

APPENDIX D
A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

PDBBV 962

1. BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS.
2. USE LETTER QUALITY TYPE, NOT "DOT MATRIX" TYPE.

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit: Mission or AID/W Office <u>USAID/Rwanda</u> (ES# _____)		B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Skipped <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY <u>83</u> Q <u>3</u>	C. Evaluation Timing Interim <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ex Post <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	--	--

D. Activity or Activities Evaluated (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report.)

Project No.	Project / Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent PACD (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
696-0122	Cooperative Training	89	3/91	1675	1675

ACTIONS

E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
Action(s) Required 1. Evaluate the market potential for sale of training guides.	URD	Jan 1990
2. Promote the training coorespondence course developed through INADES.	IWACU	June 1990
3. Institute a system to recover cost for service rendered.	IWACU	Feb. 1990
4. Install a data base management system.	IWACU	Apr. 1990
5. Accelerate the dissemination of market information to cooperatives.	UAC	Feb. 1990
6. Explore methods to diversify economic activities of cooperatives.	IWACU/UAC	Aug. 1990
7. Continue to emphasize field training.	IWACU	Apr. 1990
8. Plan video and radio production.	UF	June, Aug. Sept. 1990
9. Allocate more resources to two regional delegation offices.	IWACU/CA	Feb. 1990
10. Conduct a consultancy with TechnoServe on assistance to cooperatives in technology adaptation.	UAC	Aug-Sept. 1990
11. Study the current workload of the staff.	IWACU	Jan. 1990
12. Finish the employee compensation study currently underway and take action based on its findings.	IWACU/CA	Feb. 1990
13. Accelerate staff training especially the UAC staff.	IWACU	

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: (Month) 11/28/89 (Day) (Year)

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Name (Typed)	BNiyibizi	FNzabahimana	HMPatrick	JAGraham
Signature				
Date	4/19/90		4/18/90	

ABSTRACT

H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

The Cooperative Training and Research Center (the Center) received a \$1.5 million grant through the National Cooperative Business Association (CLUSA) as Phase II funding to promote the sound growth of the Rwandan cooperative movement by providing them with needed training and other services. This funding was specifically intended to: increase field training to cooperatives; develop new training approaches such as radio and video programs, posters, and a correspondence course; increase field support by forming an Advisory and Support Unit (UAC). The evaluation was to address whether the Center would eventually be self-sustaining and what areas of further USAID funding would be recommended.

Evaluation findings established that the Center has in place an extensive field training and follow-up service for cooperatives, but that this effort has strained the human resources of the Center. The objectives laid out for new training approaches have in general not been met. Radio shows have been minimal, only one video has been produced at a high cost, a very good correspondence course has been developed through IMADES but is not aggressively promoted, and posters have been produced and are found throughout the country but are generally promotional in nature. The UAC has been established and is an important Unit of the Center providing field follow-up services, assistance in obtaining loans, and most recently providing market information. There has been a high turnover in the UAC and currently a low level of experience. The evaluators felt that the Center is serious about being a self-sustaining institution, but felt given the nature of their activity (educational) that some outside funding may always be necessary to maintain its high quality services. Several suggestions for further USAID funding, such as support for UAC marketing activities and more involvement in assisting cooperatives to diversify their activities, possibly by employing more appropriate technologies.

Recommendations include pursuing additional avenues for self-financing, installing and using a database management system to effectively track the impact of training and follow-up services provided by the Center to cooperatives, continue to emphasize field training and continue to rent the Center facility for paying clients whenever possible, identify and implement methods to increase the experience-level of the Center staff, accelerate the dissemination of market information to cooperatives and explore methods to diversify economic activities of cooperatives, increase the promotion of the correspondence course, and suggested some other strategies for video and radio production to increase the impact of these media.

