BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. CONTROL NUMBER
PN-AAH-562

2. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION (695)
AE30-0000-0000

3. TITLE AND SUBTITLE (240)
Planning, design, implementation and evaluation of integrated rural development programs; annual report, 1975/1976

4. PERSONAL AUTHORS (100)

5. CORPORATE AUTHORS (101)
Catholic Relief Services

6. DOCUMENT DATE (110)
1976

7. NUMBER OF PAGES (120)
103p.

8. ARC NUMBER (170)
301.35.C363a-1975/76

9. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION (180)
CRS

10. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (500)

11. ABSTRACT (950)

12. DESCRIPTORS (920)
Project planning
Rural areas
Personnel development
Project implementation
Integrated development
Training methods
Project evaluation
Rural poor

13. PROJECT NUMBER (150)
932006700

14. CONTRACT NO.(140)
AID/pha-G-1117

15. CONTRACT TYPE (140)
GTS

16. TYPE OF DOCUMENT (160)
52

AID 590-7 (10-79)

PN-AAH-562

CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE

1011 First Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022

Telephone: (212) 838-4700 • Cable: CATHWEL New York • Telexes: 224241 and 667207

Most Rev. Edwin B. Broderick, D. D.
Executive Director

Rev. Msgr. Andrew P. Landi
Assistant Executive Director

James J. Norris
Assistant to the Executive Director

301.35
C363a
1975/76

Catholic Relief Services - U.S.C.C.

Development Program Grant

AID/PHA-G-1117

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT

April 1, 1975 - July 31, 1976

Catholic Relief Services - U.S.C.C.

REPORT NO. 1

April 1, 1975 - July 31, 1976

I. GRANT OVERVIEW

Catholic Relief Services (CRS) is the official overseas development, relief and disaster aid agency of the United States Catholic Conference (U.S.C.C.) and has been in existence since 1943.

During the first ten years of existence, CRS laid emphasis on relief and rehabilitation, distribution of U.S. donated foods, distribution of clothing and medicines, and services to European refugees. As developing peoples' needs changed during the past two decades, CRS has been redirecting its efforts to development goals with emphasis on self-help programs of all types: agriculture, health, nutrition, community development, cooperatives, credit unions, and organization of women. Side by side with these programs has been a program of disaster aid that is organized to respond promptly to appeals for the victims of natural and man-made disasters.

An analysis of program experiences over the past five years indicates that CRS is moving away from isolated project activities toward a systems approach to rural development programs at both national and regional levels, with emphasis on applied nutrition, small agriculture, water resources, and cottage industries. Training programs at all levels in basic education, nutrition, family life, health, agriculture, and vocational skills are intrinsic to the program.

To assist CRS with the task of reviewing its planning and evaluation system and to provide technical expertise and funds for training activities in the field of development, the Bureau for Private Humanitarian Assistance of the Agency for International Development approved CRS request for a Development Program Grant in June, 1975.

The grant was signed on June 30, 1975 and was made retroactive to April 1, 1975. It provided CRS with $250,000 for a twelve month period and pledged an additional $400,000 for a second twelve month period and $500,000 for a third twelve month period.

A. Grant Purpose

The stated purpose of this grant is to support a technical field staff and workshops for training regional and country level personnel, to improve the capability of CRS and its

A. Grant Purpose (cont'd)

indigenous counterparts to plan, design, implement and evaluate integral rural development programs in response to the aspirations and needs of the rural poor with special attention to women. Programs will be directed to improving the quality of life through attitudinal change, the promotion of local development structures (primarily at the village level), and sectoral emphasis on food, nutrition, health, education, and human resource development.

B. Expected Outcomes

Some of the more important results of this project expected to be achieved by the end of the three year grant period are:

(1) Increased number of integrated programs, especially linking food production, nutrition, and human resource development.

(2) Redesigned systems for planning, implementing and evaluating development programs and their components: needs and resources, surveys, priorities, planning cycles, evaluation methodologies, etc.

(3) Trained personnel at the country and regional levels of CRS and counterpart organizations, and in some cases, of project participants themselves.

(4) Allocations of increasing amounts of CRS and counterpart resources, both personnel and funds, to development priorities.

(5) Greater financial support from development funding sources, in response to improved program design.

(6) Linkages between technical and other in-country resources and the rural poor.

(7) Coordination with private sector, host government and foreign assistance/development agencies.

II. GRANT IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of this grant did not begin (with the exception of a planning seminar held April 20, 1975 in Dakar for the Africa Region personnel) until July, 1975 and then only on a

reduced basis until funds became available November 10, 1975, when the Letter of Credit was issued.

Implementation of the grant is divided among the five Regions in accordance with the particular priorities and programs of each. The various Regional implementation plans are coordinated at CRS headquarters by the technical officer.

A. Staffing

In July, 1975, the CRS Executive Director, Bishop Swanstrom, created a new office called the Office of Special Assistant for Government Grants, to be responsible for the Development Program Grant (DPG), all Operational Program Grants (OPGs) and liaison with U.S. Government. The personnel of this office are:

Father Robert Charlebois	Special Assistant
Julie Villaume	Deputy Special Assistant
Richard Redder	Deputy Special Assistant
Grace Hauck	Secretary
Madeline Ryan	Secretary
Judy Woodburn	Secretary

Father Charlebois, Miss Villaume and Mr. Redder have each served with CRS in overseas programs for more than ten years and, therefore, bring to this office and their new responsibility, a wealth of practical experience as well as a knowledge of the problematics of development in several of the important program regions of CRS.

In addition to these headquarters staff, a number of field staff were employed to provide some of the technical expertise required for the implementation of the activities supported by this grant.

B The following personnel were brought on DPG staff during the first year of the grant:

1	Raymond Panczyk	- Planner/Evaluator	Region III
2	Glen Knapp	- Agricultural Technician	Region III

A. Staffing (cont'd)

3	Eduardo Bracamonte	- Planning Consultant/ coordinator	Region V
C	Otto Flores	- Rural Sociologist - Consultant (short-term)	Region V
C	Rodrigo Parra	- Sociologist - Consultant (short-term)	Region V
C	Patricio Rubianes	- Economist - Consultant (short-term)	Region V
C	Maria Cristina Salazar	- Sociologist - Consultant (short-term)	Region V
C	Carlos Castillo	- Sociologist - Consultant (short-term)	Region V
C	Humberto Rojas	- Sociologist - Consultant (short-term)	Region V
C	Alfonso Gortaire	- Anthropologist - Consultant (short-term)	Region V
* 4	Alan Taylor	- Planner/Evaluator	Region IV
5	Harry Nugent	- Planner/Evaluator	Region I

$.A

7 Consultants

In summary, CRS has since the beginning of this grant added eight full-time professional staff and eight part-time consultants, all of whose work is dedicated exclusively to development programming at headquarters and regional level. AID has been informed previously of the background and qualifications of all technical staff, hired to date, whose remuneration derives from DPG funds.

I.Q.C. Consultants

During the period under report, CRS contacted seven of the AID approved Indefinite Quantity Contractors (IQC) to ascertain their capabilities and qualifications in relation to the type of consultation services required by CRS under our Development Program Grant. None of these IQC's was found to have the particular expertise and familiarity with the type of program CRS carries out. In continuing our search, we have discovered Strategies for Responsible Development (SRD)

4 - left - 5/76

of the University of Dayton, whose background data was presented to AID in June. We are convinced that SRD has unique qualifications to provide CRS with a very professional assessment and redesignment of the CRS planning and evaluation process. Negotiations with SRD are continuing towards approval and initiation of their work by January, 1977.

B. Program Activities by Region

The following are reports by each of the regions which had substantial activities during this report period:

SUB-SAHARA AFRICA REGION

RATIONALE

The Africa Regional D.P.G. concept grew out of efforts which were initiated in early 1973. After a management training workshop, held in Cotonou, Dahomey in March of 1973, it was the general consensus that the programs could profit from focused and refined program plans for each country and specific technical assistance which programs could call upon, particularly in the agricultural efforts.

The concept of a more comprehensive and complementary approach to the development efforts of the Region was further encouraged by CRS/NY. This was done so as to be better able to respond to the requests from priority areas of concern for the Agency.

For this reason, and when the opportunity arose during 1974 to obtain financing for additional staff services aimed at improving the development capabilities of our field programs, the Region responded by requesting two additional staff persons. The services of a Planner/Evaluator were secured. The function of this Planner/Evaluator is to assist program directors to evaluate their ongoing activity with a view towards assessing its coherence and linkage with agency and regional goals, as well as to assist directors and their counterparts, where applicable, to improve their management capabilities. The implication in this approach was that if the programs have a strong administrative basis for their ongoing activities they will be better able to plan and implement future, more effective development programs.

As a complement to the Planner/Evaluator, it was felt that a person technically qualified in African agriculture was needed. This person would assist program directors, and where applicable, their counterparts, to address specific agricultural related questions in their ongoing, as well as planned, activity.

