The plan will provide an increased role by CENACOF in deciding the use of TA under the project.

USAID is prepared to provide the short-term technical assistance, remaining in Project 068, which CENACOF believes is of high priority.

11

7. Recommendation D. USAID and CENACOF should take interim action as soon as possible to provide interim TA requirements for the next 5-6 months to assist CENACOF staff to: (a) implement the 1986 training plan; (b) research and develop training materials for 1986 and 1987 training; (c) develop a marketing strategy and plan for training and other services offered by CENACOF; (d) formulate a 1987-89 management and activities plan; and carry out necessary feasibility studies and planning for the proposed training center. Four consultancies of 2-3 months each may be required.

Recommendation J. In consultation with the GOZ and assisted by short-term expatriate specialists as necessary, CENACOF will carry out a feasibility studies and prepare a feasible long-term financial, managerial and programatic sustainability plan for the proposed National Training Center.

USAID considers such a plan a prerequisite for construction of the training center.

5

EVALUATION COST DATA

USAID/ Zaire -- of Bureau/Office DEO

1. No. and Title of Project/Activity: Development Manpower Training
(or Title of Evaluation Report) (660-0068)

2. Date of Evaluation Report: June 1986
Date of PES (if different): June 1986

3. Purpose of Evaluation: The evaluation examines the institutional building component of the project and makes recommendations concerning the current status and direction of the project and concerning any extension beyond its present PACD.

4. Mission Staff Person Days involved in this Evaluation (estimated):
- Professional Staff 15 Person Days
- Support Staff 3 Person Days

5. AID/W Direct-Hire or IPA TDY support funded by Mission (or office) for this evaluation:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Period of TDY (Person -Days)</u>	<u>Dollar Cost: (Travel, Per Diem, etc.)</u>	<u>Source of Funds*</u>
-------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	-------------------------

6. Contractor Support, if any, for this evaluation:**

<u>Name of Contractor</u>	<u>Contract #</u>	<u>Amount of Contract (US Dollars)</u>	<u>Source of Funds*</u>
Mr. Albert Baron	PIO/T 660-0068-3-00080	\$12,500	Project

*Indicate Project Budget, PDS, Mission O.E. or Central/Regional Bureau for

**IQC, RSSA, PASA, PSC, Purchase Order, Institutional Contract, Cooperative Agreement, etc

6

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. PROJECT TITLE

Development Manpower Training Project, (660-0068)

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In 1980, the GOZ Executive Council created the Centre National de Coordination de la Formation (CENACOF) with USAID's assistance, in order to build a Zairian institution capable of creating and increasing the training capacity and management skills of the GOZ's various Ministries and to train staff members already involved in the priority development sectors agriculture and rural development, health, transportation and communications. For the subsequent three years, emphasis was placed on the establishment of an institution capable of accomplishing this mission.

For the second phase of its existence, CENACOF has directed its efforts toward the following priorities: training of CENACOF's trainers; training of trainers in key development sectors; and manpower needs assessment and training in the same sectors.

III. EVALUATION PURPOSE

This mid-term evaluation of the Development Manpower Training Project constitutes a Threshold Decision Evaluation. The evaluation examines the institutional building component of the project and makes recommendations concerning the current status and direction of the project and concerning any extension beyond its present PACD.

IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The procedure followed was a thorough review of documentation, interviews with appropriate persons and analysis carried out with the help of the resource persons. Annex I lists the persons interviewed and consulted. Pertinent reference documents are listed in Annex 2. The analysis was led in part by a list of specific questions and issues raised by USAID in the scope of work. The answers formulated to these questions are contained in Annex 3. The training impact evaluation, appended as Annex 4, provided important inputs into the findings and recommendations contained herein. The evaluator's findings and recommendations were discussed with USAID, CENACOF and the DOP; however, they reflect the analysis and views of the evaluator and not necessarily those of representatives of these organizations.

V. FINDINGS.

Considerable progress has been achieved in the past four years in the institutional development of CENACOF and in the training of trainers and of Zairian development cadre in management. However, serious weaknesses in CENACOF's management, including financial management, require urgent action and correction. Given these corrections it is recommended that the project be continued with an extension of the PACD. Steps to strengthen CENACOF's program of training, research, evaluation and consultancies for organizational development and measures to achieve organizational and financial viability are noted in the report.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED

Lessons learned will be recorded in the final evaluation.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. The GOZ and CENACOF should continue efforts to strengthen financial management in CENACOF by: (a) elaborating and enforcing procedures for controlling and accounting for the use of budget resources and revenues and, for establishing well maintained records and clear audit trails on all expenditures; and (b) engaging a qualified CPA at least half time, to serve as CENACOF financial manager.
- B. The GOZ and CENACOF should recruit within the next few months, in replacement for the outgoing DG, a well qualified and experienced manager of sufficient stature to nurture CENACOF to full organizational and financial sustainability over the next three years; resolve the inter-personal conflicts that have affected the operations of the EMC; institute participations management; and to ensure the necessary strategic planning required if CENACOF is to be effective and viable.
- C. DOP and USAID should agree early, in consultation with CENACOF, on appropriate and adequate support for CENACOF in 1987 to permit it to plan its activity program for 1987 realistically.
- D. USAID and CENACOF should take interim action as soon as possible to provide interim TA requirements for the next 5-6 months to assist CENACOF staff to: (a) implement the 1986 training plan; (b) research and develop training materials for 1986 and 1987 training; (c) develop a marketing strategy and plan for training and other services offered by CENACOF; (d) formulate a 1987-89 management and activities plan; and (e) carry out necessary feasibility studies and planning for the proposed training center. Four consultancies of 2-3 months each will be required.
- E. USAID should act early on a forthcoming GOZ CENACOF request to fund authorized salary increases for CENACOF employees, with retroactivity.
- F. Over the next six months, USAID, GOZ and CENACOF should agree on a specific program of actions and objectives to complete project 068, with the possibility of an extension of the PACD, and including by December 1986 a detailed action plan for TA inputs for consultants, participant training and necessary commodity procurement. The plan should provide an increased role by CENACOF in deciding the use of TA under the project.

- G. GOZ and CENACOF should fix the legal status of CENACOF, preferable as a non-profit société (foundation) in the public interest with its Board of Directors including representatives of the GOZ and cooperating donors. This should be done within the next twelve months.
- H. CENACOF should formulate a three year staff training program as part of the management plan. Provision should be made for participant training.
- I. CENACOF should hire three persons over the next six months to be trained on the job, in formal seminars and in third-country training during 1987. CENACOF should plan to hire local consultants as necessary to help develop and carry out its research, studies and evaluation program.
- J. In consultation with the GOZ and assisted by short-term expatriate specialists as necessary, CENACOF should carry out a feasibility studies and prepare a feasible long-term financial, managerial and programatic sustainability plan for the proposed National Training Center.
- K. CENACOF should collect information and undertake research on the impact of the TOTM program.
- L. Research should focus on studies and consultancies to determine organizational training and development needs.
- M. CENACOF and USAID should plan a comprehensive training impact evaluation to be conducted in 1987 using tested measures for assessing impact on participants job performance.
- N. USAID should program AMDP funded seminars to be carried out with CENACOF taking into account limitations of CENACOF to conduct these seminars and carry out other necessary activities at the same time.
- O. USAID should organize more third country training under project 068 by sending Zairian participants to other African training programs and arranging by participants from other African countries to participate in Zairian training programs.
- P. CENACOF should determine modalities for providing training to PVOs (who are heavily engaged in development in key sectors).
- Q. USAID should consider a host government contract between CENACOF and an American firm to provide technical assistance, training and commodity procurement. TA should include a carefully selected development advisor to work with CENACOF over a two year period.

29

Development Manpower Training Project

(660-0068)

Threshold Evaluation

**Conducted by
Albert R. Baron
Development Advisor and Evaluator
Devres, Inc.
2426 Ontario Road
Washington, D.C. 20009**

**Kinshasa, Zaire
June 1986**

Abbreviations Used in this Report

AMDP	African Manpower Development Project
CENACOF	Centre National de Coordination de la Formation au Developpement
CPF	Counterpart Fund
DG	Director General
DOP	Department of Plan
EMF	Executive Management Committee
GOZ	Government of Zaire
LDC	Lesser Developed countries
Log Frame	Logical Framework
NTL	National Training Laboratory
OTJ	On the job
PACD	Project Assistance Completion Date
PP	Project Paper
REDSO	Regional Development Support Office
SG	Secretary General
TA	Technical Assistance
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TOTM	Training of Trainers in Management
USAID	United States Agency for International Development, Mission to Zaire
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	P. 1
	A. Objective of this Evaluation	
	B. Statement of Work	
	C. Resource Persons	
	D. Training Impact Evaluation	
	E. Acknowledgements	
	F. Methodology	
II.	Findings	P. 2
	A. <u>Goal</u>	
	B. <u>Project Purpose</u>	
	C. <u>Inputs</u>	
	D. <u>Outputs</u>	
III.	Issues Raised in the Scope of Work	P. 6
	A. Project Performance	
	B. CENACOF Institutional Framework and Constitution and Organizational Sustainability	
	C. Financial Sustainability	
	D. Project Management	
IV.	Issue of Training Center	P.10
VI.	Annexes	
	1. List of Persons Interviewed and Consulted	
	2. List of Relevant Documentation	
	3. Questions and Issues Dealt with in the Scope of Work	
	4. Training Impact Evaluation	

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Objective of this Evaluation

The purpose of this second mid-term evaluation is to examine the institutional viability of CENACOF. It constitutes a Threshold Decision Evaluation to examine the institutional component of the project and make recommendations concerning the current status and direction of the project, and future directions for AID support and/or project phase-out.

B. Statement of Work

The scope of work tasked Devres to provide the services of a project evaluator with in-depth knowledge of LDC development organization and experience in management analysis. The evaluator was called on to review all relevant project documentation available at USAID and at CENACOF and meet with relevant USAID GOZ and other concerned parties to discuss evaluation issues under the following categories:

- o CENACOF Institutional Framework and Constitution
- o Program Performance
- o Organizational Sustainability
- o Financial Sustainability
- o Project Management.

C. Resource Persons

USAID made available through its Human Resources Development Office (HRD) the services of two training specialists to assist the evaluator in this work. The first, Mr. Phillippe Bossard, had been acting in the role of Technical Advisor to CENACOF since mid 1983 with special responsibilities for advice on financial management and planning. Mr. Bossard also carried out the previous mid-term evaluation in 1983 that had led to the 1983-85 Training and Management Plan for CENACOF and the revised Project Paper that became effective in 1985. He proved very helpful to this evaluation.

The second was Mr. David Olson who is currently under a ninety day contract with CENACOF to help plan ongoing training activities. Mr. Olson has a long acquaintance with CENACOF dating back to 1982-83 when he worked with the Center in organizing and conducting a series of five USDA seminars. More recently he worked in November-December 1985 in helping CENACOF and USAID/HRD firm up the the 1986 training program. He also proved extremely helpful to this evaluation.

D. The Training Impact Evaluation of Project 068.

Mr. James Washington, Regional Training Officer of the REDSO office in Abidjan, carried out a training impact evaluation in February 1986. His report and recommendations have constituted an important input into the analysis that follows.

E. Acknowledgements

This evaluation owes a great deal to Mr. John Anderson, USAID's Human Resources Development Officer for his technical guidance, constant availability and time and effort explaining how Project 068 has worked, and to the Director General of CENACOF, Dr. Chuzunga Rudahindwa for his help and friendly explanation. Thanks are also due to the Director of Training, Dr. Aben Ngay, and Director of Research, Dr. Chirume Mendo, and to USAID and CENACOF officials who gave freely of their time and were patient in explaining CENACOF's program and its successes, and frank and forthright concerning its problems and shortcomings. The evaluator appreciated very much the assistance provided by Ms. Debra Rectenwald, USAID Evaluation Officer who was responsible for this evaluation and by Mr. Lee Braddock who manages the USAID Design and Evaluation and Capital Projects Office.

F. Methodology

The procedure followed was a thorough review of documentation, interviews with appropriate persons and analysis carried out with the help of the resource persons. Annex 1 lists the persons interviewed and consulted. Pertinent reference documents are listed in Annex 2. The analysis was led in part by a list of specific questions and issued raised by USAID in the scope of work. The answers formulated to these questions are contained in Annex 3. The training impact evaluation, appended as Annex 4, provided important inputs into the findings and recommendations contained herein. The evaluator's findings and recommendations framed were discussed with USAID, CENACOF and the DOP; however, they reflect the analysis and views of the evaluator and not necessarily those of representatives of these organizations.

II. FINDINGS

A. Goal

The goal of Project 068 is the improvement of the quality and quantity of socio-economic development programs for the poor majority of Zaire. The assumption is that significant improvement of these programs can

be achieved by producing better qualified managers for development projects and programs and development administration, whether USAID, other donors or the GOZ. This goal continues to be valid.

The aim of improving development management is being supported by other donors too. For example the French are supporting improved management with an accent on financial management by support for the Centre de Perfectionnement des Techniques de Developpement. The UNDP and the World Bank are developing a major effort to improve "Economic Management" in 5 or 6 main sectors, including Planning, Budget and Financial Mechanisms, Administration of Civil Service, Public Enterprise and Industry and possibly External Trade and Trade Promotion.

It is significant that the establishment of CENACOF received presidential endorsement when it was established and that the Center has attracted participation of senior GOZ cadres since its inception. Measures of goal achievement may prove difficult to develop and it would appear desirable for the research program of CENACOF to include a study of such measures.

B. Project Paper

The original project purpose in Phase I (1980-1983) was to establish a GOZ development oriented training capability and to train selected number of Zairians in key development centers. Phase II (1984-87) of the project seeks to achieve the purpose not only by developing CENACOF as a training capability and by continued manpower development for improved management in key development sectors, but also by undertaking to train trainers in management (TOTM) in key sectors (Health, Agriculture, Project Design and Management, and Rural Development) and by assisting GOZ technical departments through needs assessments in developing their own training services.

The conclusion of the training impact evaluation was that in the immediate future, during the transition of project management responsibilities from USAID to DOP for CENACOF, there should not be any major directional changes in the training program. It included that changes should be based on careful determination and assessment of needs with training program goals and direction consistent and coherent (Ref. Annex 4, p, 11). Thus the continued thrust for the training effort is:

- Training of CENACOF trainers
- Training of trainers in key development sectors
- Manpower needs assessments in key sectors, and
- Training (for improved management) in these key sectors.