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs				
1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			
Bob Rabatsky	MSI, 600 Water St., SW, NEU 77 Wash. D.C. 20024	PDC-5317-I-00-	3122-00	PDS Project No. 696-0130
Barbara Howald			\$33,810	
Somayire Francois				
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u>10</u> person-days		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u>10</u> person-days		

SUMMARY

J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided)

Address the following items:

- Purpose of evaluation and methodology used
- Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated
- Findings and conclusions (relate to questions)
- Principal recommendations
- Lessons learned

Mission or Office:

Date This Summary Prepared:

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:

The Cooperative Training and Research Center (the Center) received USAID funding through the National Cooperative Business Association (CLUSA) in the form of an CPG for the period August 1985 through June 1989. The goal of the project is to improve the welfare of rural people of Rwanda through the development of an effective and efficient cooperative system. The purpose is to contribute to the sound growth of the Rwandan cooperative movement by supporting a national training and research center designed to provide the needed training and services to Rwandan cooperatives. A second purpose was also defined as the formation and strengthening of the management and commercial activity of sectoral or geographical cooperative unions.

The objective of this evaluation is to assess project progress towards achieving outputs and therefore whether the Phase II project objectives have been attained. Specifically the team assessed:

- the effectiveness of training given by the Center;
- whether the Advisory and Support Unit (UAC) is meeting its objectives and make recommendations to improve its operations;
- the effectiveness of CLUSA's assistance to the Center;
- the institutional capacity of the Center to carry out its role as the Rwandan cooperative training and management institution
- future interventions which A.I.D. might explore to promote the growth of the Rwandan cooperative movement.

The evaluation's assessment of the project activities' contributions to overall project goals made use of a number of techniques: document searches of both primary and secondary data, interviews with Center and other local non-governmental organizations (NGO) staff, local government officials and field visits to cooperatives having benefitted from Center interventions.

A. IMPACT OF THE CENTER ON PROJECT PURPOSE

That the Center does indeed live up to its mandate of being the center for cooperative activity in Rwanda depends on the assumption that it is a viable organization. Measures of the viability of the Center include financial viability, government support of its activities and the management capability of the Center.

The Center has made great strides towards diversifying its revenue base, but there are other avenues that still need to be explored. It is still at issue whether the Center will ever be 100% self-financing, or should be for that matter.

There is little question that the Center is the recognized cooperative development institution in Rwanda. Both the government and other local cooperative service providers look to the Center for guidance, and cooperator identification with the Center is high.

At present staff burnout and high turnover rates are a reality. As a result, some impact on the quality of services rendered may be affected. As a means of addressing an expressed need of cooperative members and as an enlightened management approach towards its personnel, a recent change in staff assignment from a task to a case approach is viewed as a positive development by the evaluation team.

Perhaps one of the most important conclusions to be drawn at the

program level is the potential for problems caused by the lack of a usable management information system at the Center. Follow-up data is collected by either the Training Unit (UF) or the Advisory and Support Unit (UAC) after each training program or field visit, but the data is neither detailed enough to adequately measure the impact of the Center's interventions nor does it serve as a useful tool for planning future follow-ups.

A summary of recommendations focusing on the Center (here in abbreviated form) include:

1. The Center should continue to pursue efforts to diversify revenue sources. However, do not emphasize self-financing as an objective at the expense of program effectiveness.
2. The Center should institute a system to recover the cost for services rendered. Some possibilities include charging a 1% service fee to cooperatives for all loans the Center arranges for them, an annual association fee to cooperatives that have access to the Center's services, a higher charge per day for Kigali-based training programs, a library and research charge, and an emphasis on selling products and services to other cooperative service providers. In general, test the idea that cooperatives are able to pay more for these services.
3. The Center's Unit coordinators should study the current workload of their staff to evaluate whether additional personnel should be added to the technical units. More staff time should be programmed for preparation, documentation of activities, and cross training.
4. The employee compensation study currently in progress should be concluded and the Center's management should take action as soon as possible on its findings.
5. The Center should continue to cultivate collaborative relationships with the GOR and other development organizations.
6. The Center should continue to dedicate resources and time to the establishment of regional delegations. One- or two-person delegations should be established in at least the three planned locations in Rwanda. USAID should consider under Phase III funding to dedicate a portion for the establishment of the three planned regional delegations.
7. The promotion of associations and unions and eventually a federation of cooperatives is a long-term objective of all Center activity. A continued emphasis of this theme should be included in all training and follow-up activities.
8. Install a database management system which includes at least the impact data recommended in Annex 3. It should be kept up to date and regular (monthly at least) status reports should be distributed to Unit coordinators.