The combination of these two emphases should lay the groundwork for program and project development that is comprehensive in its address to problems and should be integrated in its approach to implementation.

ATTAINMENT OF INDICATOR

The objectives which the Region laid out for itself have been met for the most part:

1) Meetings

   YEAR I - April 21, 1975 - 14 days
   Held in Banjul, Gambia
   Training and Management
   Attended by: All Program Directors and Regional Staff as well as selected Agency support staff and representatives of the Executive.

YEAR II - March 22 and 23, 1976
Held in Dakar, Senegal
To review, with DPG Team and four Country Directors, as well as two Regional Staff, Special Assistant, OPG/DPG Office, the programs to date on the D.P.G.

2) Staff: - Mr. Raymond K. Panczyk - Planner/Evaluator (Appointment effective - November 1, 1975)

Mr. Glen Knapp - Agricultural Technician (Appointment effective - September 28, 1975)

3) Staff Training:

AID/Washington - Planning and Evaluation Seminar
Kenneth Hackett - Assistant to Regional Director - December 1975
Rev. T. J. Mulkerin - Assistant Regional Director - December 1975
Glen Knapp - Agricultural Technician - 1975
Raymond K. Panczyk - Planner/Evaluator - October 1976

ACTIVITY TO DATE

The Team has made preliminary visits to Gambia, Upper Volta, Sudan, Ethiopia, and while resident in Dakar, they have visited various sections of Senegal. During these initial visits the Team has made specific recommendations relative to the management and administration on ongoing activities, as well as options for either altered operational formats or variations in emphasis.

The Team has been the focal point of the Region's DPG activity to date. This builds, however, on the two management seminars - one in Banjul financed under the DPG, and one in Cotonou, Benin (Dahomey), which was financed by CRS private sources.

Since it is generally accepted that there is a demand for CRS to remain operational in Africa, in the sense that we will maintain a staff and office in specific countries, and in many instances be asked to take an administrative role in development activity, then the basis of much of the Team's activity has to be leveled at improving management competence.

In this vein the Team visited Gambia, Upper Volta, Sudan and Ethiopia. They were able to make a number of recommendations on improved systems for control and management of project activity. Specifically, they were able to highlight instances where inadequate data collection or inadequate analysis led to expensive complications in project management and accountability to donors. They suggested basic information which should be available prior to the approval and financing of specific projects. It in essence calls for a tighter, more refined focus to what we will do in a specific country.

It was obvious from their comments and recommendations that a program planning document is an absolute necessity for improved program management. We found that the programs were spread in such a myriad of activities that it was difficult for New York or the Program Director to make valid decisions on resource allocations.

The Team found that, in a few cases, the funding pressures and availability of funds have in themselves caused an environment for inadequate project management. From the NY side, inadequate attention was being given to support for the concepts of accountability, and possibly, too much emphasis on volume of activity. Within this environment, project directors did not always have the motivation to implement systems of project accountability and control which would support project goal attainment. Consequently, the Region has implemented a tighter analysis of projects prior to their funding. The Region hopes to call upon greater technical expertise in analyzing project design by utilizing the services of the Team and other consultants, as well as technical assistance agencies.

A second function which the Team lent its efforts to was in the direction of project management and the identification of integrated rural development activities. There were specific instances in Sudan and Ethiopia where the Team was asked to assist the programs in the development of projects. In the case of Ethiopia, the agricultural technician is planning to return to assist with an agricultural survey, which will provide baseline data for the expansion of an agricultural program that was an outgrowth of a resettlement program in the Gemu Gofa area.

In Sudan, the Team focused its efforts on the refinement of a water program in the Southern Region. This program had been on the drawing board for almost three years. With the Team's input, we now have a clearer indication of what we are up against in our involvement with this effort.

During this same time the Team visited Mali, where CRS has no resident staff but has been supporting a large well sinking program. The information they were able to assemble provides the Region with much needed background on our past operation in that country - where we had a program director from 1974-1976 - and a focus of what might be our attitude toward future involvement.

IMPLICATION FOR NEXT PROGRAM YEAR

The Region has decided to maximize the services of the Team by splitting them in their travels. Up to this point, they have worked as a team in most cases.

We now feel that there are specific countries that would best profit from one or the other's services, but not necessarily together.

Further, during the first reporting period, the focus of the Team has been strictly on CRS existing programs. We hope that their services can be made available as well to counterpart organizations, e.g., INADES, CARITAS, BECAD, etc. The emphasis will still remain on the improvement of managerial capabilities so as to be able to identify and implement integrated and comprehensive programs for development.

From the Regional Office, much more support must be given to the Program in project analysis and advice on programming direction. The Region will place further emphasis on detail evaluation of each project proposal before approval for funding is given. Further, continued emphasis will be given to the Program Planning concept, collaboration with counterparts and a process of problem analysis with participant involvement.

These points will continue to be highlighted in management planning sessions scheduled for February, 1977 as well as in project analysis.

The techniques proposed in regard to project appraisal and monitoring will be considered in the context of the rewriting of the Manual of Socio-Economic Development and the activities of the I.Q.C., once they come on board.

Further, the activities of the team served to highlight the necessity of close monitoring of program development and the provision of adequate technical and financial support in a timely fashion. It is hoped that within the upcoming year the Agency can respond to this demand for our field program to make them better able to serve the people of the countries where they are located.

SOUTH AMERICA REGION

After an extensive consultation among our field staff and counterpart leadership, DPG activities were begun in this region in March, 1976. The approach outlined in amendment No. 1 dated March 26, 1976 has been generally followed in the first six months of implementation. As we have learned from our experiences, the emphasis of our DPG activities has evolved further, a process we will attempt to describe in this report.

As our plan indicated, our focus is on the four Andean countries where CRS has been active for many years - Colombia, Ecuador, Perú and Bolivia. Considering the relative homogenity of the region, strengthened by the Andean Pact, it was logical that we attempt to evolve a more systematic approach to planning our development programs first in these four countries. It was always our intention that this effort be a pilot one, which would then be useful to the region as a whole, and, of course, eventually to the agency.

The initial three months of activity, March through June, were dedicated to a period of reflection and diagnosis. Each CRS office reviewed its existing program in the light of the country's needs and resources. DPG funds were made available for two basic inputs during this period; the contracting of consultants to assist in this process and the funding of seminars which could allow us to identify and study key problems that should be objects of attention of ourselves and those we work with. The results of this diagnosis, then, laid the basis for a more concrete effort to plan our development programs.

The objectives of this phase were only partially met. Each country did contract a consultant or consultants with outstanding credentials in this field. With the exception of Perú, each country did organize seminars with a broad range of participants from private agencies on themes that varied according to the priorities of the country. Summaries of these seminars are attached.

The problems encountered, however, are extremely worthy of note. With the exception of one or two consultants, most of our program staff felt the consultants did not provide the inputs we had hoped. Several reasons are clear:

1) Most of the consultants had little background on CRS programs, which meant their advice often did not reflect the constraints under which we operate.

2) Our field staff was inexperienced in managing this type of input, and had difficulties in utilizing this expertise.

3) There were misunderstandings among our counterparts, who

feared these consultants would exercise decision-making functions and make CRS an implementing agency.

4) Although exchange of experiences and information among the four countries was deemed useful, there was some reserve in accepting the usefulness of an expert from one country working in another.

The most successful consultants were those who had a background in CRS programs or who were hired for a specific function, such as organizing and conducting a seminar.

The seminars were found to be most useful in placing CRS in contact with various government and private agencies, nationally and locally oriented, that had only peripherally been involved in our past programs. By focusing on problems felt important by all, the seminars allowed CRS to catalyze collaboration among these agencies as well as provide an education to our own staff. In Perú it was simply not possible to develop a consensus within our traditional counterpart, Caritas, or among possible participating agencies to make such an activity possible.

The work accomplished in this initial phase culminated in our first International Seminar in June. Participants included Bishops encharged with Social Action by their respective Conferences, administrators of our traditional counterpart (Cartias) agencies, representatives and technical personnel from Caritas and other private agencies with whom CRS works, and CRS Regional Office, DPG office and field staff. This cross-section of participants provided an extremely fruitful feed-back essential to future CRS planning.

This feed-back summarized in Attachment 1 leads us to three vital considerations:

1) The reflection and diagnosis initiated in the first three months needs to be continued and strengthened. It is essential that in order for CRS to participate in the development process that its personnel have a profound understanding of social pastoral plans, the Latin American reality and CRS capabilities, all of which can lead to a different interpretation of CRS's role in South America.

2) The success of CRS's mission depends greatly on the preparation of local level leaders and an infraestructure that can serve communities in their attempts to help themselves. Therefore, more attention needs to be paid to activities that will contribute to this objective.