While the purpose of Project 068 is sufficiently clear, the mission and focus of CENACOF as an institution is less so. Because of this lack of clarity in its mission, an image has been extant among key personalities in the Zairian training community and to some extent among donors, of CENACOF as a convenience mechanism for USAID for channeling its training programs. This notion has dissipated somewhat during 1985/86. But a clear mission for CENACOF has yet to crystalize. The failure of CENACOF's draft Constitution to

address the question of the Center's mandate and purpose illustrates the point. This question is further examined below under the heading of CENACOF's Institutional Framework and Constitution. However, the following points are pertinent with respect to Project Purpose and CENACOF mission:

o Experience with the USDA and CENACOF seminars over the past four years supports the assumption that experiential training methods used in the seminars are well received in Zaire and can contribute significantly to improved management practice, techniques and values among individual participants (Ref Annex 4, pp. 5, 6 and 10);

o Over time the training in management techniques and skills will have a cumulative effect in raising the level of management in development administrations, project and programs in key sectors;

o The degree of improvement realized in development management is a function of the organizational climate to which the participant returns. This suggests the strategic need by CENACOF to direct more attention to organizational training and development in structuring its training programs and in carrying out needs assessments, studies and research (Ref. Annex 3, p.13);

o It is not evident that the training of trainers effort is resulting in a multiplier effect or that CENACOF has been in a position to assist very much GOZ technical departments or other development organizations to develop their own training services; and

o It is also not evident that the three week seminar for TOTM provides sufficient training. The possibility exists of providing more effective TOTM, including for previous TOTM seminarists, in four two-week modules spread over a 32 week period as has been done elsewhere in Africa with excellent results.

C. Inputs

The financial plan for the Project provides for a total investment of \$5.4 million over the life of the project, extended from 4 to 7 years by the PP revision of August 1985. Under the Project Agreement, the US contribution is established at \$2.5 million (rounded) in development grant assistance and the GOZ contribution at \$2.88 million (equivalent). As of May 31, 1986, the dollar status was:

	US \$000
Amount authorized	2,544
Expended in Phase I (1980-83)	577
Expended or sub-obligated in Phase II	942
Sub-Total	1,519
Balance	1,025
Of which reserved for Training Center Equipment	400
Balance	625

Expenditures and obligations of dollar grant assistance has been primarily for technical assistance and participant training with relatively small amounts of commodity assistance (eg audio visual aids equipment). The above contributions do not take into account USDA seminars funded under the AID regional program for African Manpower Development (AMDP).

The GOZ contribution has been provided out of PL 480 generations of local currency counterpart funds (CPF). The availability of CPF funding under the Project to support operating costs of CENACOF is a crucial requirement over the next few years as CENACOF endeavors to build its client base and generate an increasing volume of users' fees. Project Agreement Revision No. 3 dated June 6, 1985 provides that no more than \$1.0 million equivalent in CPF will be made available for construction of the proposed Training Center. The status of GOZ/CPF funding is estimated as follows:

Status of GOZ/CPF Funding For Project 068

	US \$000 Equiv
Amount Committed	2,884
Phase I Expenditures	219
Phase II Expenditures/Obligations(est.)	464
 Sub-Total	 683
 Balance	 2,201
 Reserved for Training Ctr Construction	 1,000
 Balance	 1,101

The above does not take into account the contribution of land for the proposed training center. The land provided on a desirable site of nearly 5 ha. in Kinshasa is valued at approximately 215 million in 1986 prices, or approximately \$278,000.

D. Outputs

The project appears behind schedule by somewhat more than a year in realizing planned outputs. Achievements to date are outlined below. The outputs are those indicated in the PP revision document.

1. Executive Management Committee (EMC) - The EMC has been established but it is not working effectively to the detriment of planning and organizational development (Ref. Annex 3, pps 3,4). Difficulties among the members go back to at least 1983.

2. Core of CENACOF Trainers - A highly successful program carried out in 1984/85 resulted in the development of CENACOF's own core of five qualified trainers. CENACOF's ability to carry out training on its own without expatriate inputs is proven and improving, CENACOF's reputation as a training institute has grown. There is a need to increase the number of trainers - who will also work in research, studies and evaluation activities

as well as consultancies - in the core group. There is also a need for continued training of CENACOF trainers to develop a pool of Zairian subject matter specialists, authorities in their fields and trained as trainers, to be on call for training activities organized by CENACOF or for consultancies and research.

3. Planning and implementation to train 250 GOZ trainers and 950 development cadre/managers - has been carried out increasingly effectively. These training targets should be achieved by end of Project. However, the impact of training of GOZ trainers needs evaluation and feedback into CENACOF's strategic planning (Ref. Annex 3, pps 13 and 14).

4. Coordination of Training - There has been little if any coordination of Zairian training programs by CENACOF. Moreover, coordination of training has not been a major issue or felt need in the current Zairian context of lack of sufficient, well directed training efforts. The need for such coordination and CENACOF's role therein does however warrant study and reflection by the EMC and CENACOF's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) - when established - and integration in CENACOF's strategic planning and program of action (Ref. Annex 3, p. 16).

5. Periodic briefings and presentations to senior staff of GOZ Ministries - CENACOF has developed good contact with several major, key development sector Departments of the Executive Council. However, this output relates to the question of marketing of CENACOF services, a matter requiring urgent consideration by the EMC and TAC and some technical assistance (TA) input in the near future (Ref. Annex 3, p. 16).

6. Preparation of CENACOF's staff in technical skills required for organizational development, needs assessment and related consultancies - Some on the job training has been accomplished but a systematic training plan for CENACOF's staff needs to be developed and supported by TA (Ref. Annex 3, pps 6 and 19).

7. Development of a training center - This activity has been delayed because USAID doubts CENACOF's management and organizational viability. The PP envisaged construction starting on this center July 1985 and completion of the work in 1987. An engineer has been assigned by the DOP to draw up preliminary plans. A two year period would be required for design, contracting and construction.

8. Implementation of a Development Data Base - No progress has been made on this important evaluation and research tool.

III. ISSUES RAISED IN THE SCOPE OF WORK - FINDINGS

A. Program Performance (Ref. Annex 3, Section B and Annex 4, Section III).

Progress in external training was limited in 1984 but improved in 1985 and has been satisfactory so far in 1986. The 1983-85 Training and Management Plan was followed by a one-year plan for 1986 which provides:

- o Training in management in support of various donor (AID) supported programs
- o Continued TOTM, and
- o Tests of the market for CENACOF services.

It will be important for CENACOF to formulate a multi-year plan covering training, research, evaluation, studies and needs assessments, and predicated upon a marketing effort, a broadened client base and taking into account steps required to increase its capacity to carry out its activities. Short term TA will be required to assist CENACOF in this effort over the next 5-6 months.

An important problem facing CENACOF is the uncertainty of financial support in 1987 for other operating costs or direct training costs. It is difficult for CENACOF to plan intelligently for 1987 activities without guidance from DOP and USAID on the level of support to be counted upon.

USDA-conducted seminars have played an important role in the CENACOF program in 1985 and are still significant in 1986. To some extent, an evaluation of CENACOF's training constitutes one of the trainings done by USDA in collaboration with CENACOF, a point made by J. Washington in his training impact analysis (Annex 4, p. 6). Along with recognition of the role USDA seminars have played is the recognition that CENACOF is increasing significantly its ability to organize and conduct seminars on its own without the hand holding that characterized much of the training in the early years of the Project. It is expected that such seminars, funded by AMDP, will play a lesser role in 1987 and in 1988 than in the past.

With continued support, it is expected that CENACOF can attain the target of developing its capacity to a point where it can conduct 1200 participant weeks of training by Project Assistance Completion Date.

Progress in research, studies and evaluation has been less satisfactory than in training. The research program has suffered by lack of personnel and resources. The bulk of budget support and TA has been provided in the training area. The current Research and Outreach Division is for all intents and purposes a one person operation who as a Director has other tasks. It is a challenge for CENACOF in 1986 and 1987 to formulate a sound research program and work with USAID and other donors and the GOZ to garner the resources needed to carry it out (Ref. Annex 3, Section B; Annex 4, Section III).

B. Institutional Framework and Constitution of CENACOF, and Internal Organizational Development.

1. Institutional Framework of CENACOF and its Constitutions (Ref. Annex 3, Section A)

The institutional framework of CENACOF is incomplete and its internal Constitution (Reglement d'Ordre Interieur) is still not finalized since the first draft was produced in late 1984. The new management plan and disbursement procedures for CPF support of CENACOF's operating budget directly through the Plan which became effective in January 1986 is a positive step in improving the institutional framework. Another positive step is the decision by DOP in March to follow the draft internal Constitution provisionally until the final version is available.

Nevertheless, legally CENACOF is in some sort of limbo as an "AID Project." It is important to fix its legal status. There are two options for establishing it. One involves setting it up as a parastatal. With this option the TAC should be established as soon as possible (its composition and role is defined in the draft internal Constitution).

The second option, probably preferable for this kind of organization, is to establish CENACOF as a non-profit société or foundation in the public interest, established to provide training and undertake research, evaluations, studies and consultancies on improved management for development in Zaire. Organized in this fashion, CENACOF could undertake a useful role as a center for the collection and exchange of information on management training and research in Zaire. Its activities would be directed by a Board of Directors (Conseil d'Administration) on which might sit representatives of cooperating donor agencies (Ref. Annex 4, Part A).

2. CENACOF's Organizational Development (Ref. Annex 3, Section C)

USAID should take satisfaction in that CENACOF has made substantial progress in the past four years in establishing a functioning organization with legitimacy and an increasing good reputation as a Zairian training institute not overloaded with expatriate foreign assistance. Its organization structure has corresponded well to the functions it has been called upon to carry out and its staffing has been consistent with its tasks. Considering the time span usually required for institutional development, progress in establishing CENACOF as an institution that can serve its country well in coming years is reasonable and satisfactory. In considering continuing support, USAID should keep in mind the experience of AID in general and the Africa Bureau in particular that a common error is the tendency to not provide support for a long enough period.

Continued support will involve both financial support for operations (see next section) and appropriate TA and participant training. CENACOF will need some increase in personnel to support planned increases in research and training capacity, and a financial manager is a must to manage the budget and accounts properly.

Inadequate physical facilities are a problem that can be rectified either by renting (and improving) sufficient space or by construction. However, CENACOF's principal strength as an organization lies in its competent personnel and institutional knowledge of how to organize and carry out effective management training. Its principal problem has remained that of in-effective top management and team work among the members of the EMC (Ref. Annex 3, Part A and Part C1.)

C. Financial Sustainability (Ref. Annex 3, Sections A and C)

The plan for financial sustainability which is presented in the PP requires reworking and up dating. The outlook for financial sustainability of CENACOF is more favorable today than it was a few years ago when phase II was initiated (in 1983). It has been established that substantial users fees can be generated for well-designed and carried out training programs as well as for research, studies, evaluations and consultancies. Potential clients include the private sector, parastatals and donors for activities in support of their development programs and projects. The establishment of a training center providing CENACOF with its own, rent free premises, would also be an important factor in its ability to earn enough through users fees to cover its operating costs.

Over the next few years, 1987, 1988 and 1989, it is unlikely that the GOZ will be in a position to provide support out of its operating budget for CENACOF. The GOZ contribution as indicated earlier is provided through CPF. It appears that the balance of the GOZ commitment is available through CPF and will be sufficient to supplement users revenues as needed to cover operating costs. This is certainly an important assumption for the future. While the outlook for generating users costs appears promising, it depends a great deal on the public and donor community perception of CENACOF as a viable, well directed organization that knows what it is doing and does it professionally and well. The potential for generating users fees will also depend on more effective marketing and better work planning.

The availability of access to expatriate technology and expertise will be important over the next five to ten years for any training institute in Zaire, and will be a factor in both organizational and financial sustainability (Ref. Annex 3, pp 5).

D. Project Management (Ref. Annex 3, Section D)

Project management over the past year and a half has been characterized by difficult and strained relations between the USAID Project Office and CENACOF, marked by poor communications and mistrust. A number of steps have been taken by USAID and the GOZ to improve the situation. These include the plan for management and disbursement of CPF support of CENACOF's operating budget effected in January 1986, as mentioned earlier. Among other steps that should be considered are:

-Strengthening financial management in CENACOF by enforcing procedures for controlling and accounting for the use of budget and revenues, and by establishing clear records and audit trail on expenditures;

-Clear procedures and guidelines for the generation, deposit use and accounting of users fees earned from CENACOF services to clients;

-Recruitment within the next few months of a well qualified, experienced manager of sufficient stature to nurture CENACOF to full organizational and financial sustainability to replace the departing DG; resolution of the inter-personnel conflicts that have affected the operations of the EMC; and institution of the kind of participatory management and strategic planning required if CENACOF is to be effective and viable;

-Early agreement by DOP and USAID, in consultation with CENACOF on appropriate and adequate support for CENACOF in 1987;

-Action to decide and provide TA needed over the next 5-6 months;

-Early action by DOP and USAID to release CPF for necessary and approved salary increases, long over due, for CENACOF staff;

-Agreement among DOP, USAID and CENACOF on a specific program of actions and objectives to complete the project, including a three year plan for CENACOF activities and a plan for the use of the US contribution for TA, participant training and necessary commodity procurement;

-An increased role for CENACOF in deciding on TA to be funded under the Project; and

-Action to finalize the internal Constitution and to fix the legal status of CENACOF.

IV. THE PROPOSED TRAINING CENTER (Ref. Annex 3, pp 13, 21; Annex 4, Section IVE, pp 11, 12, 13.)

The PP as revised provided \$1.0 million equivalent from the GOZ contribution (CPF) for training center construction and \$0.4 million from the US contribution for training center materials. At current costs the \$1.0 million in CPF which USAID and the GOZ have agreed to reserve for the Center's construction would build approximately 2500 sq. meters of buildings, including an office complex with sufficient space for CENACOF, good training facilities, an auditorium, dormitories (60 bed) and a restaurant, plus necessary exterior

facilities such as a parking area, fencing, drainage and septic tanks. If the work were undertaken in 1986 it would be completed in about two years in 1988. The construction of 2500 sq. meters on the FIKIN site (about 50,000 sq. meters) would leave additional space for other facilities of CENACOF in the future or of other institutions.

J. Washington's training impact evaluation found that there are likely to be more than enough clients who will use the center so that the center would be able to finance itself - providing that it were multi-functional and eventually used for regional training, conferences, etc.

There are two views on how the Center might be managed. One sees the Center, at least initially and with available funding, meeting CENACOF's needs for office, research and training facilities and these facilities (its own) being managed by CENACOF. The other sees other users besides CENACOF, a multi-function center, and separate organization and direction of the center. This view sees a multi-donor subscription base and a board formed in collaboration with the DOP that would oversee the annual and longer term program of the institution. A combination of the two views might be possible under which CENACOF builds and maintains its own facilities on the site and a board is constituted to provide for the gradual development and use of the whole site.

A feasible long term financial managerial and programmatic sustainability plan needs to be developed. Guidelines and a model for the economic analysis of costs and benefits of the center have been formulated during the course of this evaluation and left with the USAID Program Officer. A multi-down approach should be considered, given present donor programs and strategies for Zaire (Annex 4, p12).