B. Advisory and Support Unit

The UAC staffing is presently very short on experience. The Unit has undergone high turnover, with three of the five members having less than 6 months work experience in the Unit. This level of inexperience within the Unit places additional pressure on its coordinator to maintain quality control.

The Rwandan credit union, Banques Populaires, offers a loan guarantee program that is currently managed through the UAC. This is an excellent

mechanism to introduce cooperatives to formalized lending and to enhance their ability to support members' activities. It has been a very successful program in that loans are in great demand and there has been a zero default rate to date. In fact, demand has exceeded supply at this point. Several cooperatives complained that the loan approval process took too long and they missed the harvest activities that the loan is typically intended to finance.

Follow-up visits to cooperatives by UAC personnel are made in conjunction with loan requests or as a means of reinforcing formal training received at the Center. These visits are sometimes too rigidly scheduled and of too short a duration to meet the needs of some of the less experienced cooperatives who have obvious operational problems. Some cooperatives need much more help with their financial management and other technical issues.

Although site visit reports are a regular part of each follow-up visit, records of these interventions are not kept in an orderly nor accessible fashion by the UAC. Information that could be used as a valuable management tool for planning additional follow-up visits is frequently unused. As a result, several cooperatives that need additional intensified management assistance may not be receiving it.

The UAC is increasingly concentrating its efforts on improving the marketing capabilities of Rwandan cooperatives. Commodity and agriculture input prices and availability, improved storage techniques, and cooperative experiences in commercialization or product transformation are made available to members through regular Center newsletters. These activities improve commercialization activities at the village level and hence play a role in increasing farm-based income to cooperators.

Recommendations focusing on the UAC (here in abbreviated form) include:

1. The UAC should concentrate its efforts on measures to reduce staffing turnover and accelerate current staff training. UAC may consider adding one staff member to deal with the current workload.
2. UAC staff should plan to have documentation submitted in a timely manner to avoid loan approval delays. Banques Populaires should consider implementing a system to monitor its loan approval process.
3. UAC should pursue a policy with Banques Populaires to expand the loan guarantee fund so that it more adequately meets loan demand. In addition, the largest borrower Kopishyaka, given its size, should be moved out of the loan guarantee program and into a more formal loan mechanism, in order to free up additional funds for other cooperatives.
4. UAC should pursue self-financing of its services. Suggestions include service fees for loan documentation, charges for site visits and management interventions, and subscription charges for market studies and other commercialization activities.
5. UAC should revise field visit recordkeeping to include more pertinent information on cooperative management ability and financial activity, and put this information on a data base system that can provide management with monthly reports.
6. UAC should give priority to the establishment of 3 regional UAC offices and explore whether USAID funding could be obtained for this decentralization.

7. UAC should continue its efforts to assist cooperatives to diversify their economic activities, including employment of technologies that can transform raw materials and add value. Technoserve could be used as an excellent resource in this area. USAID funding under the upcoming Rural Enterprise Development Project could be earmarked for such activities, since these activities fulfill program-level objectives of increasing rural incomes.
8. UAC should accelerate its efforts to obtain and disseminate timely market information on agriculture commodity and input prices, and also on improved storage and marketing techniques. This information should be disseminated on radio and in the national newspaper as well as in the Center's regular newsletters. USAID should support these activities as part of its private sector programming.

C. Training Unit

So far, the UF - because of personnel turnover, heavy trainer workload on inter-unit tasks, and perhaps a lack of knowledge on what information to monitor - has yet to develop an information system to track the effectiveness of its training. It has compiled primary data on training sessions held and follow-up visits to individual cooperatives. However these records are not kept in an usable nor accessible format. Neither do the records track the long-term impact of UF interventions on the cooperatives.

The original targets of person-days of resident training for the period funded were not strictly achieved; the targets were too high and the emphasis was changed by the Center during Phase II to offer more field training. Nevertheless, training staff are very busy training cooperative members and employees - over four months per year of actual training - excluding preparation and report writing.

The Center's decision to subsidize all Kigali training for coop members reflects its opinion that coops cannot afford the real costs of the training. The Center's experience has also shown that field training and follow-up are the most effective means of training for coops. Therefore it appears that an effective training strategy to pursue would be to conduct the majority of member training in the field and use the Kigali site for other, paying activities. As a financial strategy, replacing non-income producing residential training with paying guests, and doing a much larger portion of training in the field may be a good one.