3) In line with the above, CRS should contribute to an up-grading of planning at all levels. First, by planning better our own activities, and

then by working in collaboration with others to plan development programs. Integrated rural development is a valid priority concern, but needs to be adopted to the capabilities of each community.

These considerations are important in explaining the rationale behind the next phase of the implementation of the DPG. It became clear that it is essential to keep the DPG in its proper perspective, which is that the grant provides one contribution toward what is an overall CRS effort. Therefore, the planning of the use of DPG resources must be carefully coordinated with all CRS resources.

We are continuing to program DPG resources into two basic areas. They are technical assistance inputs and seminar support.

Considering the experience so far, the technical assistance as contracted during the first three months of the DPG has not been continued. With the exception of one consultant, Dr. Eduardo Bracamonte, all future consultants will be hired on a specific need basis, such as the organization of seminars, rendering of technical assistance to specific programs and projects and evaluations. We believe this approach is more realistic for our needs and serves as a model that can be continued after the DPG ends.

Dr. Bracamonte, who combines technical expertise with a long experience in church and CRS programs will become a full-time coordinator for this program in the Andean Region. He will consult with each country program staff as they formulate their plans and help to organize training seminars, particularly those on an international level, and, as possible, contribute to training seminars in each country.

Each country program, then, has organized a program of training activities for the July-December period in concert with our counterparts which will to varying degrees address itself to the three considerations of the June International Seminar. The details of each country's activities are included as attachments, but in general they all represent a coordinated effort to organize training activities to prepare better local organizations to undertake development programs and to study priority concerns that will improve CRS and our principal counterparts' staff capabilities.

It is our plan that each country's program staff in December (with Dr. Bracamonte's assistance) will evaluate the effectiveness of the activities undertaken. This evaluation and the work of the previous year will be the basis of the formulation of CRS workplans for 1977. These workplans will consist of four basic elements:

1) Problem areas of priority concern to CRS in each country, thereby making

explicit the premises for CRS involvement in development activities.

2) Indication of promotional and training activities planned for 1977 and budgetary requests, resources available from the DPG.

3) Indication of project activities on-going and to be developed during 1977 including budgetary projections of needed CRS inputs.

4) Plan of utilization of personnel in function of the above program, including outside consultants, counterpart personnel, etc. and financial requirements.

These workplans would be evaluated constantly by the field staff and serve as an administrative tool and a means to judge the effectiveness of our program in each country.

This evaluation and these workplans will be instrumental in helping us to plan the continuation of our activities with the DPG. At this time, it is probable we will prefer to continue the present approach rather than move to the formation of a three person technical team. Although it is possible Dr. Bracamonte will need an assistant in his coordinating role, we expect the use of consultants will be vitally important both to organize training activities and for technical assistance in the planning of specific development interventions.

It is our plan also to hold our second International Seminar under the DPG with all South American countries participating next March. We will utilize this opportunity to develop practical themes that affect our development work. The specific content of the seminar is now being planned.

SOUTH AMERICA REGION

Attachment I - Summary report on Seminar on Country Planning - Andean Region - Quito, Ecuador June 20 - 26, 1976

Attachment II - Report on Seminar on Rural Development among Indigenous and Campesinos of La Sierra - Quito, Ecuador April 25 - 29, 1976

Attachment III - Report on Seminar on Methodology of Country Program Planning - Paipa, Colombia May 10 - 13, 1976

Attachment IV - Report on National Seminar on Productivity, Quality and Commercialization of Basic Products in Bolivia - La Paz, Bolivia May 31 - June 4, 1976

Attachment V - Projected Training Activities July - December, 1976

SUMMARY REPORT ATTACHMENT

SEMINAR ON CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES COUNTRY PLANNING

ANDEAN REGION OF SOUTH AMERICA

Quito, Ecuador June 20-26, 1976

Catholic Relief Services and counterpart agency personnel from Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador met in Quito in June to report on, discuss, and revise CRS plans and planning processes as carried out beginning in 1976 in the aforementioned countries. Since CRS programs, as well as relationships with the local Church, vary from country to country, it was felt that such an interchange of points of view would be highly stimulating and mutually valuable to all concerned.

In preparation, each country program prepared a written document containing an exposition of the physical, social, and economic situation of the country, objectives and goals of CRS in each country, and initial plans for attaining said objectives and goals. In support of this activity, each country was allowed a certain amount of funds from the CRS Development Program Grant (DPG) to hire part-time consultants and to hold seminars or courses that would contribute to the proposed planning process in each country. Just as the position of CRS in relation to the Church in each country varies, so did the preparative steps taken by each country program for the international seminar in Quito.

In Ecuador, for example, CRS works directly with the Ecuadorean Bishops Conference with which there is a long history of close collaboration and mutual understanding. Little time, therefore, needed to be spent in discussing institutional relationships or if, indeed, the DPG was "appropriate" for Ecuador. Rather, from the beginning, the funds available from the DPG were viewed by both CRS/Ecuador and the Bishops Commission for Human Promotion (PH) as simply another of a number of resources to be taken advantage of in order to improve our

ability to be of assistance in chosen areas of mutual endeavor.

As the first step in initiating the DPG program, CRS/Ecuador and Promoción Humana (PH), decided to sponsor a seminar that would have a manifold utility for all involved:

1) The subject matter, Rural Development in Indigenous and Peasant Areas of the Ecuadorean Sierra, would be of significant importance to all;

2) By sponsoring such a seminar, CRS/PH would be opening the door to future colaboration with a number of Church-oriented or affiliated organizations;

3) Through participation in the course, numbers of actual and potential project holders would gain knowledge of and have direct access to a number of potential funding sources (including CRS and PH) as well as sources of project/development advice and consultancy;

4) CRS/PH would gain invaluable additional knowledge of grass-root development activities leading to possible future interventions in these areas; and finally

5) A forum would be provided whereby numbers of project holders involved in diverse development activities throughout the Andean region of Ecuador would be able to exchange ideas, methodologies, and points of view, thus enirching said development activity.

As for the planning process itself, it was decided that a <u>joint plan</u> (as opposed to a "CRS plan") would be devised taking as starting point the entire calendar of proposed activites in which PH hoped to become involved, pin-pointing where CRS and PH interests coincide, and, in effect, extracting the joint plan from the overall PH Plan based on said coincidences of interest in traiditional and/or proposed areas of endeavor.

In Colombia, it was decided that the national seminar to be held should be more of an in-house exercise with participants coming from among organizations (both national and diocesan levels) that have traditionally been close collaborators with CRS over the years. The principal goal of this meeting would be an actual initiation of the country planning process through accomplishment of the following objectives:

1) Creation in CRS Colombia of a critical awareness of the need for reflection and self-evaluation;

2) Definition of the nature and role of CRS in Colombia;

3) Development of criteria for a planning process for the CRS Program in Colombia.

In Bolivia, yet another plan of action was devised. A seminar of the highest level on a subject of urgent national concern (Commercialization of Bolivian Agricultural Products) was held with the participation of the Bolivian Government (Ministries of Campesino Affairs and Agriculture, Planning, Industry and Commerce, Central Bank), intermediate agencies involved in production and commercialization (National Rice Enterprise, Bolivian Coffee Committee, Study Commission on Cotton and Sugar, Cotton Producers Association, etc.), international organizations (BID, IICA, FAO), and a number of national institutions of various levels (National Institute of Cooperatives, Central Menonite Committee of Santa Cruz, and, to the extent possible, producers groups, cooperatives, etc.).

The Bolivia seminar was planned in two stages, first, a week-long delineation of the problem and development of conclusions, and second, after a refinement of the conclusions by the GOB (Ministries and Central Bank), an afternoon round-table discussion with the concerned ministers.

The point of this seminar in terms of CRS' future plans in Bolivia, aside from discussion of a vitally important question that has direct bearing on rural development activites, was to bring CRS/Bolivia into contact with a wide range of state and private agencies. In a sense sponsorship of such a seminar by CRS would help to build credibility and affirm credentials in the development field of an agency that heretofore was considered one of social welfare.

Due to a series of unpropitious circumstances, CRS/Peru was unable to carry out its plans for a national-level seminar before the June meeting in Quito.

The first international seminar in the South American region to be held under the CRS DPG, then, was designed to bring together these several experiences in a single forum so that each could be studied and analyzed by the entire group, that each country program would receive feed-back, refinement and/or enrichment through this process, and a number of common general lines of action could be identified that could be the basis of future CRS activities in the four countries.

The following methodology was employed:

1) Each country presented a resume of its situation, plans and objectives for the immediate future. Previously, printed documents of these plans were distributed to each participant. Three work groups were then formed to discusss these country presentations in terms of a number of predeterminated interrogatories. The recommendations, observations, and suggestions made by these work groups was then used by each country in a special session dedicated to initial revision or revamping of its plan.

2) The next part of the seminar was dedicated to identification of the above mentioned general lines of action as well as limiting factors common to the four country presentations.