ANNEX 1

LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED

A. GOZ Officials

1. Mikobi Mingashanga, Secretary, Department of Plan
2. Professeur Buka Eka Ngoy, Expert
3. Kahenga Messo, Chief, Cellule de Formation, Department of Plan

B. CENACOF Officials

1. Chizunga Rudahindwa, Director General
2. Chirume Mendo, Director of Research and Diffusion
3. Ngay Aben, Director of Training
4. Kindoki Nsaka, Trainer
5. Toko Pulu, Trainer
6. Ilambo Bwaka Mangala, Trainer
7. Ngoie Kalanga-Mimwemwe, Trainer
8. Masumbuko Bunyas, Trainer
9. Kalenga Wa Mwamba, Public Relations
10. Makiesse Mvemba, Accountant
11. Udaga Aungi, Chief, Administrative Support Services

C. Donor Agency Officials

1. Robin Kinlock, Resident Representative, UNDP
2. John Louis Albertini, Development Advisor, FAC
3. Alice Lezin, German Aid (GTZ)
4. David Chen, Chief, United Nations Project for Assistance in Planning and Economic Management, Department of Plan

D. Technical Consultants

1. David Olson, Trainer and Consultant
2. Jana Glenn, Trainer and Consultant
3. Brook Schoepf, Anthropologist and Senior Trainer (Pragma)
4. Jean de Hasse, Consultant and Trainer, ORT
5. Phillip Bossard, Consultant, Trainer and Long Term Advisor to Cenacof
6. Tabaro Tchimala Mungo, Trainer, ORT

E. USAID

1. Richard Podol, Director
2. Arthur Lezin, Deputy Director
3. Lee Braddock, Design and Evaluation
4. Debra Rectenwald, Evaluation Officer
5. Donald Brown, Chief, Agriculture and Rural Development
6. David Atteberry, Project Officer, Agricultural Research
7. Timothy Born, Project Manager, DEO
8. John Bierke, Chief, Program Office
9. John Anderson, Chief, Human Resources Division
10. Katunda wa Mkambua, Program Specialist, HRD
11. Massila wa Nkazi
12. Carol Payne, Chief Nutrition Program
13. Gael Murphy, Acting Chief, Public Health Division
14. Mulamba wa Kabasele, Engineer

F. Other

1. Leslie Fox, Project Manager, ORT
2. Janet Poley, International Development Specialist, USDA/OICD
3. Kandoto wa Kashala, Director General, Centre de Perfectionnement Aux Techniques de Developpement (CEPEDETE)
4. Joel Conan, Director of Studus, CEPEDETI
5. Michel Saint-Amand, Sludus Department, CEPEDETE

ANNEX 2

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

1. AID, Managing Developing Programs: Management Strategies and Project Interventions in six Agricultural Projects, January 1986
Washington D.C.
2. Alison Kathy, Identification of Video and other Audio Visual Training Equipment Needs For Cenaco, USDA/OICD, Kinshasa, October 1984
3. Anderson, John, CENACOF, Institutional Direction and Financial Sustainability, USAID/Zaire, Kinshasa, May 10, 1986
4. Bossard Phillipe, An Evaluation of Project 660-0068, Development Manpower Training, USAID, Kinshasa, August, 1983
5. Bossard Phillipe, Cenacof Progress
USAID, Kinshasa, February 28, 1986
6. CENACOF, Plan de Formation de 1983 à 1985, Kinshasa, Mai 1983
7. CENACOF, Rapports sur Les Consultations de CENACOF vec Le Department de l'Agriculture et du Developpement Rural, (3 Vol.) Kinshasa, 1/84.
8. CENACOF, Rapport Annuel-1984, Kinshasa, 1986
9. CENACOF, Reglement d'Ordre Interieur du CENACOF, Kinshasa, Juillet 1985
10. CENACOF, Rapport Annuel-1985, Kinshasa
11. CENACOF, La Lettre d'Information du Cenacof No. 3, Kinshasa, Janvier 1986
12. CENACOF, Programme des Activités de Formation 1986, Kinshasa, 1986
13. CENACOF, Budget-1986, Kinshasa, 1986.

14. Chirume, Mendo and Murray, Thomas D., Evaluation of The Center for In-Service Training's (CPA) Project "Local Administration and Rural Development, CENACOF, Kinshasa, December 1981.
15. Glenn, Jana Merrill, Training of Trainers in Management - Mid Term Report, June-September 1984, Kinshasa, September 1984.
16. Glen Jana Morrill, Training of Trainers In Management, June 1984 to March 1984 to March 1985,- Final Report, USDA/OICD, Kinshasa, March 1985.
17. Glenn Jana, and Ilambo Bwaka Mongala, Masumbuko Bunyas Wenduku, Ngoie Kalance Mimwemwe and Toko-Puku Kafam, Rapport Final sur le Module I, Séminaire de Formation des Formateurs Santé-ISEFD, November-December 1984, CENACOF Kinshasa, Jan 85.
18. Glenn Jana and Masumbuko Banyas Wenduku and Kindoki Nsekad., Rapport Final sur le Module II, Séminaire de Formation des Formateurs Santé - ISEFD, December-Janvier 1985, CENACOF, Kinshasa, Feb 1985
19. Grant, Stephen H, First Year Evaluation of project 660-0068 "Development Mampower Training "USAID, Kinshasa, July 1982
20. Ilambo Bwaka Mangala, Rapport Final, Séminaire sur La Infrastructures de Recherche Agronomique à Mbanza-Ngungu du 1er au 11 juillet 1985, Cenacof, Kinshasa, 1985
21. Karhagoma, Kafuno et Nachoka, Masikika, Rapport sur l'Etude et l'Evaluation du Système de Contrôle Interne et la Vérification des Recettes et des Dépenses du CENACOF pour la Période de 10 Juillet 1983 au 31 décembre 1985, Cenacof, Kinshasa, June 1986.
22. Masumbako Bunyar, Toko Puku Kafam, David Olson and Tshibaka Tshikala, Rapport Final du Séminaire sur la Politique Agricole au Zaïre tenu à Kinshasa du 7 au 25 octobre 1985, CENACOF, Kinshasa, 8 November 1985.

23. Masumbuko Bunyas Wenduku and Ngoie Kalanga Mimwenume, Seminaire sur l'Entreprise des Graines Agricoles et Prevention Des Apres Recottes (Kongolo du 13 au 31 Mai 1985), Cenacof, Kinshasa June 1985.
24. Mendo, Dr. Chirume and Murray, Thomas D. Evaluation of The Center for In-Service Training (CPA) Project "Local Administration + Rural Development, Cenacof, Kinshasa, December 1981
25. Olson, David, Projet d'Amenagement de la Bibliothèque de Production et de Stockage de Materiel de Formation, CENACOF, Kinshasa, March 1986.
26. Olson David Land Kalonji, Ntalasa, Rapport du Seminare sur Le Developpement Rural Interne (Kikwit; 26 November - 14 Décembre 1984), CENACOF, Kinshasa Janvier 1985
27. USAID, Devepment Manpower Training Project Paper (660-0068), Washington, 1980.
28. USAID, Development Manpower Training Project Paper (660-0068 - Revised, Kinshasa February 1985.
29. USAID, Country Development Strategy Statement FY 1987 (Update), Kinshasa May 1985
30. USAID, Management and Disbursement Plan, Counterpart Fund Contribution to the CENACOF Budget for 1986, Letter to CENACOF, Kinshasa, December 13, 1986.
31. USAID, Reunion Plan - USAID - CENACOF du 1èr Mars 1986, Letter to CENACOF Concerning the CENACOF budget, Training Center Construction and Equipment Procurement for the Center.
32. Washington, James R, Development Manpower Training Project (660-0068), Training Impact Evaluation, USAID, Kinshasa, February 1986
33. Watts, Sylvia, Report on Findings for Cenacof, Kinshasa, April 1985

23. Masumbuko Bunyas Wenduku and Ngoie Kalanga Mimwenume, Seminaire sur l'Entreprise des Graines Agricoles et Prevention Des Apres Recottes (Kongolo du 13 au 31 Mai 1985), Cenacof, Kinshasa June 1985.
24. Mendo, Dr. Chirume and Murray, Thomas D. Evaluation of The Center for In-Service Training (CPA) Project "Local Administration + Rural Development, Cenacof, Kinshasa, December 1981.
25. Olson, David, Projet d'Amenagement de la Bibliothèque de Production et de Stockage de Materiel de Formation, CENACOF, Kinshasa, March 1986.
26. Olson David Land Kalonji, Ntalasa, Rapport du Seminaire sur Le Developpement Rural Interne (Kikwit; 26 November - 14 Décembre 1984), CENACOF, Kinshasa Janvier 1985
27. USAID, Devepment Manpower Training Project Paper (660-0068), Washington, 1980.
28. USAID, Development Manpower Training Project Paper (660-0068 - Revised, Kinshasa February 1985.
29. USAID, Country Development Strategy Statement FY 1987 (Update), Kinshasa May 1985
30. USAID, Management and Disbursement Plan, Counterpart Fund Contribution to the CENACOF Budget for 1986, Letter to CENACOF, Kinshasa, December 13, 1986.
31. USAID, Reunion Plan - USAID - CENACOF du 1èr Mars 1986, Letter to CENACOF Concerning the CENACOF budget, Training Center Construction and Equipment Procurement for the Center.
32. Washington, James R, Development Manpower Training Project (660-0068), Training Impact Evaluation, USAID, Kinshasa, February 1986
33. Watts, Sylvia, Report on Findings for Cenacof, Kinshasa, April 1985

ANNEX 3

Questions and Issues Dealt with in the Scope of Work
1986 Evaluation of Development Manpower Training Project 660-0068

A. CENACOF Institutional Framework and Constitution

Question No. 1: Since the official transfer to the Ministry of Planning what is the degree of integration into the Tutelary Ministry? What is DOP's managerial responsibility, interest and involvement in CENACOF's program and functioning?

o What is the degree of integration into the Tutelary Ministry?

Integration of CENACOF into the Department of the Plan (DOP) was not the intention of the GOZ or of the DOP in: a) shifting jurisdiction over CENACOF from the Prime Minister's Office in 1984 and b) shifting the responsibility of channeling counterpart fund support to CENACOF to the Department of Plan (from USAID) in January 1986.

The question, however, appears intended to inquire into the degree of effective supervision and support that DOP does or can provide CENACOF. Oversight of CENACOF administration and operations is exercised within the DOP by the Office of the Secretary General with the SG taking this responsibility on himself. Under its draft internal constitution (Reglement d'Ordre Interieur), CENACOF reports quarterly to the DOP and the SG chairs CENACOF's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) - which still remains to be established. In practice, there is consultation on a weekly basis between the SG and the DG.

o What is MOP's managerial responsibility, interest and involvement in CENACOF?

As Tutelary Agency for CENACOF, the DOP exercises oversight in terms of goals, administrative performance and use of resources. In general, the Department has the same responsibilities as those it would exercise over a parastatal organization. The extent DOP involvement is indicated by the activities undertaken by the Department in recent months to:

- a) Assign the task of finalizing and publishing the Internal Constitution of CENACOF to a staff member (Prof. Buka) working with the DG of CENACOF;
- b) Order an external audit of CENACOF's accounts;
- c) Channel CPF support to CENACOF (in transfers effected in February and March);
- d) Meet with USAID on CENACOF matters, including the 1986 budget;
- e) Assign an engineer to work on plans for the CENACOF/National Training Center at the Fikin site; and
- f) Collaborate in the analysis of CENACOF Training Impact carried out by J. Washington (Annex 2) in February 1986 and the threshold evaluation carried out by A. Baron in June 1986.

The SG has moreover assisted CENACOF in applying for work with the World Bank in the execution of human resource needs analysis and study in several sectors of the economy. In addition, in April 1986 the Commissioner of State for the Department invited CENACOF to prepare a training proposal for the Cellule Technique de Coordination.

Comment: A pertinent question is the character of CENACOF's future legal status. Currently its status is that of an "AID Project." Options to fix its legal status as a permanent institution are:

- An office of the Government;
- A Parastatal; or
- A non-profit société operating in the public interest.

Little consideration had been given to which option, if any, to exercise. Currently Centre de Perfectionnement aux Techniques de Developpement (CEPEDETE), a similar training institute, is operating under the tutelary responsibility of the Department of Plan as a non-profit society operating in the public interest with a small subsidy from the GOZ. The DOP sits on the board of directors of CEPETEDE as does a representative of the French AID Agency (FAC) who sits as an observer.

In the opinion of the evaluator, the future legal status of the Center should be settled as soon as possible by adoption of the second or third option listed above, and probably the third.

Question No. 2: What are the prospects for a viable semi-autonomous status under DOP sponsorship as recommended in the PP and the PP Amendment? Have concrete steps been taken to establish a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)? If so what is its role?

- o Prospects for viable semi-autonomous status?

The term semi-autonomous has not been defined in reference documents. It may be assumed that it refers to a situation where CENACOF would be partly subsidized by the GOZ but would enjoy the use of revenues it could earn. One of the conditions of the revised Project Paper was that the Executive Council agree to maintain the "present" semi-autonomous status of CENACOF under sponsorship of the DOP. USAID saw this semi-autonomous structure as contributing to better coordination of training activities at the national level and promoting quick and effective implementation of training institutions.

The question of a viability as a "semi-autonomous organization" depends partly on prospects for charging user fees and earning income from training and other activities (research, studies, consultancies evaluations) and partly on prospects for obtaining GOZ financial support.

It has been established that a well-run training program can generate substantial user fees in Zaire from the private sector, parastatals, and donor-funded training and research. CEPETEDE for example has been able to generate Z19 million in 1985 and is expecting to earn Z36 million (\$650,000) in 1986. CEPETEDE expects to be financially self sufficient within two to

three years - not counting the extensive Technical Assistance it enjoys from FAC and which is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. CENACOF also has been successful in a more modest way in raising funds. Receipts amounted to about 2300,000 in 1984 and to about 2880,000 in 1985 and, according to the DG are expected to amount to about 22 million (\$38,000) in 1986.

The prospects of a continuing GOZ subsidy are better if one assumes continuing availability of counterpart funds than the assumption in the PP revision that the GOZ will support all CENACOF recurrent expenses from the regular budget.

o Have concrete steps been taken to establish a TAC?

The draft internal Constitution under which CENACOF is provisionally operating provides for the establishing of a TAC under the chairmanship of the SG and including representatives of donor agencies, public organizations and the private sector. The draft text provides that the TAC plays an advisory role, that it provides CENACOF with suggestions as to training and research priorities, gives advice and guidance on CENACOF's program of activities and helps CENACOF determine likely markets, and available resources.

However, no concrete steps have been made so far to re-establish this Committee which functioned temporarily for a few months in 1983.

Question No. 3: What is the role and responsibility of the Executive Management Committee? Does the EMC function to approve programs and budgets or to engage funds? Discuss how effectively this committee functions?

Comment: This question relates to the approach established in the PP to achieve project institution building by establishment of a project EMC with improved management competence in development training and applied research/outreach. (output #1).

o What is the the role and responsibility of the EMC?

The role and responsibilities of EMC are set forth in Article 9 of CENACOF's draft internal Constitution. These include:

- Planning and Programming (formulation and decisions),
- Approval of the general budget and work program of CENACOF,
- Budgetary reallocations,
- Commitments of funds, including expenses not included in the CENACOF Working Plan,
- Study training and other missions,
- Hiring and firing of personnel,

- Salary levels for employees (in consultation with the tutelary agent and corresponding donor agency); and
- Promotions and bonuses, leaves.

o Does the EMC approve program and budgets or engage funds?

This question appears to aim at differentiating what EMC does with what it should do. In accordance with its mandate, the EMC does approve programs. However, in its current functioning, according to one member of the EMC and other observers, and contrary to the internal constitution, all decisions at the level of CENACOF concerning budgets and commitments of fund are in fact made by the DG.

o How effectively does the EMC function?