The fact that the Center has placed increased importance on the training of and collaboration with personnel of other development projects, the communes and other NGOs is more concrete evidence that it is serious about finding strategies to train more people at lower cost. However, the cost of trainers in the field as opposed to trainees in Kigali needs to be compared to the cost and effectiveness of training these other trainers.

The audio-visual (AV) activity for Phase II funding proposes the production of videos, radio shows and posters. The targets appear high, especially considering that the trained AV specialist has recently been appointed coordinator of the UF. Very long production time and the high cost of appropriate equipment may result in this component being less than cost effective, despite the promise media holds for increasing the contact that the Center can have with rural cooperators.

A summary of UF recommendations (here in abbreviated form) follow:

1. All personnel should begin immediately to record their labor on time sheets. These are necessary to track level of effort input to the different activities - essential if cost effectiveness ratings on impact are to be gauged later.
 2. The UF should reorganize the management information system for the Unit, which has been neglected for years.
 3. UF trainers and coordinator should immediately identify that data necessary to tracking UF activities and impact, and work with d-Base knowledgeable people at the Center to create or add to a master client file.
 4. The Center should decrease the number of coops served directly by UF personnel, and increase its emphasis on offering the number of training programs and provision of training materials for other organizations and the "conseiller des groupements."
 5. The UF with the assistance of the Research and Documentation Unit (URD) should evaluate the market potential for the sale of training guides. Instead of selling these manuals on a one-time basis, consider marketing subscriptions to a training manual service.
 6. Since non-cooperative users of the Center's facilities are in a better position to bear the costs for services rendered there, self-financing strategies could potentially go beyond rental of Center facilities to sales of Center training products to these organizations. With URD assistance, analyze this potential market.
 7. If service contracts with other organizations are found to be feasible, the UF should consider providing them not only with participation in a series of training of trainer activities, but with follow-up services in the field.
 8. The UF should experiment more with technical materials suggested by field personnel, such as the monthly financial report format suggested by the Gisenyi Delegation.
 9. The UF should concentrate resources on decentralizing training activities rather than increasing AV production. Limiting video production to two per year appears reasonable, however, these should be less of a promotional and more of a technical training nature. Even if only two videos per year are produced, production difficulties can be largely overcome with better planning of the activity.
 10. The UF in conjunction with URD should research the marketability of training videos. Sale or rental of these videos to other organizations, especially if they are accompanied by a teacher's guide, holds some promise.
 11. De-emphasize production of long radio programs by Center, and instead collaborate with the Ministere de la Jeunesse et du Mouvement Associatif (MIJEUMA) to produce less expensive radio programming, such as 1-2 minute "sketches" or public service announcements.
- D. Research and Documentation Unit

The URD provides its services to the UF and UAC, cooperatives and to other organizations which work with cooperatives. Most of its recent research has been more theoretical than practical, treating broad subjects instead of specific cooperative issues. Only six of the twenty-two studies undertaken from 1984 could be classed as "practical" works.

x
7

The major exception to this phenomenon appears to be the Center newsletter, the circulation of which has grown four-fold over the Phase II funding period.

A correspondence course conducted with the assistance of and managed by L'Institut Africain pour le Developpement Economique et Social (INADES) covers the same technical material as the training courses offered by the Center, and has become known more as an INADES than a Center service.

The Center's library is underutilized by other coop service providers in Rwanda, even though it is situated in Kigali, and despite the publication of a reference manual on cooperative materials available there. NGOs have expressed an interest in more access to the library and a willingness to financially support the service via users' fees. This is a possible means of making the library more profitable in both technical and financial terms.

Recommendations focusing on the URD (here in abbreviated form) include:

1. The Center should utilize the URD for more applied research activities and limit the number of theoretical, less applicable studies.
2. The URD should experiment with ways to re-dynamize the library such as marketing its services and bringing in more dynamic staff.
3. The URD should research the demand for Center library services by other cooperative service providers. Consider the possibility of a subscription fee for library services, and adding a "New Publications Arrived" type of circular to cooperatives and associated organizations on a regular basis.