Instead of the three randomly selected work groups as were used previously, for this section of the seminar the participants were divided into: a) CRS Program Directors; b) CRS Assistants; c) presidents (bishops) and national directors of Caritas, and d) professional personnel.

The attached documents give a chronological resume of the entire seminar ineluding details of the results of the work groups formed to discuss each presentation and how each country reacted and/or readjusted its program planning as a result of work groups feed-back received. It was felt that this particular exercise was of great value not only to the individual countries in terms of the final polished plans that will eventually evolve therefrom,but that the process itself, with minor exception, was carried out in a spirit of mutually supportive congeniality between the several countries as well as between CRS, as representative of the Catholic Church of the U.S.A., on one hand, and representatives of several Latin American Catholic hierarchies, on the other.

The final part of the seminar involved the discussion, as a training exercise, of a paper presented by Dr. Hans Hoyer, Regional Development Consultant. Dr. Hoyer's paper, entitled "Criteria for CRS", as a resume of basic concepts of development (participation, organization, commitment, etc.). As before, this presentation was analyzed in groups in terms of specific predetermined questions to be dealt with by each group. Document Nº 10 gives the results of these particular discussions.

Document Nº 11 "Conclusiones" was prepared as a working document by a special commission named by the plenary. This document was then studied, modified, and approved as Document Nº 12 "Final Document of the Seminar", by the entire assembly as its final act before official closure of the seminar.

The seminar ended with a luncheon attended by His Eminence, Cardinal Pablo Muñoz Vega, Archbishop of Quito, USAID Officials including Mr. Harry Ackerman, Director of AID/Ecuador, as well as all the participants in the seminar.

T R A N S L A T I O N

SEMINAR ON CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES

COUNTRY PLANNING - ANDEAN REGION -

"FINAL DOCUMENT OF THE SEMINAR"

(June 20-26, 1976)

I. Observations and Criteria for the Action of CRS

1. Reinterpretation - The realization of a subjective diagnostic study by means of a questionnaire that would contemplate the following matters:

   1.1 Solicit information concerning CRS personnel;

   1.2 And at the same time request collaborating institutions to offer information concerning what they think are desirable characteristics for CRS personnel.

   1.3 The objectives sought through this questionnaire are:

      1.3.1 Self-evaluation

      1.3.2 To facilitate a "refitting" program by CRS

      1.3.3 To gather information concerning the human resources that CRS maintains at various levels to be applied for South America.

   1.4 As a tentative date for the above, the first week of August is indicated.

   1.5 The follow-up stage will be structured according to the necessities demonstrated; for which the following support activities are contemplated:

      1.5.1 Seminars

      1.5.2 Training Courses

      1.5.3 Technical assistance for specific tasks

1.5.4 Complementary activities whose necessity may appear during the execution of the present tentative plan.

2. An attitude of openness among the institutions of the Church - Consequent to the "refitting" effort of CRS, and parallely to its realization, attitudes of openness between the Church of the United States and South America should be encouraged, which would imply:

   2.1 The urgency of a theoretic definition and operative planning of the social pastorate in each country (of South America);

   2.2 The greatest comprehension of this definition on the part of the United States Church;

   2.3 CRS can play an important part in the inter-relating of Church Institutions, utilizing the existing known channels of relation between the respective episcopal conferences.

3. Reinterpretation of the role of CRS - The open dialogue between the United States and South American Church would signify, undoubtedly, an attitude of reinterpreting the role of CRS by the directors of that institution.

4. Integral Rural Development - In this regard, there arises for CRS the necessity to clarify its criteria when it refers to integral rural development. Once this clarification is done, it and the resulting operational changes should be disseminated among social, diocesan, etc. institutions.

   As basic elements of this change, the following are pointed out:

   4.1 A commitment of action and follow up (this includes evaluation, a permanent assistance in favor of integral development, etc) and the strengthening of the infrastructure of the local Church.

   4.2 This concept does not necessarily deal only with large programs, and could involve small pilot projects.

   It is desirable that such projects would serve to strengthen the Social Pastorate and assure, as a policy, the conscious participation of the "campesino".

II. <u>Elements in Common between CRS and Collaborating Institutions</u>

1. Positive Elements

   1.1 These institutions work with a pastoral criteria.

1.2 Their favored option is for rural areas;

1.3 Building on the base community;

1.4 As a service for integral development;

1.5 Promoting training at all levels;

1.6 CRS finds itself in a constant search for its identity;

1.7 As an institution of the Church its identity in other countries expresses itself through service to the local Church through its support in the socio-economic field.

1.8 As support, its service is based on experience in working with the less favored, based on the existence of plans (although incipient) for each CRS office in the Andean region and the dialogue with other institutions that work in the same field.

1.9 Beyond that already indicated, CRS has and can get resources that, though they are limited, support social action in the region.

2. Constraining Elements.

2.1 Clarification of the identity of CRS as an agency of the Church; it is necessary to continue to develop explicit values, objectives, criteria and forms of operating;

2.2 Clarification of the identity of collaborating agencies;

2.3 Too much theorizing and limited operationality among the national or collaborating institutions, and little technical depth in CRS;

2.4 Insufficient preparation of the personnel of these institutions.

2.5 The Bishops have insufficient information concerning activities and functions of CRS as well as other international organizations;

2.6 Limitation on resources provided by CRS and the Christian communities of the Andean countries for implementing programs of the social pastorate;

2.7 Bureaucratic procedures that are extremely lengthy at the New York level for an opportune approval of the request for financial assistance needed for the implementation of programs and projects;

2.8 Lack of a mechanism for opportune financing of concrete national CRS programs as well as that of the counterpart institutions.

III. Recommendations to CRS

1. That in its concrete planning, CRS take into account the identity and individuality of the institutions of the local Church.

2. That CRS deepen its knowledge of the social pastorate and of the plans in each country in relation to their theological and social fundamentals.

3. Take into account in the international meetings of CRS the mechanisms of coordination of the Social Pastorate of the area, such as: Department of Social Action of CELAM, the Corresponsalía Bolivariana of Caritas, Justice and Peace, etc.

4. In its programming, CRS should take into account the indicated priorities of the local Church;

5. And that the dialogue among institutions be maintained.

6. Take advantage of the experiences in rural development of Church and other national and international institutions of Latin America concerning participation and organization;

7. That CRS support and participate in the technical improvement of plans and personnel of local collaborating institutions.

8. Concrete objectives:

   8.1 Study and planning seminars.

   8.2 National and international training courses for various levels.

   8.3 Local investigative studies.

   8.4 Compilation of documentation.

   8.5 Joint participation in the execution of pilot plans.

   8.6 Support for national courses concerning development and Social Action.

   8.7 An informative bulletin of CRS activities in the four countries.

8.8 Participation of CRS in international activities relating to social problems that collaborating institutions undertake.

8.9 That CRS and collaborating institutions in each country, review their planning and put them up for consideration at a future international seminar.

8.10 That the possibility be studied of allocating to each CRS program funding corresponding to a concrete program presentation.

8.11 That the possibility be studied of accelerating the approval process of projects.

8.12 That each of the offices of CRS in the four countries establish concrete and quantifiable objectives, that can be evaluated at a future international seminar.

SEMINARIO INTERNACIONAL ANDINO
"DESARROLLO RURAL INTEGRAL"
CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES-USCC
Quito, 20-25 de junio, 1976

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NAMES	INSTITUTION
BOLIVIA	
Ing.Agrón.Jaime Alba A.	Caritas Boliviana Dpto. Socio-Económico
Dr. Eduardo Bracamonte Estivariz	CRS/Bolivia Asesor-DPG
Obispo Adhemar Esquivel	Conferencia Episcopal Dpto. de Acción Social
Señor David W. Loretan	CRS/Bolivia
Antropólogo Mario Montaño Aragón	Caritas Boliviana Dpto. Socio-Económico
Señor Robert Parker	CRS/Bolivia
Sociólogo Edgar Solís V.	CRS/Bolivia
BRASIL	
Antropólogo Hans Hoyer	CRS/Brasil
COLOMBIA	
P.Joaquín Castro G.	Secretariado Nacional de Pastoral Social

Econ. Miguel Gómez	CRS/Colombia Coordinador Dpto. de Proyectos
P. Darío Molina J.	Secretariado Nacional de Pastoral Social
Señor Lynn Renner	CRS/Colombia
Obispo Pedro Rubiano S.	Conferencia Episcopal Comisión de Acción Social
Ing. Industrial Pablo Stiefken H.	Conferencia Episcopal Centro de Promoción de Proyectos de Desarrollo (CENPRODES)
P. Germán Silva Hurtado	Caritas Arquidiocesana de Cali.
Señor John Hingerter	CRS/Colombia

ECUADOR

Señor César Astudillo	Promoción Humana, Bienestar Social
P. José V. Equiguren	Promoción Humana, Secretario Ejecutivo
Sociólogo Wagner Molina	Promoción Humana, Departamento de Proyectos
Señor Hernán Montero Z.	Promoción Humana, Departamento de Proyectos
Señor Mark E. Reilly	CRS/Ecuador

Econ. Patricio Rubianes	CRS/Ecuador
Mons. Raúl Vela Ch.	Conferencia Episcopal, Secretario General

PERU

Señor Kevin Cahalan	CRS/Perú
Señor Joseph Casey	CRS/Perú
Señor Vernon Ficklin	CRS/Perú
P. Enrique León	Caritas del Perú, Secretario General

U.S.A.