A majority of both the middle level cadre and of the members of the EMC reported to the evaluator that in fact the EMC does not operate effectively. Difficult inter-personal relations among members of the EMC apparently have prevented effective team work and cooperation. This situation apparently has existed for a number of years since members of the EMC were by design sent to the U.S. early in 1985 for special training in management techniques for developing team work with colleagues. One observation made to the evaluator was that the EMC has operated less effectively since the new management plan (Department of Plan undertook oversight of funding operations) in January, 1986. Another observer reports that it also has met less frequently.

Question No. 4: Do Top Management Professionals work as a Team? Do they provide supervision of subalterns?

o Does Top Management work as a Team?

There is little evidence that the EMC members currently work as a team. The instances where they have combined forces relate to their strong differences with the USAID Human Resources Development Office which backstops the project. By contrast, there is team work among the core of trainers.

o Supervision of Subordinates?

The top managers of CENACOF do provide supervision of subordinates. However, there is some concern that supervision is not what it should be. Such concern has been expressed by middle level cadre as well as by outside observers. Supervision appears to be inadequate in two respects - authoritarian without effective communications or sufficient participatory management, and laissez-faire without sufficient guidance and supervisory support. The evaluator observed low morale throughout the organization. This poor morale is attributable in part to poor physical working conditions, including transportation problems, delayed support for training activities, and lengthy delays in adjusting salaries to compensate for rising living costs. However, according to a majority of staff members it is also due to in a large part to poor management of CENACOF and poor supervision and support of staff in their work.

Question No. 5: Is the CENACOF's Constitution effective in guiding organizational and managerial development? How does this document serve to guide CENACOF's relations with other organizations including DOP, Principal GOZ collaborators, USAID and donor organizations, "sister" training organizations, and other clients, recipients and suppliers?

o Is CENACOF's Constitution effective in guiding organizational and managerial development?

The draft internal Constitution has been in effect since March 1986 when it was approved provisionally by the DOP. To some extent, CENACOF has been following the current draft; in many respects it has not. One member of the EMC concluded to the evaluator that the internal constitution was not sufficiently followed since its "adoption" in March 1986.

If followed fully, the Constitution in its current draft version would improve management of the Center and its organizational development because it does define roles and responsibilities of Center staff quite well and because it would entail the establishment of the TAC which would work to strengthen the organization. However, in both the view of USAID and the DOP the draft requires further work. USAID has considered that it needs to take into account several issues including the treatment of outside revenues, policy regarding external consulting by CENACOF employees on their own account, and vacation and sick leave policy. DOP has requested CENACOF to review other models for presentation and content.

Comment: To be fully effective, the documents will need to be finalized taking into account the legal status fixed for CENACOF.

o How does the Constitution define CENACOF relations with other organizations?

With regard to the DOP and USAID (or other cooperating donor agencies), the internal Constitution defines the Department as the tutelary agency of the GOZ and specifies that the DG accounts for CENACOF performance to the Tutelary agency and to the Cooperating Donor Agency (USAID).

As noted above, the Constitution provides for the establishment of the TAC and specifies that representatives of the Departments of Plan, Agricultural and Rural Development, Transport and Communications and Social Affairs and Women Welfare will be invited to participate in the Committee. It also specified the participation of private and parastatal organizations including the National Association of Zairian Enterprises, and the Office of Small and Medium Sized Enterprise. Religious and donor organizations are expected to be represented including the Eglise du Christ au Zaire, the Service du Developpement d'Eglise Catholique and donors including USAID and the World Bank.

No provision is made in the draft document to define relations with sister training organizations or to specify a coordinating role with respect to training in Zaire as its name would imply. However, there is coordination through the GOZ with request to participation of training institutes in regional or international meetings.

B. Program Performance

Question No. 1: Has a core of qualified trainers been developed to help the GOZ establish a training capacity in various sectors of the economy? Have two of these trainers received further specialized training in research and evaluation techniques? Discuss.

- o Has a core of qualified trainers been developed?

The revised PP provided as one output the development of this core of trainers by the selection of seven individuals with appropriate backgrounds and abilities "to help establish training centers" in various sectors of the economy. It also provided that two of these individuals would be provided further specialized training in research and evaluation techniques.

- o In order to develop qualified in-house trainers, CENACOF conducted a well planned and well implemented training program over a ten month period which was completed in the spring of 1985. Eight trainers were selected to be retained by CENACOF. Three of these were subsequently dismissed leaving a core of five outstanding trainers today who are able to organize and conduct training courses in management for different sectors of the economy. Further specialized training in research and evaluation techniques has not been provided.

Comment: A concern of CENACOF is to augment the number of trainers in-house to permit an expansion of training and research and to establish a pool of Zairian professionals in different subject matter areas, trained as trainers who can be called upon perhaps on a retainer basis to assist in CENACOF's training program. If CENACOF has a weakness, it is the lack of subject matter specialists. Another weakness is the lack of a program to provide continued professional development (training) for existing staff, particularly the core trainers.

- o Have two of these trainers received further training in research and evaluation techniques?

Yes. On the job training for two trainers in needs assessment was carried out in 1985, however, further specialized training in research and evaluation and is needed.

Question No. 2: Has a management training plan for 250 GOZ Trainers and 950 Development Cadre been planned? What was the level of the 1985 performance? How much training was internal? External? Discuss.

- o Has a management training plan been developed for 250 GOZ trainers and 950 Development Care?

This question relates to another of the planned outputs in Phase II of the Project that provided that CENACOF was to:

- Train CENACOF trainers;
- Train trainers in key development sectors;
- Carry out manpower needs assessment in key development sectors;
- Train development managers and cadre in these sectors.

The first two activities were to establish a GOZ training effort. On the one hand, CENACOF was to train its own trainers and those of GOZ technical

departments; on the other, it was to assist these departments in developing their own training services. Items 3 and 4 in the above list represented a continuation of the training program in Phase I; i.e. manpower training in key development sectors. The PP Revision specified that during Phase II 250 GOZ trainers and 950 managers.

The basis for CENACOF's activities was the 1983-85 training plan drawn up in mid 1983. Under that plan, CENACOF was to:

- Train seven trainers (see Question B1, above);
- Train 80 trainers in agriculture, 110 in health and 100 in transport, for a total of 250;
- Train 150 managers in agriculture and 120 in health.

The training accomplished by 12/31/85 was in Health, Agriculture, Project Design and Management and Rural Development:

Table 1

CENACOF Training in Phase II Through 1985*

	Planned/PP	Trained by <u>Revision</u>	<u>12/31/85</u>	<u>%</u>
A.	Project Trainers	7	8**	114
B.	GOZ Trainers	250	216	86
C.	Development Managers/Cadres	950	198	21

* Annex II, p. 12. See Bibliography for reports on this internal training.

** Seventeen candidates were selected for a 14-week training course followed by six month's OTJ training conducted in the framework of courses in agriculture and health. Of the seventeen, eight were initially retained by CENACOF. During 1985, three were let go leaving five still working with CENACOF.

A training plan for 1986 was developed in the fall of 1985, and is currently under implementation. As noted in Table 2, the 1986 training program includes 21 activities and a projected participation of 20 trainers and 475 managers/cadres. This training plan is well targeted, covering activities in support of donor development programs and continuing the training of trainers effort for GOZ departments. At the same time, the 1986 program provides a further opportunity to CENACOF to test the market and develop training materials. CENACOF has in fact developed two standard seminars and is developing two more:

- Training of Trainers in Management.
- Role of the Manager;
- Analysis and Planning of Development Projects (being developed);
- Management of Small and Medium sized business (being developed);

36

Table 2

CENACOF Program of Training Activities In 1986*

<u>Title of Activity</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Days of Training</u>	<u>Period Planned</u>
1. Agricultural Statistics**	Seminar	20	March
2. Project Analysis and Planning: Phase II	Seminar	10	March/April
3. Organization Management and International Rural Development**	Seminar	15	April/May
4. General Management: Managerial Roles and Functions	Seminar	15	April/May
5. Techniques in Conducting Meetings and Decision Making**	Workshop	3	May
6. Training of Trainers	Seminar	15	June/July
7. Organization Management and Decision Making	Seminar	15	May/June
8. Baseline Information Management**	Seminar	15	July/August
9. Team Spirit and Group Dynamics	Workshop	3	July
10. Training Workshop on Project Administration and Management	Seminar	10	August
11. Agricultural Research Management	Seminar	14	August
12. Human Resource Management	Seminar	15	August
13. Health Service Management	Seminar	15	September

14. Agriculture Extension**	Seminar	14	September
15. Human Resouce Symposium	Workshop	3	September
16. Management of Cooperatives	Seminar	15	September/October
17. Leadership: Situational Model	Workshop	3	October
18. Evaluation Training	Seminar	15	November
19. Management of Small and Medium Enterprises	Seminar	12	November
20. Audio-visual Techniques	Seminar	15	December

Total Participants
Planned - 475

* Source: CENACOF, Programme des Activites de Formation 1986, January 1986

** Courses given by the USDA

CENACOF is currently formulating its annual program for 1987 and has informed the evaluator that it also plans to produce a strategic multi-year plan covering 1987 and beyond. It is unclear how firm the work commitment for the strategic plan is. This work is scheduled to be finished by October 1986.

o What was the level of performance in 1985?

The CENACOF Report of 1985 Activities received in June 1986 covers this question. The highlights of 1985 were:

-Completion of the TOTM program,

-Organization and implementation of the five seminars listed in Table 3.

o How much of the training was Internal? External?

With the exception of the TOTM program carried out for the core trainers all training has been external.

Question No. 3: Does the 1986 training plan allow the project to meet its goals? Has a corresponding management and workplan to implement proposed training been prepared? Are staffing levels appropriate? Is the plan cost-effective?

- o Does the 1986 training plan allow the project to meet its goals?

This question is related to the realization of PP targets for training of 250 GOZ trainers and 950 development cadre. With respect to the training of GOZ trainers, the answer is yes. CENACOF has a well designed seminar for the training of trainers in management (TOTM). CENACOF having achieved the training of 216 such trainers for the GOZ by end 1985, it is expected that the goal of 250 will be reached by the end of 1987. The 1986 training program includes one TOTM seminar currently being held (June 1986).

With respect to the training of development cadre and managers as part of the manpower training effort, it is likely that the target of 950 participants will be achieved in spite of shortfalls in such training in 1984/85.

Comments on Project Training Goals

Information on the impact the program of training GOZ trainers in key development sectors is not available. While a substantial number of GOZ trainers has been trained, there has been little activity in assisting the technical departments concerned to develop their own training. The TOTM component of the project looked very much to the multiplier effect and it appears that this may have been very small (See also answer to Question B5 below).

- o . Has a corresponding management and workplan been prepared to implement the 1986 training program?

- o Are Staffing Levels Appropriate?

The current training staff of five persons plus the part-time assistance of three top managers is adequate to carry out the level of training activities planned for 1986. However, a staff of five trainers is not considered sufficient to sustain this level of training activity and to support the research, studies and evaluation activities that CENACOF should be doing.

- o Is the 1986 Plan Cost Effective?

The 1986 training program is less costly in terms of training than in 1985 or prior years, cost-effectiveness could be improved by doing more training at regional locations (rental) in Zaire. In general in-country training is considerably more cost-effective than training overseas. The question of cost-effectiveness of CENACOF trainers merits closer analysis than possible in this evaluation, as well as further consideration by CENACOF and its TAC (See also Question 4(B) below).

Question No. 4: How many management seminars have been implemented during phase II? Have these seminars addressed complementary or special topics? Have alternative seminar venues been explored? Discuss.

The purpose of the question appears to relate to an observation on the Management Plan for the 1983-85 training program (p.5) that "for the years beyond 1986, CENACOF plans to maintain a yearly training load of twelve management seminars complemented with about six seminars addressing special topics."

- o How many management seminars have been implemented during phase II?

A complete list of seminars carried out through 1985 is appended to Annex 4. In general, all seminars have focused on management aspects of development. A total of 18 management seminars have been implemented in Phase II (1984- June 1986).

- o Have these seminars addressed complementary or special topics?

Yes. And this is particularly true of the seminars carried out with direct US training assistance. Table 3 provides a listing with comments on seminars carried out in Phase II including with direct US assistance.

Table 3
Key Points of Project 068 training and U.S.
Direct Support of CENACOF seminars 1984

TOTM Implemented (training of trainers)

1984

JUN-DEC Training of Trainers in Management, Training of 17 participants to provide in-house trainers. Number of of participants - 17 (Trainers: Olson, Glenn, Diallo, Chirume, Ngay)

Integrated Rural Development - Kikwit - USDA - December
Done by: Olson, Kalonji - first use of CENACOF Team.

1985

JAN-MAR Training of trainers in Management continuation of in-house Training Program involving practical training exercises

JAN/FEB

Management of organization charge (USDA)

Done by: McCorry, Dehaase, Waruzi. Number of participants - 25
Place: CENACOF.

Significant in that another Zairian consultant was utilized. Course had mixed reviews indicative of something problematic unknown to this day, but it was the 1st effort at 4-5 hours a day instead of 6.

JAN-FEB 1985 Training of Trainers (Agriculture)

MAY 1985

"Drain Storage Management and Post-Harvest Loss Prevention"

Done by: Olson, Bolduc, Masumbako, Ngoie

Place: Kongolo/Ngaba CTR

First course done jointly by USDA and "new" Cenacof Trainers.

"First course executed at a great distance from Kinshasa"

"Effective use of subject specialist with the process specialist"

"First intervention more technical in nature.

JUNE 1985

"Management of Agricultural Research Institutions"

Done by: Thomas, Eaudreau, Ilambo. Number of participants - 21

Place: Mbanga Ngungu

Use of other trainers with CENACOF Trainer;

Combination of Training/logistics in one CENACOF staff person (1st);

Second intervention with same organization (Ag. research):

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER

"Public Administration and Women in Development"

Done by: Watts, Kabundi, Chirume. Number of participants: 23

Significant in that it was an OD intervention, produced a plan document

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER

Agricultural Policy Number of participants - 16;

Done by: Olson, Thibaka, Massumbuko, Toko

Significant in that it was 1st high level seminar that helped to re-assess policy at high level.

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER

TOT by CENACOF. Number of participants 6;

Their first on their own in addition to earlier interventions shorter in duration: Significant in that they executed and performed perfectly Led to organization's interest and repeat requests.

1986

JANUARY

TOTM (CENACOF) (Number of participants - 12)

Repeat performance of December 1985:

1st of 1st year of seeking paying participants.

MARCH - Ag. Statistics

A joint venture by USDA/Pragma/USAID with CENACOF - Successful

APRIL

Management of Agricultural and RD organizations (USDA)

Done by: Olson, Glenn, Toko, Kindoki (Number of participants-23)
Significant in that it was a practice of the system, allowed staff development and showed effective abilities of trainers.

Role of the Manager (Number of participants-12)

Done by: Masumbako, Ngoie

Significant in that it was CENACOF's first substantive management course designed by them and executed by them outside project management which had some outside help. This course was a resounding success. This course of 3 weeks was reacted to well and may be a successful repeat for 1987.

MAY

How to hold Meetings (Number of participants-9)

Done by: Olson, Ngay, Ngoie, Toko

First high level seminar (3 days) designed and executed by CENACOF; quite successful. Use of expatriate was in advising on design, process with very little actual intervention. Demonstrated effective use and management of short-term interventions.

* For complete listing of training activities see Table 2 (1986) and Annex 4 (1984 and 1985).

o Have alternative seminars venues been explored?

Yes, alternative sites for CENACOF seminars have been explored and used in Phase II. These sites include the NGANDA Center, the Nsele Center, the Office des Routes Training Center at Kasangulu (40 kms from Kinshasa), the Béthany Center (Kinshasa), Kikwit, Mbanza-Ngungu, and the Ngaba Center in Mbulula.

This question refers to a conclusion stated in the Management Summary of the 1983-1985 Training Plan (Lessons Learned, paragraph (V), page 2): "The local currency costs of the seminars - eight seminars carried out in Phase I - are judged to be excessive; to reduce their costs in the future alternative seminar venues must be explored." The USAID concern in Phase I which has continued in Phase II is for excessively high costs of outside room and board for training participants. It was for this reason that AID inputs were programmed for furniture and living facilities for an "Internat" to provide room and board for residential training participants. However strenuous efforts by USAID have resulted in significant decreases of local costs of residential centers which have been reduced to about 2400,000 per seminar this year (1986).

Question No. 5: Have CENACOF staff members been adequately prepared in technical skills required to perform specialized organizational development training including training/manpower needs assessments and related consulting services for its client base?

o CENACOF has been slow in identifying its internal training needs and working with USAID under the project to address them. To some extent

CENACOF staff members have acquired the technical skills in question by on the job work with their counterparts, top management and expatriate trainers. However, there is no organized training program for CENACOF staff. If CENACOF is to continue, it will be desirable that existing and future staff should have training in these skills.

Comments:

With respect to organizational development, findings of Phase I and Phase II suggest that training in management would have considerably more impact if carried out in the framework of specific organizational development programs based on training needs assessments for the organizations concerned. The 1983-85 Training Plan concluded for example:

- The experiential training method used by CENACOF has been enthusiastically received by the participants and warrants a continuation of CENACOF's activities; and
- The uncoordinated program of seminars has had mixed results; this argues for the establishment of a training plan in which training activities are concentrated and focused to maximize the impact.*

These findings are supported by the preliminary results of the evaluation of the training impact from five seminars carried out in 1982-83. James R. Washington's training impact evaluation also concluded that training needs assessments should be conducted in organization units with potential clients prior to the design of training programs and that research should be conducted via studies or consultancies to determine training and organizational development needs (Annex 2, page 13).

With respect to needs assessment, CENACOF continues to have only limited capacity. Some useful assessments have been carried out; for example a needs assessment of agricultural education in Bandundu region. However, the Center has not been able systematically to conduct manpower needs assessments in key development sectors on which to base its training program. Training for existing and additional staff in needs assessment is needed.

Training is also required in the organization and conduct of research and providing consulting series related to organization development of its clients.

Question No. 6: How have training activities been coordinated with other training institutions? Have yearly programs of CENACOF's training activities been published? Have quarterly newsletters summarizing all training seminars been prepared by all training institutions in Zaire?

o How have training activities been coordinated with other Training Institutes?

There is no apparent coordination of CENACOF training activities with those of other institutions or formal process for such coordination. However, it is not apparent that the coordination of training in Zaire is a significant problem. The need for training, organizational development and improved financial and economic management is so great that the main concern has been to develop solidly conceived in-country training capabilities.

* CENACOF, Training Plan - 1983-85, Management Summary, Kinshasa, May 1983, p.2

Comment on the Coordinating Role of CENACOF

The question misses the issue of a CENACOF's role as a coordinating agency for training in Zaire, as its name implies, and as was initially intended. The coordinating role was never implemented and was for all practical purposes abandoned in the Project Paper Revision. The revised PP providing only that coordination of training activities be accomplished by: (a) publishing yearly programs of CENACOF's training seminars; and (b) preparing quarterly newsletters summarizing all training seminars that are scheduled by all training institutions in Zaire.

For CENACOF to have a positive role in coordination it will need to expand its research and studies program into training needs and impact of training and otherwise provide a useful service to other institutions.

- o Have yearly programs been published?

A yearly program of activities was published for the first time by CENACOF in 1986.

- o Have quarterly newsletters summarizing all training seminars been prepared by all training institutions in Zaire?

CENACOF has published three newsletters, the last dated January 1986. These have covered only CENACOF's activities. About 1,000 copies have been distributed. The impact of the newsletter has not been surveyed (by feedback from recipients). The usefulness of the newsletter as a marketing tool and potentially for communicating information to other training agencies needs to be reviewed by CENACOF and its TAC.

Question No. 7: What joint activities have been carried out with "sister" training institutions in Zaire? What progress has been made in compiling information on other African counterparts?

- o What joint Activities with Sister Training Organizations have been carried out?

- Conversations with Centre de Perfectionnement de l'Administration (CPA) carried out several years ago regarding joint training for local administrators were unproductive. No joint activities have been carried out.

- o What progress has been made in compiling information on other African counterparts?

There have been several attempts (in 1982, 1983, 1984 and 1985) to compile such information on a systematic basis and to store it. CENACOF maintains a loose collection of written information on these institutions and their programs which is not properly clarified or indexed. A meeting of African institutes of Management Training in July 1986 does offer a golden opportunity to compile such information. Further progress in this regard is related to USAID in procurement of commodities for library facilities and for a development data base proposed and needed as a research and study facility for the Center.

Question No. 8: Have any training needs assessments in priority sectors taken place in 1984? In 1985? In 1986?

o In 1984 CENACOF carried out an in-depth training needs assessment of the Zairian Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. In 1985, CENACOF carried out two needs assessments. The first covered training needs for the Department of Social Affairs and Women Welfare. The second dealt with nationwide training needs for DOP planning purposes in 27 GOZ Departments in 1985. United Nations officials have indicated that this later assessment was not as "professional" as would have been desired. DOP officials consider that it was a relevant and useful study. In April 1986, the DOP has asked CENACOF to assess training needs of the Cellule Technique de Coordination in:

- management and administration of Public Investment Projects;
- Nature and quality of the data base and socio-economic-cultural indicators for project monitoring;
- Methodologies for project monitoring (during implementation); and
- Methodologies and approaches for the evaluation and synthesis of development policies.

Question No. 9: Have at least three presentations per year been made to top level staff or major GOZ institutions?

o This question relates to CENACOF marketing efforts. The 1983-85 Training Plan provided that CENACOF would market its activities by: (1) employing a PR staff person; (2) creating a TAC; (3) offering short-term management seminars to senior GOZ officials; and (4) making presentations to senior GOZ officials.

The activity reports for 1984 and 1985 do not reflect any program of formal presentations. However, CENACOF top management has maintained close contacts with senior officials of several GOZ departments including DOP, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development; and Department of Social Affairs and Women Welfare. CENACOF has also conducted radio and TV programs presenting its programs to the public.

Comment on CENACOF Marketing of its Services

The marketing policy and program of CENACOF needs to be reviewed (and strengthened) in the light of its overall functions and role, which also needs review and elaboration.

C. Sustainability (Organizational and Financial)

1. Organizational Sustainability

a. Has CENACOF developed the organizational capacity to implement its program? Can CENACOF's present staff provide strategic guidance? Can it prepare workplans and training programs? Has the reduction of the long-term technical advisor's contract had positive effects in regard to organizational sustainability?

o Has CENACOF developed the organization capacity to implement its program?

CENACOF does have the organizational capacity to carry out its current 1986 program. Moreover the 1986 program represents a level of training effort close to the Phase II target of building capacity up to handle 1200 person weeks of training per year. However, taking into account requirements for a necessary research and study program on which to base sound training and human resource development efforts, it appears that CENACOF will need to increase its organizational capacity to sustain the Phase II Training Capacity target (See Question C.1.b below). Measures to bolster existing organizational capacity will need to deal with both physical and personnel constraints as well as organizational structure and management.

In any case, it is clear that CENACOF faces serious constraints in carrying out its program, however defined.

The physical constraints are serious. Office space is not available for most of the professional staff or for visiting consultants. There is no library, and visual aids equipment was only recently received. Equipment and facilities for the production and storage of training materials are minimal. Transportation is inadequate. Training facilities are minimal, sufficient for only one seminar at a time. (CEPETEDE has four conference facilities).

The second constraint relates to personnel. The original plan called for a group of seven trainers, two of whom would also be trained to work on research and evaluation. It appears that the current in-house training staff should be expanded to 7 or 8 persons, most of whom should be cross-trained to work in research, evaluation and organization development and management consulting. In addition, CENACOF needs and intends to constitute a pool of Zairian subject matter specialists to be trained as trainers and to be available on call for research and training activities.

Comment: This question raises the more fundamental question of what CENACOF'S program is and what it will be? Currently there is a training program for 1986 and staff of CENACOF is working with an American training advisor to consider its program for 1987 and its multi-year training strategy. CENACOF has yet to develop a research program although the Director of Plan has recently circulated an initial three-page document suggesting elements for such a program. As suggested in the comments to Questions B1 and B5, CENACOF needs to review its training strategy and objectives.

o Can CENACOF's present staff provide strategic guidance?

USAID has felt that the Director General, whose role is to provide strategic guidance to CENACOF as well as overall direction of its activities, has not provided the level of strategic guidance and planning needed. The record appears to bear this out.

o Can it prepare workplans and training programs?

Yes. However it needs to standardize procedures, plan its work further in advance and organize its work more carefully.

o has the reduction of the long term technical advisor's contract had positive effects in regard to organizational sustainability?

The removal of the technical advisor position helps to improve CENACOF - USAID relations.

Comment Regarding The Need of a Long Term Advisor(s)

The fact that the two long term technical advisors to this project have both not worked out which raises the question whether it is possible or desirable to invest further resources in long term advisory assistance for CENACOF even if needed. The evaluator's findings are that the first advisor (1981-82) was let go from the position primarily because of poor french and unsatisfactory work and that the the decision was taken jointly by USAID/HRD and CENACOF.

It appears that the second technical advisor - who was assigned to make regular visits to consult with and advise CENACOF - was used or allowed himself to be used (or perceived to be used) to act as policeman and controller over the use of counterpart funds in CENACOF to the detriment of his advisory functions. By mid-1985, it was the unanimous perception of all the training cadre as well as senior managers of CENACOF that this advisor was not providing useful technical guidance and assistance and that his presence was unnecessary and counter productive to the work of the Center. It also appears that deep personal differences and grievances developed between the DG and this consultant, with grievances freely aired on both sides.

This history should not prejudice the question of the assignment of another advisor. That issue should be based on need and a strong management commitment within CENACOF to make good use of such a person.

b. Will CENACOF have the capacity for 1,200 person-weeks of training per year by PACD?

Yes. This target was specified in the revised PP and is based on the concept of sixteen training activities, probably seminars, averaging three weeks and 25 persons per seminar. However, the affirmation is based on some expansion of personnel in the next 18 months, eventual resolution of the problem of inadequate physical facilities and action to strengthen management and finalize the organizational structure of CENACOF.

c. Is CENACOF able to do manpower and training needs studies? What has been the reliance upon expatriate services to carry out training? To assist planning and workplan development?

o Is CENACOF able to do manpower and training needs studies?

Yes. But CENACOF does need more training of staff and more staff capacity in this area. TA specialists can be supportive and will be needed to help it carry out expanded programs and OTJ training in this area.

o What has been the reliance upon expatriate services to carry out training?

Before the internal TOTM program, CENACOF's capacity to carry out training was limited and heavily dependent on expatriate assistance to carry out specific seminars and training programs. USDA seminars funded under the African Manpower Development Program played an important role in providing this assistance, as is apparent from material presented in Annex II. Since the completion of the TOTM program, the capacity of CENACOF to organize and carry out training programs with its own staff has increased significantly. "Bread and butter" or "Fufu" seminars which all the training staff can carry out have been and are being developed.

However, it is important to recognize that any training institution in Zaire will need some continued access to expatriate know-how and technology for some years to come in the elaboration and in the conduct of training programs. CEPEDETE, for example, has four full time french specialists working with it to develop and carry out its training programs, and expects to add a fifth expatriate specialist. In addition, CEPEDETE calls on short term consultants both expatriate (about 30) and Zairian (about 80) to help plan, elaborate and carry out particular courses.

o What has been the reliance upon expatriate services to assist in planning and workplan development?

CENACOF appears to have been heavily reliant upon expatriate services in the past years, and earlier, to assist it in planning and workplan development.

2. Financial Sustainability

a. What are CENACOF's plans for financial sustainability? Will these plans permit CENACOF to maintain its present program and staff?

o What are CENACOF's plans for financial sustainability?

A plan for financial sustainability of CENACOF was included in the revised project paper prepared in 1985. This plan requires reworking and updating, a process that CENACOF should attempt to complete this year, with the TAC as well as DOP and USAID. CENACOF's current approach to financial sustainability involves generation of use fee for training and other services and construction of a training center to provide it with its own physical facilities, which would constitute a major subsidy for long-term operations.

o Will these plans permit CENACOF to maintain its present program and staff?

The outlook for financial sustainability of CENACOF is more favorable today than it was when Phase II was initiated. It has been established that substantial users fees can be generated for well-designed and carried out training programs, as well as for research and consulting services. Scenarios developed by the evaluator and the long-term advisor suggests that a financial plan can be developed and carried out to permit CENACOF to realize its program and a staff somewhat larger than at present.

b. Does CENACOF have enough clients or potential clients to permit the institution to become self-financed? Can CENACOF support itself through user fees? Have clients met the real costs of training? What attempts have been made to contain these costs and widen the paying client base?

o Does CENACOF have enough clients or potential clients to permit the institution to become self-financed?

Yes. In the opinion of the evaluator, CENACOF can with strengthened management, a clearly defined strategy and policy for its training and research activities, (including marketing of these activities) some expansion of its staff, and adequate facilities within four to five years-become self-financed, exception made of the external technical assistance it will continue to need for its programs.

o Can CENACOF support itself through users fees?

At present no, potentially yes, particularly if it occupies its own premises.

o Have clients met the real costs of training?

This innocent looking question turns out to be hard to answer because of difficulty in determining real costs of training.

To determine real costs of training, the direct costs of the different training activities need to be known as well as real overhead costs. The calculation of overhead requires assumptions about the volume and type of trainings and the level of salaries and operating costs of CENACOF, apart from direct training costs.

The evaluator calculated real costs per participant day at about Z1,000 per participant day for a non-residential seminar to about Z2,000 per participant day for a residential seminar. The overhead included in these estimates is Z800 per participant day.

These estimates of real costs cover only GOZ inputs and exclude any donor funded TA.

By comparison to these estimates of real costs, CENACOF is currently charging at a rate of Z2000 per participant day for non residential seminars and Z5000 for seminars including room and board for participants. Some clients have paid these user rates.

CEPETEDE reported to the evaluator that it expected to raise Z 36 million in 1986 on the basis on 90 persons in its long term (7 months) program and about 300 participants in its seminar program (1 to 2 weeks). Calculating roughly that the CEPETEDE program in 1986 would involve, if realized, some 5000 participant weeks of training, the user fee per participant week calculated in this way works out at Z12,000 or about Z2,400 per participant day (non-residential).

o What attempts have been made to contain these costs and widen the paying client base?