Econ. Richard Redder	CRS/New York
Sociólogo Daniel Santo Pietro	CRS/New York

VI-23-76.-

PLANNING OF SEMINAR. ATTACHMENT II

Initial steps in the planning of this seminar were taken in conjunction with Commission for Human Promotion (PH) of the Ecuadorean Bishops Conference (CEE). Our preliminary objective was to host a seminar that would contribute to a greater understanding of a relatively isolated problem area, both within CRS and PH as well as between agencies, institutions, and project holders dealing with the specific problem on a day-to-day basis. It was decided to begin a process of narrowing the scope of CRS activities, as per the recommendations made at the CRS/South America meeting in Cartagena in 1975, by limiting the seminar both geographically and by subject.

An analysis of present and future project possibilities led us to choose the Andean region of Ecuador as top priority for future CRS activities, eliminating, at least temporarily, both the coastal and eastern jungle areas. Within the Andean region we chose to concentrate on rural areas, and of the rural population, give highest priority to indigenous people. This was later expanded somewhat, at least for this seminar, to include projects with rural people of mixed blood, or campesinos.

Once we had established these basic objectives we sought the services of an expert who would be responsible for the design, planning, and implementation of the seminar. We were fortunate in being able to contract the services of Alfonso Gortaire, an Ecuadorean social anthropologist of wide experience in the field of indigenous affairs, not only in Ecuador but a number of Latin American countries.

With Alfonso Gortaire on-board as special consultant in charge of the seminar, we proceeded to develop a number of specific objectives as well as a methodology, as follows:

OBJECTIVES OF THE SEMINAR.

1) Sharing of experiences through presentation of projects and activities on three levels: National or regional agency or institution, both private and governmental; Diocesan level; level of direct intervention (project level).

2) Exposition of actual situation (political, social, economic) from a national as well as rural/indigenous viewpoint.

3) Dialogue with the public (government) sector to learn about its resources, experience, and plans for development of the rural areas, as well as to expose government authorities to points of view of participants in the seminar.

4) Identification and analysis of several development models (integrated, educational, pastoral, economic, social, assistencial, etc.).

5) Development of "synthesized methodology." This will be a conglomerative result of all the various experiences related during the first days of the seminar, and will be one of the principal conclusions of the seminar.

6) Discovery of lines of mutual support and/or common action.

In consultation with PH and the bishops of the nine Andean dioceses a list of invitees was drawn up. Each person received a written as well as personal invitation via a visit by CRS and/or PH staff personnel. Each invitee was interviewed and explanations given him regarding the methodology of the seminar. Each was asked to prepare, in advance of the seminar, two papers: one, an evaluation of the rural situation in which the invitee is involved (form of a questionaire), and secondly, an exposition of his particular activity program, or project. The former was to be used for preparation of Alfonso Gortaire's presentation on the national rural situation (Second Part: Panel 1), the latter was to be the basis for the participans' own presentation to the seminar (First Part: Presentation of Projects).

A special effort was made to interest the nine bishops of the Sierra region to attend the seminar. However, due to the fact that invitations went out just three weeks prior to the seminar and the fact that bishops normally have a heavy schedule of commitments, their attendance at the meeting was practically nil.

USE OF DPG CONSULTANTS.

In March at the time of the first visit to Ecuador of the group of DPG Consultants, it was decided that these persons should not be presented as "experts," at least during the first round of national-level seminars. Rather, they should constitute of group of permanent observers and evaluators of these seminars. Their presence would serve to enrich the proceedings since they would be able to contribute examples of situations in their own countries pertinent to the discussion at hand. They would be in charge of developing and presenting the "synthesized methodology" (Panel 3, Third Part), and, of course, they would participate in an evaluative analysis of the seminar immediately following the closing of same.

Logistics of the Seminar. Inasmuch as we were planning to treat problems related to Indians of the Andean region, our first inclination was to hold the seminar in a site close by the greatest concentration of project activity of this nature, in Tungurahua or Chimborazo Province. There were two possible sites that might be available: A training center near the city of Riobamba, in Chimborazo, and a retreat house in Baños, Tungurahua. Both finally had to be discarded, the former due to "political" reasons, and the latter because it was too small to handle the number of participants and staff to be invited. We were fortunate to be able to reserve the El Inca retreat house in Quito; it proved to be fairly comfortable and adequate for carrying out the seminar.

At one point we had given thought to hiring extra secretarial help. However, since almost the entire staff of Promoción Humana would be participating in the seminar, it was decided to use our own secretaries, and pay overtime as the case required. This turned out to be totally satisfactory. We also used the PH social welfare office staff to purchase supplies, provide messenger service, and to operate the mimeograph machine. In this way we were able to supply written summaries of presentations, work groups, panels, etc., to each participant within a matter of minutes after the fact, thus assuring a current and permanent record of the entire proceeding for each person.

PARTICIPANTS.

Counting CRS/Ecuador and/New York staff, and DPG consultants from Peru, Colombia, and Bolivia, we had a total of 49 participants. Of those bishops invited, only two were able to attend at all. Bishop Mario Ruiz of Latacunga attended the opening session on Sunday night and at our request, prepared and gave the opening address. Bishop Raul Lopez, of Guaranda attended one day in mid-week. Several of the agencies attending, most notably CESA, sent different delegates on different days. The representatives of Government agencies did not attend the entire seminar; rather, they came as a panel, made presentations, answered questions, and left. It had been decided that the presence of Government officials throughout the week could be an inhibiting factor on the rest of the participants.

SCHEDULE.

The seminar began on Sunday afternoon, April 25, with inscriptions, opening remarks by Bishop Ruiz, and a presentation of the methodology that was to be followed in the seminar. The day's first session began at 8 a.m. and ran until 12:30 p.m. The afternoon sessions began at 3 p.m. and continued until 7:30 p.m. Both in the morning and afternoon there were a total of 45 to

60 minutes free time for coffee and informal discussion. The seminar ended with lunch on Thursday, April 29th.

The schedule was designed to be as easy-going as possible yet allow us to meet our objectives. Unfortunately, we fell behind almost immediately due to the fact the time allotted to each agency and project holder (15-20 min.) for exposition of his activities was exceeded in nearly every case. Having thus fallen behind, we were forced to leave out something or shorten time allotted to the different activities on the schedule. We ended up shortening the coffee breaks, working overtime, and paying only prefunctory attention to theme 1.4, which was meant to give the participants a chance to voice opinion regarding the objectives and proceedings of the seminar which had, of course, been preestablished by CRS/CEE.

PRESENTATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS.

Part One: Presentation of Projects. This was designed as sort of a getting acquainted session where each agency, diocese and project holder would give a brief description of his area of activities which was to include basic and specific objectives, methodologies employed to attain goals and objectives, results obtained, and an evaluation of the degree of success or failure achieved in terms of objectives. The assembly was to have an opportunity to discuss, approve or modify the objectives and procedures of the seminar. Due to a shortage of time (the project presentation phase took much longer than had been anticipated), discussion of this point was limited; the program and schedule, as presented by CRS/CEE, was approved by voice vote.

Part Two: Identification and Analysis of Development Models. The principal task in this part of the seminar was to identify development models from among the presentations made in Part One. Five basic types of development were identified: Economic, Social, Educational, Pastoral, and Integral. Five work groups were established to study the several types; each seminar participant could join the group of his choice. Most chose the Integral while no one chose Educational, therefore, two "Integral" groups were formed. Social and Economic were combined, which, along with the Pastoral group, made a total of four work groups. Before the groups convened, and to give additional back-ground, three panels were held. The first was a discussion of the present national situation presented by Dr. Oswaldo Hurtado of the Catholic University of Quito, the second was on the situation in rural areas presented by Alfonso Gortaire, and the last was presented by a group representing several agencies of the public sector that are involved in planning or carrying out rural development.

Each of the work groups presented its findings to the assembly which were then analyzed, criticized, and discussed.

Part Three: Methodological Synthesis. A special group composed of the DPG consultants attending the seminar presented the panel on Methodological Synthesis (Document Nº 23). This presentation was discussed in assembly.