Attempts to contain real costs of training have been primarily led by USAID which has tightly controlled the use of funding for seminars. As noted above, the direct costs of seminars has been reduced dramatically (see Question B4). CENACOF currently is testing the market with rates of 22000 per participant day for non resident training and 25,000 for resident training.

c. Are there any mechanisms to allocate organizational receipts to the post project period, as versus current consumption?

There are mechanisms for billing for users fees and for depositing receipts in CENACOF controlled bank accounts. There appears to be no policy to apply such receipts to a sinking fund to help finance operations after A.I.D. project support ceases. Current procedures for programming, budgeting, accounting for and controlling the use of these funds are unclear and need clarification urgently.

Comment: There is lack of agreement between USAID/HRD and CENACOF on the size of the budget required to cover salaries and operating costs of the Center, as distinct from direct costs in support of training. For 1986, the difference is of the order of 25 or 30% with USAID calculating on the low side. As a result, according to CENACOF management, users fees in 1986 will be required to cover operating expenses in 1986.

d. Has the GOZ made its contribution to the program? What are the prospects for full commitment in 1987 and after the PACD?

o Has the GOZ made its contribution to the program?

Yes. The financial plan for the project as revised calls for a total cost of \$5.7 million for the life of project, extended from 4 to 7 years. The US contribution was estimated at \$2.5 million in grant funds reserved for foreign exchange costs. The GOZ contribution was estimated at \$2.9 million equivalent. The GOZ also contributed land for the construction of a training center. The GOZ contribution was intended to cover in-country training, salaries and operating expenses, training center construction and a contingency item (9%) and has been met out of CPF.

Comment: The revised PP contains the suggestion that GOZ regular budget funds be allocated in gradually increasing amounts to support CENACOF personnel and operating costs. The stringencies on GOZ revenues are such that this possibility appears remote and it has not been pursued. The Project Agreement Revision (#3) signed in June 1985 provides that CPF for Training Center construction will be limited at most to \$1.0 million equivalent and that additional local currency funding would be provided by the GOZ from other than CPF.

o What are the prospects for full commitment in 1987 and after the PACD?

Prospects for full commitment in 1987 and after the PACD depend on the availability of CPF. Expenditures of CPF under the project have amounted to the equivalent of \$219,000 in Phase I and \$454,000 to date under Phase II (this latter figure includes commitments). Since a total of \$2,884,000 was committed for the project by the Project Agreement, there remains a balance of \$2,201,000 equivalent, of which not more than \$1.0 million is to be used for the construction of the training center, leaving a balance of \$1,201,000.

Requirements for CENACOF's training activities, personnel salaries and operating costs for 1987 were projected in the PP and Z21.2 million or \$388,000 equivalent. Assuming the balance of \$1,101,000 equivalent remains available, there would be ample CPF funding available for several years, at least through 1989. The CPF earmarked for training center construction would suffice to construct about 2500 sq. meters of buildings at current prices.

e. Have local funds been properly spent to attain project objectives?

o USAID staff are convinced that there have been substantial improprieties in the use of local funds managed by CENACOF to attain project objectives. Two of the senior managers state that some budget may have been poorly used but maintain that funds were used for project objectives and not misused for other purposes. Some CENACOF staff complain however that resources are not being used to support the training programs as they should be. Poor accounting and the absence of proper audits since 1983, until early 1986, makes it difficult to establish mis-use. However, the evaluator learned that financial procedures were followed only partly, at best 40 to 50% of the time. The internal audit carried out by CENACOF itself in the first half of 1986 shows serious shortcomings in procedures for controlling and accounting for the use of project funds. It may be accepted nearly as axiomatic that where proper accounting of funds is lacking for an extended period, improper expenditures are more than likely to exist.

Comment: The DOP also ordered an external audit of CENACOF finances in the early part of 1986. This audit was not available for review at the time of this evaluation.

D. Project Management

1. Discuss the relationships among USAID, Project Staff, and the GOZ. Are there steps which could be taken to strengthen these relationships so that the project might be implemented more efficiently and effectively

o Discuss the relationships among USAID, Project Staff, and the GOZ.

The important point is that relations between the USAID project office (Human Resource Division) and CENACOF have been difficult and strained for the better part of two years, and marked by poor communication, mistrust and grievances.

0 Are there steps which could be taken to strengthen these relationships so that the project might be implemented more efficiently and effectively?

Yes:

- The shift of responsibility to the DOP for transferring CPF to CENACOF and for monitoring use of funds and performance (effective January 1986).
- Improved management of CENACOF, including in particular financial management and controls and resolution of the interpersonal problems within the EMC.
- The recruitment of an experienced manager to replace the departing DG.
- Departure of the current long-term advisor (effective June 1986).
- Agreement among DOP, CENACOF and USAID on a specific program of action and objectives to complete the Project.
- A positive approach by USAID toward support for CENACOF, assuming necessary strengthening of its organization and management.
- Agreement by USAID and DOP, in consultation with CENACOF, on appropriate/adequate support for CENACOF in 1987.
- Action by USAID to expedite procurement of materials for the library and to release CPF for salary increases.
- Establishment of the TAC this year.
- Early finalization of the internal Constitution.
- Positive steps to provide adequate facilities for CENACOF, including necessary feasibility studies of the proposed Training Center.
- Increased role by CENACOF in deciding on TA funded by USAID under the project.

2. How does CENACOF participate in selecting expatriate consultants? Is the current means of hiring local consultants effective and efficient?

o How does CENACOF participate in selecting expatriate consultants?

There is no formal or set procedure. CENACOF's perception is that it must have more say in such selection in the future. USAID/HRD's perception is that CENACOF has participated in a number of selections (e.g., Bossard, Glenn, Olson). However there is no agreed plan for use of the balance of \$ 600,000 available for technical assistance.

CENACOF's participation could be ensured by: a) developing an agreed plan for technical assistance support; b) establish a formal procedure whereby CENACOF's clearance is obtained on PIO/Ts and PIO/Cs.

o Is the current means of hiring local consultants effective and efficient?

In CENACOF's view, the procedure has been completely inadequate. CENACOF has a roster of 40 or 50 local consultants. The procedure has been to select among this listing with final decision by USAID (until January 1986). As noted earlier, CENACOF is planning to develop a pool of specialists, perhaps on retainer, and trained in training and consultancy.

3. Are Project Officials interested in further TA or advisor inputs? If so, in what forms?

o Are Project Officials interested in further TA or advisor inputs?

Yes. But CENACOF needs to formulate needs and would hope that existing funds would be available through 1988 (requiring extension of the PACD).

o If so, in what forms?

This is undecided as this time and still under review by CENACOF as part of planning of 1987 (since the availability of TA will expand training capacity).

Development Manpower Training Project (660-0068)

Training Impact Evaluation

Conducted by
James R. Washington
Regional Human Resources Development Advisor
RECSO/WCA

Kinshasa, Zaire
February 1986

List of Accronyms Used

US	United States
AID	Agency for International Development
USAID/Kinshasa	American Agency for International Development Kinshasa Mission
AMDP	African Manpower Development Project
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
GOZ	Government of Zaire
CENACOF	National Center for the Coordination of Development Training
LOP	Life of the Project
REDSO/WCA	Regional Development Support Office/West and Central Africa
TDY	Temporary Duty
PACD	Project Assistance Completion Date
TOTM	Training of Trainers in Management
NTL	National Training Laboratory
AMA	American Management Association
IRDC	International Research/Development Corporation
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

55

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. SUMMARY

II. OBJECTIVES

III. FINDINGS

- A. Experimental Training Methods
- B. Training Profile
- C. General Project Training
- D. Training Received by CENACOF

- 1. Management Training
- 2. Training of Trainers

E. CENACOF Training

IV. SPECIAL MISSION CONCERNS

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

VI. ANNEXES

- A. List of people contacted
- B. Detail breakdown of Training Profile
- C. Interview Guides
 - 1. US Mission and Contractor Interview Guide
 - 2. Host Government Interview
 - 3. Development/Participant Training Interview Guide
- D. Possible Training Center Functions

56

I. SUMMARY

USAID/Kinshasa has provided training for over 456 Zairians under project (660-0068) during the past three and a half years. AID support for these programs came primarily from two types of training sources: 1) the bilateral Development Manpower Training Project (660-0068), and 2) through the Africa regional AMDP project. Although the lion's share of the project's training occurred as in-country training in Zaire, on the whole the mission seems to have been committed to all varieties of training, i.e., long and short-term U.S. training, third-country training, and of course in-country training. The project also provided training in the following development sectors: Agriculture, Rural Development, Health, and Development Management. During the second phase of the project, after CENACOF was created, except for a few participants who were trained in either the U.S. or in a third country, almost all "participants" were trained in Zaire. Therefore, since USDA was the main supplier of training under the project, the evaluation in a sense assesses the impact of the training done by USDA in collaboration with CENACOF.

Given the above, the Africa Bureau strategy for developing mid to high-level technical and managerial skills in Africa, and the mission's interest in being responsive to the host government's requests for training assistance, the mission most likely wants to continue to provide quality training throughout the life of the project to a select number of Zairians in priority development fields. However, with only about 22 months LOP remaining, the USAID mission and the GOZ find themselves in the midst of a serious transition period, which will not be painless, therefore greater, rather than less, deliberate efforts and creativity will be required on the parts of both USAID and the GOZ to bring about a smooth institutional transition - the transfer of the major project management and implementation responsibilities from USAID to the GOZ.

In keeping with the mission management desire to learn more about the quality and relevancy of the training being performed under the project during this crucial transition period, a REDSO/WCA TDYer was invited to Kinshasa February 14 to 28, 1986 to assess the impact of the project training activities, including general project training, training received by CENACOF's staff, as well as training provided through or by CENACOF.

In addition to the above areas of concern the impact evaluation focused on such questions as:

- Should training continue after the PACD?
- How effective can a three-week seminar be in bringing about a change in people's behavior on the job?
- Does a compelling need exist for a training center in Kinshasa?
- What direction should any new training take?
- And other questions relative to mission specific concerns.

97

This evaluation at the time was considered to be well timed (it was, however, most unfortunate that the institutional evaluation scheduled for June 1986 could not have been conducted in conjunction with this one). After a brief review of relevant project training documents, prepared interviewing instruments followed by interviews involving USAID staff, GOZ officials, CENACOF's staff, outside U.S. and African technical consultants, and where possible, training participants, the evaluator produced the following report.

The evaluation concludes that despite the inordinate delays in getting the project off the ground, the training accomplished under the project has been of generally good quality and relevant at all three levels. Almost all Zairians who received training are in positions to apply their skills and knowledge gained from the training. While the evaluation revealed that the relevancy and utilization of training may be considered impressive, it is much too soon and the evaluation was too short and sketchy to draw any final conclusion as to the actual impact the training had on the job.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The training impacts evaluation of the Development Manpower Training Project (660-0068) was conducted February 14-28, 1986 to determine the quality and relevance of the training received by the Zairian participants. Based on the evaluation findings, recommendations were made regarding the re-focusing of the training programs during a critical transition phase of the project, a period during which the majority of the project management and implementation responsibilities were being shifted to the GOZ.

The objective of this evaluation was to assess the impact of the training done under the auspices of the project, including general project training activities, training received by CENACOF's staff, and training provided by or through the CENACOF organization. In addition to the above areas of concerns, the evaluation paid particular attention to such questions as:

- A. Should training be allowed to continue beyond the PACD?
- B. How effective can a three-week seminar be in bringing about a change of people's attitude toward their work?
- C. Does a compelling need exist for a training center in Kinshasa? What direction should any new training take?

Upon arrival to Kinshasa, and after an immediate briefing by the USAID project manager, the evaluator reviewed relevant project training documents, prepared instruments for interviewing, followed by interviews involving USAID mission staff, GOZ officials, CENACOF staff, outside US technical consultants, and where possible training participants, to determine the extent of their satisfaction with the training and how their acquired skills were being utilized back at the work site.

III. FINDINGS

A. Experimental Training Methods

Even at this stage of development in the training, we are witnessing numerous attempts to find the panacea - the approach to developing training

programs which will solve all our problems. Of course, this is an oversimplification. But, still the search continues. A word of caution. In the training field as in other disciplines there is still a lack of agreed upon vocabulary. As in this evaluation, the word training signifies an organized learning experience designed to improve the effectiveness of an employee in his/her present job. This applies to the highest level employee in the organization, as well as to the lowest. It also includes the learning experience which must be provided when a change in materials and methods of production causes a change in how people behave and how things get done. Since the world is constantly changing, training is always needed to develop human resources to help bring about change and to effectively achieve the organization objectives and goals. While much has been learned from the text about organization behavior, regrettably experience with managers and academicians makes it all too clear that cognitive knowledge about people in organization all too frequently does not get carried over into behavior.

Therefore the rationale for utilizing experiential based training enhances the affective dimension and awareness of how people really behave in an organization. Participants in experiential learning sessions are guided by skilled trainers to examine what they are learning and how they are behaving or reacting in relation to various problems they are encountering in their jobs. By utilizing this training approach, the job context and problems are examined in the training situation in groups and various approaches (including management concepts, content) are applied in structured classroom situations to practice solving problems. The effect or impact of this training usually empowers people to change or improve their own situation to some extent.

USAID/Kinshasa has provided training for over 456 Zairians under project '660-0068) during the past three and a half years. AID support for these programs came primarily from two types of training sources: 1) the bilateral Development Manpower Training Project (660-068); and 2) through the regional AMDP project. Although the lion's share of the project's training occurred as in-country training in Zaire, on the whole the mission seems to have been committed to all varieties of training, i.e., long and short-term U.S. training, third-country training, and of course in-country training. The project also provided training in the following development sectors: Agriculture, Rural Development, Health, and Development Management. During the second phase of the project, after CENACOF was created, except for a few participants who were trained in either the U.S. or in a third country, almost all "participants" were trained in Zaire. Therefore, since USDA was the main supplier of training under the project, the evaluation in a sense assesses the impact of the training done by USDA in collaboration with CENACOF.

B. Training Profile

Development/Participant Training

(From August 1982 to the Present)

	U.S.	Third-Country	In-Country
Long-term Academic (6 months or longer)	4	-	-
Short-term technical (Less than 6 months)	20	16	414
	24	16	414*

* Includes 58 "participants" trained entirely by CENACOF's staff. Also, 228 of in-country "participants" were trained under AMDP funds.

In the 2nd phase (August 1982 to present) the project has provided training to about 454 Zairians, of which 216 were GOZ trainers; the balance of 238 development "participants" received effective exposure to training of trainers (TOTM) in development management from CENACOF with T.A. provided by USAID through USDA. The training was provided for GOZ officials in the following sectors: Agriculture, Rural Development, Health, Project Design, and Management (for a complete breakdown of courses and seminars by names and dates, see Annex B).

C. General Project Training

From the project's beginning until now, 36 Zairians have received short-term training either in the U.S. or in other African Countries. The training consisted mainly of non-degree technical courses in such development fields as: 1) Agriculture business management (thirteen); 2) management leadership for social workers (four); 3) alternative energy (two); 4) family planning (four); 5) accounting (three); 6) public health (six); 7) labor statistics (three); and 8) management leadership.

Because none of these courses were conducted in Zaire under the services of CENACOF and USDA none of these participants were interviewed during the evaluation, except the three CENACOF managers (see comments below, Section D Training received by CENACOF).

D. Training received by CENACOF

1. Management Training

A project management committee, composed of a Director General, a Training Director, and a Director for Research, for development training and

applied research was established in CENACOF. As a part of the preparation and to improve its competency to manage the newly established CENACOF, the committee members received short courses in management, human interaction, and leadership for development at various training institutions in the U.S. (i.e. MTL, AMA, etc.).

During a debriefing of the committee members, following their attendance of two NTL and four AMA training sessions in the US, the committee members summarized their impressions as follows:

- a. Regarding the NTL training, the consensus was that it was a most useful first step at looking at oneself in a working relationship with other professionals of a particular group, and that all came away with a considerably enhanced understanding of themselves;
- b. Regarding the AMA training, two members experienced serious reservations as to the usefulness and pertinence of the financial management techniques that were taught, and the relevance of these techniques to the activities of a training institution.

2. Training of Trainers

A specialized team of five trainers has been set up within CENACOF. During phase II, the trainers handled manpower training and training of trainers for the GOZ departments in the key sectors. In preparation for their training responsibilities with CENACOF, 17 potential (candidates) trainers, after surviving several cuts in a grueling selection process, underwent an intensive 4-month training of trainers workshop conducted by two experiential management training consultants (one African and one American). The course/workshop consisted of both theory and practicals (they actually conducted some training sessions under observation by the two workshop facilitators). An interview with four of the five finalists during the evaluation revealed that the TOTM course was very helpful and well done; however, there were some courses that were better than others. The participants would have liked to have a repeat of the conception and evaluation module because they do not feel that they grasped this very well. In addition to this module they would have also liked to take some "new" courses for up-dating their skills in the training field, preferably some management training in the U.S. or other African countries.

Observations made during the training by staff members as well as their spouses were unanimously favorable. They recognized their own personal growth as a result of the training, and the improved and open relationships with their peers. The newly gained self-confidence of the trainers manifested itself also in open and freely communicative behavior with their family members, an observation which was independently made by some spouses. They felt that the training seminars emphasized training methodology and basic management techniques, and that they would need to receive supplemental training to strengthen their skills in specific disciplines.

E. CENACOF's Trainers

As a result of an elaborate selection process and four months of intensive TOTM, five trainers emerged. Subsequently 216 GOZ trainers and 198 development cadres received an effective management training of trainers course from CENACOF with the USAID technical assistance provided through the training programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The training provided was in the following sectors: Health, Agriculture, Project Design and Management, and Rural Development. In addition, CENACOF trainers produced alone, without USDA assistance, eight workshops on various subjects involving 110 Zairians in 1985.

Almost all participants interviewed felt that training had a positive impact on their job performance. Although none indicated that they have been promoted after training they still felt that they have gained a lot from their training which can better enable them to pursue their careers. Some have been given additional responsibilities, while others felt more competent professionally and able handle assignments in their fields more easily than before. Some participants observed that they can identify and solve problems better than before, and that they can communicate better thereby do more and better work in a relatively short time span.

USAID officers working with participants on various projects and GOZ supervisors have expressed satisfaction with the overall performance of the returned participants. However, many of the participants who have had exposure to in-country short-term seminars felt their training was too short and misdirected - they were selected because their boss was not available - to have any effect on their professional life. While there were other negative "qualifiers" even among those who experienced positive impacts, on the whole the participants found the Development Manpower Training Project (660-0068) to be very useful to them in the present jobs.

IV. Special Mission Concerns:

During a meeting with the Mission Director and other staff members, Mr. Podol asked the evaluator to address the following concerns during the evaluation:

- A. Should the training program be continued after the POCQ? If so, should we use CENACOF to conduct the training sessions, or should some other institution be considered?

The presently defined "Training Program" (i.e. long-term US, short-term US, third-country, and in-country training) should continue at least for the remaining life of the project. However, presently there is no clear national rationale for determining the training needs, selecting participants, nor for adjusting the methodology, content and management of training. Therefore, certain adjustments will have to be made as to how training needs are determined and participant selections are made.

b7

CENACOF should be used because of its experience and reputation; others should be considered to complement the services that CENACOF cannot offer, and to help further refine/define the directions, contents, and techniques of the project training activities in Zaire.

B. Can a three-week seminar change people's attitudes towards their work? Do participants work differently after they have attended these seminars?

On a personal level, most 3-week experiential sessions will affect attitude towards work. What is not exactly known is to what degree these changes occur. However, during this evaluation many participants and supervisors of participants responded positively to this question saying that they have noticed changes in behavior on and off the job after attending a three-week seminar. If the workshops are properly designed and conducted involving the appropriate participants, these seminars can and do change behavior on and off the job. Some data from the 1982-83 OMDP-funded USDA/CENACOF courses (seminars) will be available soon which might assist in determining the extent to which participants work differently following their attendance at a seminar.

C. Are such training seminars helpful given the Zairian context?

Experiential/Applied Behavioral Science type training in management content/concepts/issues/problems solving is an extremely powerful and potentially long-term influencing factor, if properly applied in the Zairian context. The cyclical process of the training based on the experience/learnings of participants through 15-21 days effects significantly their perceptive horizons (perception/change) and thereby empowers them in effect to not only change their own behavior but to also become change agents if they so choose. The magnitude of this type of chain reaction is not known yet, but some data have indicated that this process is in motion. The training seminars conducted so far have had identifiable positive evaluation feedback from participants as being able to perform better on their jobs by making smaller behavioral adjustments in the following areas: peer communication and comparison, valuing behavior/expression opportunities, problem-solving opportunities, learnings about other ways to do things, examination of one's own situation, ventilating frustration concerning one's own situation, and empowerment to change/choose different behavior.

These are helpful aspects of behavioral changes but would be more so if these training interventions were done more systematically and with groups/organizational units as a whole. Some data already exist which indicate that the seminars can and do permeate, influencing an ever-widening population of participants, when the training is conducted in a systematic/repetitious manner.

D. Make suggestions on the direction that the training program should take.

During this very delicate transitional phase there is a shifting of project management responsibilities. There should not be any major directional changes in the training program. However, should there be a need

67

for change in the future, make sure that the training program goals and direction are consistent and coherent based on a very careful determination of training needs. In the meantime, the following should be considered in designing training programs under the project:

1. Training (ST, LT, 3rd Country, Local/in-country) to be based on: organization/unit needs, organizational goals, individual needs/competencies, functional relation between training and job to be taken up after training, cost effectiveness and opportunity costs, and research data.

2. Purpose of Training to consistently and coherently pertain to improvement of: management of change and influencing skills in individuals, practical management skills, i.e. organizational problem-solving, decision-making, communication, conflict-management, supervision principles/skills, planning, organizing, controlling, evaluating, budgeting, performance and productivity in key project/sectors where financial investment matches or assists human investment or commitment.

3. Spread effects and replication of training could be done systematically over time by: training of Trainers and Training of Consultants, targeting of larger populations of Zairians, and long-term management of curricula, and varied levels of same based on monitoring of impacts over time.

E. Does Kinshasa need a training center? Are there enough clients who will use the center so that the center will be able to finance itself?

There are likely to be more than enough solvent clients to enable a center to finance itself, provided the Kinshasa training center is multi-functional and, eventually, regional in nature. The demand for training sites has been evident for several years as seen by the frequent and multiple uses of various sites already in existence e.g., NGANDA, BETHANY, NSELE, KASANGULU, and others.

The need for a center is more than a need for a site when one assesses what is required to provide systematic and programmed training, conferences, workshops, etc., over time at sustainable cost. Using various sites over the period of the last few years has proven expensive and has had no significant impact upon these sites in terms of developing infrastructure or permanent training management. Reports from training management consistently indicate the same problems e.g. sizing costs, low food quality, inappropriate site management, and logistical problems.

A center designed for mid-level to high-level management training, research and other related consultancy work would operate with its main business to provide services systematically, efficiently and effectively. These services can be better managed when one has direct control over his performance rather than indirect control. Elements such as food, lodging, laundry, and learning environment would be more easily managed with these functions being centralized in a center.

6/1

The users of such a center would know in advance of the availability and quality of services; they would be asked to subscribe or pay as a client/user to ensure the long-term viability of such a center. Ad-hoc training and other types of interventions might to some extent be handled by the center as well as the heretofore previously utilized sites.

For the center to be attractive to numerous clients/users, the center would need to offer a range of choices to solvent clients. For example, IRDC researchers, USAID TDY consultants might use the center as a base; other international agencies (UNDP, IBRD) might wish to base a project under its umbrella in order to affect work related to public administration, management, or human resources development. Regional conferences, seminars, etc., might also be planned to be held at the center. The attraction for donors would be services, site, and cost; the advantage for the center (institution) would be long-term viability.

The organization and direction of the center or institution given donor subscription and client/user base would suggest that a board be formed in collaboration with Department of PLAN that would oversee the annual and longer program of the institution. As an example, this board comprised representatives from the donor or client/user base would approve programs, activities and staffing in order to enable the center to function. The functioning of the center would be separate from the program work of the center and this "center management" would be responsible to the programs' administrative officer.

The possible clients/users and center functions including possible staff sources are suggested in Annex D, Possible Training Center Functions. It is probable that some or all of the client/users will pay or subscribe for services, offices, programs that they envision as the institution operates. Some seed money may be required in order to provide cash flow. Staffing may have to change from time to time given constraints and needs. The institution's core program staff should be in the lead on program direction.

To finance itself, the center over time would require some grant funds and some subscribers/users to pay costs over a period of time - this would require a center management and a committed core staff to work on programming in cooperation with potential users. A feasible- long-term financial, managerial and programmatic sustainability plan needs to be developed. A multi-donor approach would work given present donor programs and strategies for the foreseeable future in Zaire.

V

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CENACOF's trainers should receive additional staff development training to reach a higher level of competency (preferably in the U.S. starting with the University of Pittsburgh's Francophone Africa Management Development Seminar) to enhance their practical exposure to experiential management and training methodology.

B. The training center should be constructed as a national center after the Department of Plan develops a national management structure with USAID/CENACOF playing a major role in that development.

C. Zairian technical subject specialists and trainers should be recruited and familiarized with CENACOF's work, utilizing the experiential training process.

D. Training needs assessments should be conducted in organizational units with potential clients prior to the design of training programs.

E. Research should be conducted via studies or ongoing consultancies to determine training needs and organizational development needs.

F. Client relationships should be maintained with organizational units/heads and their personnel on particular problems related to training or other management needs.

G. Additional time should be allotted to U.S. short-term technical assistants for course materials adaptation in Zaire prior to the conduct of seminars/workshops.

H. More third-country training should be done under project by 1) sending Zairian participants to other African countries, and 2) receiving participants from other African countries.

I. A comprehensive joint USAID/GOZ training impact evaluation should be conducted about one year from now (for all AID funded Zairian training), using a set of scientifically tested measures (instruments) for assessing the impact of training on participants' job performance. American Institute for Research developed such an instrument in the mid-20s. Also, if the evaluation is done on a sector basis AID/PPC might be interested in conducting such an evaluation.

J. Record keeping storage and retrieval system library system for accessibility to and keeping current its training materials should be established.

rk

ANNEX A

A. List of Persons Consulted

I. USAID/Kisumu

- a. John Anderson, HRD Officer and Project Manager
- b. Katunda wa Nkambua, Program Specialist/HRD Assistant
- c. Lee Braddock, Chief Project Development Officer (DEO)
- d. Debra Rectenwald, Evaluation Officer DEO
- e. Massila Kwa Nkazi, Training Officer
- f. Donald Brown, ARD Officer
- g. David Atteberry, ARD Assistant Program Officer 091
- h. Timothy Born, DEO, Project's Manager
- i. Richard L. Podol, Mission Director
- j. Arthur S. Lezin, Deputy Director

II. GOZ Officials

- a. Mikobi Mingashanga, Secretary General/Ministry of Planning
- b. Massa Mukambo, Participant, Planner, President's Office, Agriculture
- c. Kapanji Kalala, Participant, Economist, President's Office, Agriculture
- d. Mubenga Cit., Supervisor, Chief of Office of Studies and Planning, Department of Agriculture
- e. Mota Bakajika, Participant, coordinator of Agriculture Research, Department of Agriculture
- f. Singa Cit., Participant, Head of Planning, Department of Agriculture
- g. Salumu Dr., Participant, Directeur General, INERA

III. CENACOF:

- a. Chizungu Rudahindwa, Director General of CENACOF
- b. Chirume Mendo, Director of Training
- c. Ngoy Aben, Director of Research
- d. Masumbuko Bunyas, CENACOF Trainer
- e. Ilambo Bwaka, CENACOF Trainer
- f. Kindoki Nsaka, CENACOF Trainer
- g. Ngoie Kalnaga, CENACOF Trainer
- h. Toko Puku, CENACOF Trainer

IV. Technical Consultants

- a. Philippe Bossard, Long-term Advisor
- b. David Olson, Consultant/Trainer
- c. Jana Glenn, Consultant/Trainer
- d. Jean Dehasse, Consultant/Trainer

V. Associated with CENACOF & Training Program(s) Execution

- a. Bianga Waruzi
- b. Ntalaja Kalonji

DEVELOPMENT MANPOWER TRAINING PROJECT (660-0068)
PERFORMANCE

I. PHASE II TRAINING OUTPUTS

The Development Manpower Training Project (660-0068) was evaluated in July 1982. Following this positive mid-term evaluation, a decision was taken to commence the project Phase II. From the beginning of the second phase (August 1982) to date, the project has produced the following outputs:

1. A project Management Committee with improved competency in development training and applied research was set up. The Management Committee is made of a Director General, a Training Director and a Director for Research.
2. Training of Project Trainers: a specialized team of five trainers has been set up within CENACOF. During this phase, the trainers are handling manpower training and training of trainers for the GOZ departments in the key sectors.
3. As result of the project output #2 above, 216 GOZ trainers and 11 development cadres received an effective management training of trainers from CENACOF with the USAID technical assistance provided through the training programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The training provided was in the following sectors: Health, Agriculture, Project Design and Management. and Rural Development.