Part Four: Evaluation and Conclusions. The work groups were reconvened to draw up conclusions and recommendations (Documents 29-32). This turned out to be rather anticlimatic inasmuch as the Seminar was more designed to come up with conclusions along the lines of the Methodological Synthesis (Part Three). With this already accomplished, there was not much left that could be summarized or concluded, and the groups tended to founder a bit on this point. There were several recommendations worth mentioning, however:

1) That PH assume a greater coordinating and informative role (formation of a Data Bank, publication of bulletins or periodic pamphlets) to facilitate exchange of experiences and information on project activity.

2) That other seminars be organized on specific topics which might include: planning, elaboration and evaluation of projects; investigation; agrarian reform, training of leaders; etc.

3) Regional meeting of project holders in order to draw lines of coordination resulting from an analysis of the regional situation, and use of resources based on a joint regional planning.

EVALUATION OF THE SEMINAR.

Each program in the Andean region, as well as CRS/New York and Dr. Hoyer, has received a copy of Alfonso Gortaire's report and evaluation of this seminar. His report deals at length with an analysis of the evaluations made of various aspects of the seminar by those who participated in it. From the point of view of the participants, it can be fairly said that the seminar was useful and worthwhile, and to a great extent fulfilled the purpose and objectives established by CRS/CEE.

I feel that the fact a number of invitees, most notably the Ecuadorean bishops of the Andean dioceses, could not attend the seminar was a negative point in that it should be the bishop who take the lead and set the pace in the area

of development. For many it would have been enlightening to learn first-hand of the many fine and worthwhile projects that are being carried out under Church auspices, and by and through Church-related organizations. It also would have been an excellent opportunity for them to see CRS and their own Commission for Human Promotion (PH) in action, and to observe that the participants, as expressed in the work group reports, look for guidance, coordination, and even greater service from PH.

Regarding the 1.4, which was meant to allow the participants a say in determining the objectives and methodology of the seminar, and which, for lack of time, was not fully followed through on, I feel that this can be a valuable tool in the development of cohesion among seminar participants. It seems to me that giving the participants an opportunity to contribute to and approve the content of their seminar can only but add to an increased sense of common purpose thus enhancing the possibilities for a successful seminar, meeting, congress, etc.

The use of the non-Ecuadorean DPG consultants was deliberatly low-key in that it was felt that it would be an error for CRS to present a group of "experts" at this point of initiation of our DPG activities. The interventions that were allowed them, a presentation of the rural situation in each of their countries (Peru, Bolivia, and Colombia), and the panel on the "methodological synthesis," were roundly applauded; I feel that their worth as persons who could make valuable contributions to the development of projects was most certainly recognized by the participants in the seminar, Whether the value of consultants lies more in the realm of permanent advisory capacity or as advisors for or on specific projects or activities should be carefully analyzed. Our experience with Alfonso Gortaire has been excellent; he was contracted for a specific task which he fulfilled most competantly and efficiently. As a permanent advisor to CRS he might find his lack of experience and knowledge of CRS/CEE to be a handicap that would outweight his professional attributes. Again, as an advisor on a specific project having to do with rural, indigenous Ecuador, Alfonso Gortaire would be invaluable and we would hope to so obtain his services in the future.

The value of this seminar to CRS and to our partner agency in Ecuador, Promoción Humana, has been high. CRS has begun to implement a policy of limiting areas of activity geographically and by subject. While we do not propose to totally reject the possibility of becoming involved in a project of urban origen, or one that may be located on the Pacific coastal area or in the Eastern jungles, our major emphasis will be in the rural Andean belt that runs from north to south through the middle of the country. The seminar identified for CRS and PH a number of excellent possibilities for future

project activity, and of course, the project holders got a good look at CRS/PH and are now more fully aware of our desire to be of assistance as well as what resources we have available to make assistance a reality. Naturally, the same can be said for the different national agencies, foundations and organizations in regard to actual or potential projects. It would be our hope that a better climate as been created for collaboration between national agencies, as well. There certainly can be no doubt that CRS and PH stand ready to cooperate on this level. Our program planning to take place over the next several months will most surely reflect the possibilities for positive action that have been clearly demonstrated for this seminar.

SEMINARIO:

EL DESARROLLO RURAL
ENTRE INDIGENAS Y CAMPESINOS DE LA SIERRA

Quito, 25-29 de abril de 1976

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	INSTITUTIONS
IMBABURA	
P. Jaime Justicia V.	Instituto Social Indigenista "Alfonso Barba".
PICHINCHA	
Hno. Miguel Neira N.	Promoción Humana/Departamento de Educación.
Hna. Teresa Del Hierro	Congregación de Misioneras Lauritas.
Hna. Genovava Rodríguez	Hospedería Campesina "El Tejar".
Hna. Betty Aguinaga	Hospedería Campesina "El Tejar"
Antrop. Francisco Gangotena	Universidad Católica.
Sr. Beppi Tonello	Fondo Ecuatoriano Populorum Progressio (FEPP).
Ab. Carlos Arrobo	Central Ecuatoriana de Servicios Agrícolas (CESA).
Socióloga Diana de Landívar	Fondo Ecuatoriano de Désarrollo (FED).
Econ. Hernán Hoyos	Fondo Ecuatoriano de Desarrollo (FED).
Ing. Carlos Furche	Fondo Ecuatoriano Populorum Progressio (FEPP).
Econ. Oswaldo Mata	Promoción Humana/Departamento de Proyectos.
Sociólogo Wagner Molina	Promoción Humana/Departamento de Proyectos.
Sr. Hernán Montero Z.	Promoción Humana/Departamento de Proyectos.
Econ. Franklin Canelos	Fundación Brethren Unida
Sr. César H. Astudillo	Promoción Humana/Departamento de Bienestar Social

P. Carlos Altamirano	Programa Pastoral.
Sociólogo Raúl Egas A.	Central Ecuatoriana de Servicios Agrícolas (CESA)/Departamento de Evaluación.
P. José Martín Irure	Instituto de Antropología Pastoral.
Econ. Patricio Rubianes	Catholic Relief Services/Ecuador.
Antrop. Alfonso Gortaire	Catholic Relief Services/Ecuador y Promoción Humana.
Hna. Bernarda Ortíz P.	Promoción Humana/Departamento de Indigenismo.
Sr. Mark E. Reilly	Catholic Relief Services/Ecuador.
P. Rafael Escobar	Oficina de Evangelización y Catequesis, Arquidiócesis de Quit

COTOPAXI

P. Luis E. Jácome S.	Promoción Humana/Latacunga.
P. Víctor Corral M.	Casa Campesina de Salcedo.

TUNGURAHUA

Hna. Carmen Edilma Porras	Centro Indígena Atoch
Hna. Victoria Carrasco	Hospedería Campesina del Tungurahua.
P. José Carvajal A.	Juntas de Defensa del Tungurahua.
Sr. Gonzalo Hallo U.	Caritas Ambato.
Sr. Segundo Juan Lligalo	Hospedería Campesina del Tungurahua.
Sr. Mauro Cuevas V.	Obispado de Ambato.

BOLIVAR

P. Luis Sánchez P.	Movimiento Indigenista Campesino de Guaranda.

CHIMBORAZO

P. Rubén Veloz	Escuelas Radiofónicas Populares del Ecuador (ERPE).
P. Julio Gortaire	Acción Integral Guamote.

CAÑAR

P. Víctor Hugo Vásquez	Di cesis de Azogues.

AZUAY

P. Jesús Emilio Osorno	Centro Regional de Capacitación de Sayausí.
P. Hernán Rodas M.	Arquidiócesis de Cuenca.
Sr. Víctor Hugo Torres	Caritas Cuenca

LOJA

P. Francisco Gil	Diócesis de Loja.
P. Cristóbal Espinosa	Párroco de Macará.
P. Francisco Aristizábal	Parroquia de Alamor.

MORONA-SANTIAGO

Sr. Miguel Tankamash	Federación Shuar
Sr. Jorge Silverio Karakras	Federación Shuar

DPG CONSULTANTS

Dr. Eduardo Bracamonte	CRS/Bolivia
Sociólogo Otto Flores	CRS/Perú
Sociólogo Humberto Rojas	CRS/Colombia
Sr. Richard A. Redder	CRS/New York
Econ. Patricio Rubianes	CRS/Ecuador

COORDINATOR

Antrop. Alfonso Gortaire	CRS/Ecuador

SECRETARIAT

Sr. Rommel Palacios	Promoción Humana/Departamento de Bienestar Social.
Sr. Oswaldo Ordóñez	Promoción Humana/Departamento de Bienestar Social.
Srta. Margoth Estrella	Promoción Humana/Secretaría
Srta. Rocío Torresano	Catholic Relief Services y Promoción Humana/Secretaría
Sra. Mónica de Morocho	Conferencia Episcopal Ecuatoriana/Secretaría

/Rtt.
VI-28-76.r

ATTACHMENT III

Colombia

Introduction

The local D.P.G. seminar that was held in Paipa May 10-13, was the result of many long hours of planning.

When we first started planning the seminar, we considered the possibility of dealing with any one of a wide variety of themes ranging from the role of women in development to the Administration of agricultural credit for small farmers. During one of the discussions with our consultants and Padre Molina we decided that a reflection on what CRS Colombia has accomplished up to the present and some projections for the future would be a good way to initiate the activities under the D.P.G., hopefully giving some direction and structure to them. We felt that launching a major seminar on a topic related to development without relating it to an overall strategy for D.P.G. implementation could lead to a seminar which may or may not provide information necessary for CRS programming. We originally hoped that our first seminar would provide the guidelines for future seminars and other activities.

The seminar was planned mainly by Carlos Castillo, Darío Molina, and John D. Wingerter with the help of other including Lynn Renner and Miguel Gómez. The CRS personnel arranged the logistics such as hotel, transportation and supplies, as well as producing many of the working documents. Darío Molina acted as the seminar animator by leading the group though the various discussions and presentations. The consultants role was not clear at the start but their intervention during the seminar proved valuable.

Only a small number of participants were invited because we felt that the nature of the seminar did not warrant a larger number. Also we were doing some self criticism we did not feel that such a meeting should be open to any and all comers. This decision proved very prudent for we were able to assemble a very good group of participants who were sensitive, sympathetic to CRS, yet honest enough to tell us what our strong points and weak points are. The smallness of the group also allowed us to treat all of the topics in plenary session which added much to the group cohesion and effectiveness.

The selection of the participants was a trying task to say the least. We tried to chose a cross section taking into account the following factors: a) Clergy- laity b) National level-grass roots c) liberal-conservative d) Deep knowledge of CRS-slight knowledge of CRS and finally whether we though they would come or not. In the end we were a little heavy on clergy, and light on laity and grass roots but this was more by accident than design since a couple unanticipated members of the clergy were invited at the last minute while one of the lay people did not show up. Please see the attached list of participants for the bakground of people involved.

Objectives

The objectives that were established for the seminar were as follows:

1. Create in CRS a critical awareness of the need for reflection and self evaluation.

2. Define the nature and role of CRS in Colombia.

3. Develop a criteria for a planning process for the CRS Colombia Program.

Schedule

The seminar was scheduled to begin on Monday evening and end Thursday evening. Sessions were generally held from 8:30 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. No formal schedule was developed since the group was small and we wanted to be flexible enough to move from one stage to another as the seminar progressed.

Methodology

The methodology employed for the development of the seminar was a new and interesting one which was suggested by Dario Molina. See attachedment for details.

Basically there were five stages through which to pass with four steps in each stage.

The stages are:

1. Sharing of personal experiences about CRS.
2. Knowledge of the Colombian Socio-economic-political and cultural realities.
3. Theoretical knowledge of CRS (Philosophy, Structure, Objectives, etc.)
4. Diagnosis (Relating all the previous steps into a unified whole)
5. Plan of action (what should CRS do?)

Within each stage there were four steps or moments as they are called, for the completion of each stage. The steps are designed to help the participants logically examine the material and reach conclusions. The four moments are as follows:

1.- Presentation of the material
2.- Discussion of the material
3.- Identification of important points
4.- Identification of unanswered questions.

This methodology proved very effective if not hard work, but all of the participants were impressed by the efficiency of it.

Presentations and conclusions

The following documents were used as the basis for the discussion, being distributed to the participants at the beginning of the seminar.

1-01 Description of the Methodology of the seminar
1-02 History of CRS
1-03 Report on the Cartagena Regional Meeting
1-04 List of CRS/Col. Projects.
1-05 Report on the Cali D.P.G. Meeting
1-06 Summary of the discussions of the First Stage

2-01 Charts indicating Socio-economic conditions in Colombia.
2-02 14 National Census on Population and 3 Census on Housing.
2-03 Presentation by German Feged.
2-04 Summary of the discussions on the Colombian Socio-Economic Situation.

3-01 Summary of the Discussions on the theory and structure of CRS

4-01 Summary of the fourth and fifth Stages.

Summaries

Stages 1.- Generally it was felt that CRS has made a positive contribution to development of Colombia. Some of the more salient observations were:

1.- Our identity is somewhat confused as to whether we are a church agency or a branch of the United States Government.

2.- CRS should respect local plans and priorities.

3.- CRS is one of the few agencies willing to open itself to criticism and dialogue. We are one of the few agencies sensitive to the needs of Latin Americans.

4.- We are an agency with few resources of our own rather we depend on other donors for our program resources.

Stage 2.-

1.- The rural sector should be a priority area

2.- There is a process of descomposition of the rural Social and Economic Structures.

3.- The Church is the institution most aligned with the campesino.

4.- There is need for better planning of church actions.

5.- The rural problem is complex with many causes and many partial solutions.

Stage 3.-

1.- CRS appears to be more a civil agency than a church agency.

2.- Our objectives are predominately assistancial in nature.

Stage 4.- Deficiencies of CRS.

1.- Programs are very conditioned by donor agencies.

2.- CRS has a confused image.

3.- Lack of clear policies in programming.

4.- Problems in administration between CRS/NY and CRS/Colombia.

Positive aspects.

1.- CRS does not cost the local church any money.

2.- CRS is open to dialogue and self evaluation.

3.- CRS has the confidence of both funding agencies as well as local agencies.

4.- There are many local dioceses ready and willing to work with CRS.

5.- CRS respects the autonomy of the local agencies.

Recommendations

1.- CRS should clarify its objectives a little more.
2.- The local agencies should clarify their objectives and programs so as to achieve a better coordination.
3.- Establish priorities as scientifically as possible in accordance with a general model of local development.
4.- Up date the concept of the pastoral aspect of the programs.
5.- Deepen our knowledge of the rural needs and problems of Colombia.

Stage 5.-

Plan af Action

1.- What should we do?

a) Clarify and establish objectives, criteria and priorities

for CRS/Col. so as to be able to coordinate with local agencies.
b) Deepend our knowledge about the rural sector.
c) Increase contact and coordination with local church agencies (We shouldn't work only with national level agencies)
d) Up date the concept of the pastoral aspects of our programs.

2. How should we accomplish this?

a) Dialogue with SEPAS National, other agencies, and campesinos throughout the interchange of documents, seminars, meetings, etc.
b) Studies of the rural sector as well as contact with groups working at the grass roots.
c) Exchange of experiences at the regional level.
d) Continued self evaluation
e) Seek pastoral orientation from the programs both from the New York and local level.

3. Who should do it?

a) CRS/Colombia and New York
b) SEPAS National
c) SEPAS Diocesan Offices
d) Other Catholic Agencies.
e) Qualified experts and technicians

4. Time frame.

a) By December 1976

5. Resources

a) Regular budget of CRS/Colombia
b) Budget from D.P.G.
c) Local support

Evaluation

There were many planned and unplanned results from the Paipa Seminar.

Objectives:

1. Create in CRS a critical awareness of the need for reflection and self evaluation.

This objective was pretty much accomplished before the seminar was held as indicated by the very fact that we sponsored one of this type. What was interesting were the suggestions as to how this should be carried out. The suggestion that CRS dialogue with a wide variety of agencies at all levels was welcomed and refreshing. Although SEPAS National was somewhat insistent that CRS work even more closely with them, almost all of the other participants insisted that CRS maintain contact with a wide variety of agencies so as to have a well rounded point of view.

The need to reflect more on the pastoral aspects of our program was also a new twist. There was no doubt that the CRS programs contain pastoral aspects but it is not clearly identified or articulated. We probably gave the impression that we were more interested in being administrators of donations than promotors of a socio-pastoral program of the church.

Everybody was extremely impressed at the sincerity of the CRS people to want to improve their programs. It was suggested that other agencies might want to do the same. This sincerity undoubtedly did much to elicit participation as well as open a dialogue with many if not all of the participants and the agencies they represented.

This is the third seminar in which CRS Colombia did a self critique the other two being the Cartagena meeting and the Cali D.P.G. meeting. The various agencies that know us are pretty well convinced that we are sincere in trying to improve our programs. Probably future seminars should be less self reflective and deal with more concrete topics.

Define the natures and role of CRS in Colombia.
The seminar was fairly successful at defining the administrative structure of CRS but the identification of a specific role left much to be desired. It was generally agreed that this should be something that is established over a period of time through dialogue with many church agencies and is reflected in the plan of action. It was probably not reasonable to expect a group of people with varying degrees of knowledge about CRS, to tell us what we should be doing here in Colombia. Neither the group nor the length of the seminar was conductive to accomplishing this.

3. Develop a criteria for a planning process for the CRS Colombia Program.

Although no formal set of criteria were developed, certain elements were identified which will prove very valuable in the near future. The need for local agencies to clarify their objectives, respecting local priorities, deepening knowledge about the rural areas, etc,, will serve us quite nicely in the near future when we articulate a set of criteria for our local planning process.