	<u>Planned/ PP Revision</u>	<u>Trained by 12/31/85</u>	<u>%</u>
A. Management Committee Members	3	3	100
B. Project Trainers	7	7	100
C. GOZ Trainers	250	216	86
D. Develop Cadres (Public/Private)	950	198	21
	<u>1200</u>	<u>424</u>	<u>35</u>

II. MAJOR ACTIVITIES FOR 1984 AND 1985

	<u>Planned</u>	<u>Implemented</u>	
1984	12	5	42
1985	14	6	43

III. MAJOR ACTIVITIES PERFORMED

	<u>Duration/ Days</u>	<u>Number/ Partic.</u>	<u>Training Role</u>
<u>1982 Activities</u>			
Oct. - Ag Project Planning & Analysis (Phase I)	21	29	ICNA
TOTAL 1982	<u>21</u>	<u>29</u>	

*Seven trainers were trained and hired by CENACOF. Later, 2 trainers were dismissed

1983 Activities

1. Feb. - Training of Trainers	21	23	IPD
2. Feb. - Basic Ag. Statistics (2 groups)	26	31	USDA
3. Feb. - Mgt of Ag. Research	26	28	USDA
4. Mar. - Ag Projects Plng & Analysis, (Phase II.20)	20	28	USDA
5. May - Dev. of Regional Ag. Resources	19	28	USDA
TOTAL 1983			

1984 Activities

1. Jun/Sep. - Training of Trainers	80	17	USDA/ CENACOF
2. Nov. - Training of Trainers/Health	54	16	USDA/ CENACOF
3. Nov. - Training of Trainers/Agric.	54	17	USDA/ CENACOF
4. ^{Jan/Feb 85} Dec. - Mgt of Organisational Change	18	25	USDA
5. Dec. - Integrated Rural Development	18	24	USDA
TOTAL 1984	116	99*	

1985 Activities

1. Apr. - TOT in Family Plng	38	20	CENACOF
2. May - Grain Storage/Prevention of Food Losses	18	27	USDA
3. Jun. - Mgt of Cooperatives/C.F.	9	15	CENACOF
4. Jul. - Ag. Research Facilities & Org.	19	21	USDA
5. Aug. - Ag. Policy Seminar	18	16	USDA
6. Sep. - Project Planning & Analysis	18	23	CENACOF
7. Oct. - WID Mgt Training/C.F.	26	23	USDA
TOTAL 1985	218	148*	

IV. SHORT-DURATION ACTIVITIES/WORKSHOPS/MEETINGS

In addition to major activities mentioned above, CENACOF has conducted some short-term training sessions identified below:

	<u>Duration/ Days</u>	<u>Number/(1) Partic.</u>	<u>Training/ Role</u>
<u>1983 Workshops</u>			
Feb. - "Matinée de Réflexion" on Agric. in Zaire	1	12	USDA/CENACOF
<u>1984 Workshops</u>			
Feb. - Project Planning & Evaluation	4	20	CENACOF
Mar. - Curve of growth	2	24	CENACOF
Apr. - Role of 5th Directorate of Primary Health Care	1	18	CENACOF
May - Mandate and role of CEPLANUT	1	10	CENACOF
Jun - Diagnosis of Ag. & Veterinarian Education in Bandundu	5	18	CENACOF
Nov. - Study on Training Needs Analysis	3	28	CENACOF
Oct. - Delimitation of Health Zones in Bandundu	3	8	CENACOF
TOTAL 1984	19	126	

101

1985 Workshops

May - Definition of Role & Mandate of FONDS (former FONAMES)	3	12	CENACOF
May - 5-year plan for Dept of Health	3	6	CENACOF
Jun. - Status of Health zone	3	15	CENACOF
Jul. - Delimitation of Health Zones in Equateur	2	16	CENACOF
Aug. - Delimitation of Health Zones in Shaba Region	2	16	CENACOF
Aug. - Population & Development	1	30	CENACOF
Aug. - Mgt of Ag. Statistics Data	1	7	CENACOF
Aug. - Ag. Policy in Zaire	1	8	CENACOF
TOTAL 1985	<u>16</u>	<u>110*</u>	

1) Estimates

ANNEX C No. 1

U.S. MISSION AND CONTRACTOR INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. PROJECT PURPOSE AND IMPACT:

a. As you probably know, Development Manpower Training Project (660-0-68) was particularly designed to remove or alleviate critical development constraints in institutions that impact upon the success of AID's projects. The purpose of this project is to improve the quantity and quality of the GOZ's rural development programs. This will be achieved by strengthening the GOZ's training capacity and to training selected numbers of Zairians in priority development sectors.

In your opinion, to what extent has the project accomplished its primary purpose? Has the host country re-employed returned participants or in other ways is utilizing the training provided? How has the project supported CDSS objectives? What have been the most effective types of training? Least effective?

b. Do you believe that the purpose of Phase II should remain the same or be modified? Please explain. (Try to get at the degree of flexibility desired and reasons for this.)

c. Can the host country effectively absorb the remaining funds under this project? Are there sufficient candidates available? Does the host country have an effective HRD planning mechanism or studies that provide good information on training needs? In general, what evidence do you have to support your viewpoint?

d. If given flexibility in planning training activities under Phase II, what types of training have the highest priority for your Mission (both types of training and fields)? (Note: Try to get a fairly detailed list.)

e. What priority would you give to the following areas:

(1) Strengthening training institutions through use of short-term technical assistance. What about the use of OPEX-type TA/training activity? Please discuss.

(2) Using funds to encourage private sector development. (Some examples: banking, finance, small-scale business or industry, cooperatives training, etc.) Please discuss.

(3) Increasing the involvement of women in training for development. (Try to have facts on numbers of trained women before discussing this.) Please discuss.

(4) Improving development management capacity. Should Phase II include specific plans to address training needs in this area? Please discuss.

(5) Use of "training of trainers" approach for multiplier effects.

2. PROCESSING PARTICIPANTS:

a. Would you outline a typical chronology of processing participants for U.S. training for your Mission, noting which stages apply to long-term, short-term or both? (If one of the steps is left out, clarify if this is a slip-up or if in fact Mission does not do it.)

Selection

Pre-departure orientation (administrative, program, cultural)

ELT

Monitoring of training (e.g., being sure reports from Partners or USDA are received and reviewed)

Re-entry

Follow-up

b. How does typical process described earlier vary for third-country training? Please discuss.

c. In your opinion, which of the above-delineated steps are carried out most effectively? Least effectively? Note responses for both U.S. and TC training.

d. What can Phase II include to improve the processing of participants? For U.S. ST? U.S. LT? TC ST? TC LT?

e. Should selection criteria be specified in Phase II-- e.g., the requirement that participants have at least two years of experience in the job area and position before being considered for training, participant must commit himself/herself to working five years in country upon return, etc.?

3. THIRD COUNTRY TRAINING:

a. As you know, this project was designed to also encourage the use of third-country training. Has your Mission increased, decreased or continued the same amount of third-country training as a result of the project? Get statistics and explanation.

4. IN-COUNTRY/REGIONAL SEMINARS:

a. To what extent has the Mission used training funds for in-country and/or regional seminars? Get data on both IC and regional.

b. What is Mission assessment of the IC training activities implemented? Strengths? Weaknesses? (Note: Project Paper called for Mission assessment of each IC seminar. Any documentation or its absence on assessment should be noted.)

c. What suggestions do you have for designing Phase II for improving this type of training?

d. Should limits be put on U.S. training to encourage greater use of this generally more cost-effective method?

4. ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING:

a. What is the Mission's current practice in regard to ELT, including location, length of time, etc.?

b. To what extent did the Mission adhere to the basic minimum TOEFL score to be achieved prior to allowing departure? Discuss reasons for practices followed.

c. Has the Mission implemented any suggestions from the ALIGU study on ELT and predeparture materials? What action has the Mission taken?

5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT:

a. In your opinion, has the project management (PM) mechanism worked well? Discuss in terms of Mission roles/levels.

b. What suggestions do you have for improving the PM in Phase II? Would you prefer a regional field location of PM? AID/W? Please discuss.

c. In your opinion, can your Mission manage an expanded program, including possible third-country training monitoring? (Get as many specifics on response as possible.)

6. PARTICIPANT TRAINING DATA SYSTEM:

a. How does the Mission currently keep participant training information? In logs, on the computer, etc.? Please describe. (Note: Team should observe documents or whatever on the actual method used.) How effective is the current system in your opinion?

b. Does the Mission now have or plan to establish a computer-based participant tracking system? What equipment (hardware and software) is now used or anticipated?

c. Has the Mission requested a software package from ST/IT for participant training?

d. What can Phase II include to facilitate better tracking of participants?

7. EQUIVALENCY:

a. Are you satisfied with the equivalency allotted U.S. degrees in the host country? Please explain, especially noting negative consequences of inadequate equivalency recognition.

b. Do you believe Phase II should address this issue systematically? Discuss.

c. Do you have additional suggestions for improving the cost-effectiveness of training activities overall?

72

ANNEX C No. 2

HOST GOVERNMENT INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Country Training Strategy. To what extent did your Ministry or Department participate in formulating the Country Training Strategy for this training Project? Do you have a copy of the document?
2. Host Government Relationship with Project. What is this Ministry's/Department's role in managing and administering the Project? Who is host government counterpart and what position?
3. Participant Monitoring. Do you receive periodic reports on participant progress in U.S. or third-country training institutions?
4. Training Needs Assessment
 - a. What mechanism or formula have you used to identify your country's training needs? (check the CTS)
 - b. What combination of type, level, and location of training would best suit your country's development needs given the limitation on resources?

short-term	non-degree	technical	U.S.
long-term	degree	vocational	3rd-country
		academic	in-country
 - c. What skill areas are important in improving the effectiveness of government service?
5. Absorptive Capacity of Returned Participants. What growth areas in government do you foresee in the next five years?
6. Impact
 - a. Long-Term Training. What impact has this project had institutionally? Have returned participants been placed in positions which utilize the knowledge and skills acquired from the AID training program?
 - b. In-country Training. What impact have the in-country training seminars had, and how have you assessed these programs?
7. Special Areas
 - a. Strengthening institutions via short-term technical assistance (e.g., special seminars) and/or long-term TA (e.g., OPEX)
 - b. Private Sector Development
 - c. Increase number of women candidates
 - d. Training of trainers approach
 - e. Improving development management capability (i.e., more management training)
 - f. Training for HRD Planning
 - g. Training to encourage policy reform

74

ANNEX C No. 3

DEVELOPMENT PARTICIPANT TRAINING AND INTERVIEW GUIDE

PARTICIPANT REGISTRATION SHEET

NAME: _____ Interview Date: _____

M___ F___ US___ 3rd Country _____ Date Returned _____

Accompanied by Spouse/Family _____

TYPE OF TRAINING _____

Short-Term

Long-Term

___ Observation/Field Tour

___ Diploma/Certificate

___ Workshop/Seminar

___ Undergraduate

___ Short Course

___ Graduate

of weeks/months _____

of months _____

INSTITUTION: _____

FIELD: _____

JOB HISTORY _____

Present Position: _____

Department/Ministry: _____

Former Position: _____

Before leaving for training, did you know what job you would be returning to? ___yes ___no

Is your current job in the same field for which you were trained under the AID program? ___yes ___no

Have you advance in grade or position since returning? ___yes ___no
Is this a result of training? ___yes ___no

Compared to your level of responsibility before training, does your present job have:

- ___ less responsibility
- ___ same responsibility
- ___ more responsibility

COMMENTS: _____

ANNEX C No. 3
GUIDELINES FOR PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS

1. PRE-DEPARTURE PHASE

- a. Selection: How were you selected? (e.g., nominated by supervisor, open competition, committee selection, etc.)
- b. Program Design: To what extent did you participate in planning your program? (e.g., selecting institution or agency to be visited, setting objectives/degree)

2. ORIENTATION AND PREPARATION

- a. Lead-Time: How long had you known about plans for your AID program, and how much notice were you given prior to departure date?
- b. What kind of an orientation did you have before leaving? (e.g., workshop, lectures, videotapes, written materials, etc.) Was this orientation adequate for preparing you for your program?
- c. To what extent were you briefed on the following:
 - administrative aspects (visa, allowances, travel, contacts in country of training, health insurance)
 - technical aspects (program content, schedule, objectives)
 - cross-cultural (living conditions and education system in country of training)

3. IN-COUNTRY TRAINING

- a. What impact has the in-country training seminar etc. had on your work performance?
- b. How satisfied were you with the training objectives, contents, methods and length?
- c. Which training site do you prefer most, on-site or at a central location?
- d. How were you selected for the training program?
- e. Any further suggestions for improving the implementation of in-country training?

4. TRAINING EXPERIENCE IN THE U.S. OR THIRD COUNTRY

a. Arrival Orientation & Contact with AID Program Agent

- (1) What kind of an orientation did you have upon arrival and where? (e.g., WIC, training site)

- (2) How satisfied were you with the orientation? If not, what kinds of information would have facilitated your training experience?
- (3) How satisfied were you with the support provided by the AID Program Agent throughout your training with technical or personal matters?

5. SUPPORT_AT_TRAINING_SITE

- a. How satisfied were you with academic guidance in planning your program? (e.g., choosing relevant courses or research topics; field trips, etc.)
- b. What were the major strengths and weaknesses of your training program? (elicit information on quality, relevance, and appropriateness of training)
- c. Program Completion: Did you finish all your program requirements? Did you finish your program by the date originally planned? If not, why not?
- d. Did you have any adjustment problems with American life and culture or educational system? If so, how satisfied were you with counseling services at training site (e.g., foreign student advisor)?

6. RE-ENTRY_IN_HOME_COUNTRY

- a. De-Briefing: Upon return, did you report to the mission? What kind of de-briefing did you have after finishing your program? By whom?
- b. Contact with USAID: Since returning, how often have you been in contact with the AID mission, either formally or informally?

7. POST-TRAINING RE-ADJUSTMENT: Have you had any difficulties in re-adjusting to your job or life-style since returning?

8. ENGLISH_LANGUAGE_TRAINING

- a) Where and for how long did you study English before your training program?
- b) Did you have any difficulties during your training with the English language in understanding, speaking, reading, or writing?

9. UTILIZATION_OF_TRAINING

- a) Appropriateness: Was your training appropriate (relevant) to your country's local conditions? If not, please explain.
- b) Current Use of Training: Are you using the knowledge and skills acquired from training in your current job? If not, why not? (probe and elaborate)

- c) Constraints to application of training: Have you experienced any constraints to applying the knowledge and skills from training to the performance of your current job? (e.g., lack of resources, lack of support from supervisor, resistance from peers)
- d) Innovative Behavior: What kinds of new activities have you undertaken in your job as a result of training? (e.g., develop or revise policy or operating procedures, develop new projects and proposals, plan workshops, publish works in professional journals, etc.) Elaborate with examples.
- e) How successful have you been in introducing these new activities to your peers and/or supervisors?

10. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- a) Professional Contacts: Since your return, have you corresponded with persons met or agencies visited during training? How frequently?
- b) Professional Associations: Do you belong to any professional association? Do you receive any professional journals or publications?
- c) Alumni Association: Do you meet regularly with other colleagues trained under the AID program? Is this a formal or informal group? Do you think a formalized group would be desirable?
- d) Spread or Multiplier Effect: To what extent have you shared your knowledge and skills from training with your colleagues? Through what channels? (e.g., informal discussion, formal presentation, on-the-job training reports)
- e) Equivalency: Compared to the overseas training of others, does your training have less, more, or the same prestige? In your opinion, have you received sufficient recognition for your degree/training?
- f) Overall Satisfaction: How satisfied are you with your overall training experience? Are there any other problem areas or highlights which we haven't covered? (elaborate)
- g) What suggestions would you have for improving future training programs?

ANNEX D

Possible_Center_Functions

Center_Functions__		Staff_Sources	Users
Training	Local		
Skills		CENACOF CEPETEDE	GOZ
Management Development Development Management Public Administrative, Civil Service		CENACOF CENACOF, CPA Zaire	Para-statal Private Church, PVO
Research	Regional		
Studies Analysis		CENACOF,others	GOZ Para-statal Private Church, PVO
Consulting	International		
Private, para-statal, Roster of available consultants		CENACOF,others	IBRD IMF FAO WHO UNDP UNICEF Bilateral donors
Publications, Research			
Facilities			
Conferences Productivity center			