On the whole we were very pleased with the seminar. We gained a lot of usefull feedback on our programs and attitudes. We also learned a lot about the attitudes and feelings of the participants toward CRS. The D.P.G. was put more in perspective and perhaps we managed to overcome some resistance on the part of SEPAS in collaborating with as on this program.

CRS: II SEMINARIO DE REFLEXION

PARTICIPANTES

I. SACERDOTE - TEOLOGO:

Jesús M. Coronado
Kra. 8 #20A-23, Giradot
27-06
Obispo de Giradot

Dario Molina Zaramillo
Calle 26 #27-48, Piso 6º, Bog.
328821
Colaborador SNPS/Colombia
Area de Promoción y Difusión IDES

Jorge Jiménez Carvajal
Kra 74A #80-57, Bogotá
Res. 518518 Of. 517736
Sacerdote/filósofo
Subgerente Promoción Social de Minuto de Diós
Subdirector Promoción y Asesoría SEPAS nacional

Pedro Nel Luna
Parroquia de San Roque, C/gena
42512
Sacerdote

Ignacio Torres
SEPAS/Duitama
2810
Asistente Director SEPAS/Duitama Sogamoso

Joaquín Castro
Calle 26 #27-48, Piso 6º, Bog.
328781 - 328821
Director Nacional SEPAS

Eulises González Sánchez
Avenida 30 #7A-50, Giradot
6115 y 6124
Director SEPAS
Párroco de Cristo Resucitado

Germán Silva Hurtado
Caritas/Cali, Curia Arzobispal
831702 o 761766
Director Arquidiocesano, Caritas Cali

Manuel Antonio Sanabria
SEPAS/Duitama
2810
Director SEPAS/Duitama - Sogamos

II. Economista:

Richard Redder
1011 First Ave., NY, NY 10022
(212) 838 - 4700
Administrador CRS

Germán Féged
AA 16120, Bogotá
518100, Ext. 22
Director FERURAL
Abogado

Miguel A. Gómez C.
Calle 26 #27-48, Piso 6º, Bog.
328821 y 328841
Coordinador Proyectos, CRS

III. Sociólogo:

Carlos Castillo
Kra. 9 #26-39, Apto 1106, Bog.
323218
Trabaja en OFISEL

Humberto Rojas
Kra. 4A #25B-62, Bogotá
AA 14453
428746 o 828463
Sociólogo

IV. Asesor:

Angelo Neglia
Kra. 36 #106-43, Bog.
360110
Subdirector Desarrollo Social
FUNDECLAM
Asesor Organismos Internacionales

Eduardo Bracamonte Estivariz
Cajón Postal 2921, La Paz, Bol
23335
Consultor/CRS

V. Trabajador Social:

John Wingerter
Edificio SPEC, Bogotá
328841
Director CRS Colombia

VI. Estudios Latinoamericanos/Idiomas:

L. Lynn Renner
Kra. 43 #103-27, Bogotá
565248
Asistente del Programa CRS/Colombia

Marilyn J. Beni
AA 66, San gil, Santander del Sur
2573
Asistente Administrativa SEPAS/San Gil (voluntaria CRS)
Secretaria Bilingue

PLANNING OF THE SEMINAR ATTACHMENT IV

The initial steps in the planning of this seminar were undertaken by CRS/Bolivia and the Socio-Economic Department of Caritas Boliviana. Once the tentative theme of commercialization was chosen, it was decided that the Bolivian Central Bank and the Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Science (IICA), which are noted for their technical expertise on this specialization, should be included in a working committee with CRS and Caritas Boliviana.

The theme of Commercialization was selected for several reasons:

- It is a subject of great national importance, it has significance for a private institution since it enables it to become acquainted with the commercialization mechanisms at a national level and allows it to work with these plans at a local level for small farmers.
- It would allow CRS and Caritas the opportunity to come in contact with national organizations, private and international, so they could direct more coordinated programs.
- Cooperation from other important institutions could be obtained for the fulfillment of the seminar.

Having decided on this theme, the working committee defined it more specifically. The title "National Seminar on Productivity, Quality and Commercialization of Basic Products in Bolivia" was agreed upon.

The Central Bank assigned its Commercialization Advisor, Lic. Hugo Ossio, to help implement the academic part of the Seminar. IICA designated a specialist in Agricultural Commercialization, Ing. Hugo A. Torrez, to assist in other technical matters.

As a plan of action, the committee decided that CRS and Caritas should dedicate much of their time during March, April and May in generating interest and soliciting the participation of public, private and international organizations. The institutions visited were: the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Industry and Commerce, the Central Bank, several institutes of commercialization and several research and human promotion centers. A special effort was made to incorporate all of those organizations involved in this area or specialization. (For a complete listing of all the organizations which worked on or attended the seminar please see attachment.)

Next a questionnaire dealing with technical aspects on productivity was prepared and sent to the participating institutions. This was prepared by the sponsoring institutions, the Central Bank of Bolivia, IICA, Caritas Boliviana and Catholic Relief Services.

METHODOLOGY OF THE SEMINAR

The methodology of the seminar was broken down into several parts:

1. Exposition - Each one of the national institutions prepared, on the basis of

the questionnaire, presentations describing the productivity and commercialization of rice, coffee, cotton, wool, meat and sugar. During these hour long presentations, problems and questions were raised and statistical information was offered.

2. Speeches given by international, governmental and private agencies - Semi-autonomous public agencies were invited to introduce a line of thought distinct from the conventional governmental philosophy. A period of analysis also followed these presentations.

3. Coordination - The team of coordinators along with the Academic Director of the Seminar, were responsible for elaborating the conclusions at the end of each day and the final conclusions at the end of the seminar.

4. Other topics - Four other important presentations were given:

   a. Theoretical frame: "Productivity and Quality in the Commercialization of Agriculture-Animal Husbandry Products". Dr. Hugo Torrez, specialist in commercialization from the Interamerican Institute of Agricultural Science of O.A.S.

   b. "General Notes on Productivity and Quality of Commercialization of Basic Products of Agriculture and Animal Husbandry in Bolivia". Lic. Hugo Ossio, Advisor of Banco Central de Bolivia.

   c. "Productivity and Commercialization". Ing. Raúl Salas, Chief, Division of Agricultural Economy and Commercialization, Ministry of Agriculture.

   d. "Solution to Problems of Commercialization of Agriculture-Animal Husbanry Products", Ing. José María Pérez, Under-Representative of IDB.

   It is expected that the first topic will be selected for presentation in the CRS Bulletin.

SCHEDULE

The seminar took place from May 31 to June 4 beginning at 9 AM to 1 PM. The afternoon sessions took place from 3 PM to 7 PM. There were 48 participants and 20 observers.

Academic Director: Lic. Hugo Ossio.

Administration and Operation: Eduardo Bracamonte and Guillermo Limpias.

Moderation: Guillermo Limpias, Lic. Manuel Herrera, Ing. Raúl Salas, Eduardo Bracamonte.

FINANCIAL

CRS and the Socio-Economic Office of Caritas Boliviana received a good deal of participation from other institutions. This participation enabled the seminar to achieve a high academic level, and also establish relations with public and international organizations. CRS had set aside US$2,000 (40,000 pesos bolivianos) for the realization of this seminar under the following categories:

Seminar Materials	$ 100.00
Lodging	$1000.00
Meals	$ 400.00
Transportation	$ 500.00
TOTAL	US$2000.00

Of this total only $600.00 ($b. 12,155.75) was spent on the seminar. This does not include expenses for the two DPG technical advisors, Dr. Eduardo Bracamonte and Mr. Edgar Soliz, sociologist. US$ 600.00

The other financial inputs were:

1. Interamerican Institute of Agricultural Science:
   - Round Trip Ticket from Colombia for a technician.
   - Experts' salary.
   - Participation of local technicians.
   - Contribution of Materials US$1,700.00
2. Central Bank of Bolivia:
   - Participation of an Advisor US$1,000.00
3. Socio-Economic Department of Caritas Boliviana:
   - 1 full time person for a month US$ 400.00
   - An Agronomist, and Economist, two secretaries, two auxiliaries - 20 days of work US$ 900.00
4. CENCOS:
   - The meeting hall, office space, telephone secretary US$ 450.00

Total Cost for the Seminar: US$5,050.00

RESULTS

1. As a direct follow up from the seminar, a round table discussion is to be held next month with the decision-makers from the Ministries of Agriculture, Industry and Commerce, Planning, the Central Bank of Bolivia and other participating institutions. At these round table discussions decisions will be made on the productivity and quality control of the six products.
2. A new Governmental regulation has been instituted regulating the meat industry.
3. At a grass-root's level, Caritas Boliviana has been able to define a credit system on behalf of rice producers for commercialization of their product. Caritas also helped design, with CIPCA (another voluntary agency), a coffee collection and commercialization system for the producers of this product.
4. In late July a seminar sponsored under the DPG by Caritas Boliviana and CRS was held in the colonization area of Alto Beni for rice and cacao producers. Commercialization methods for foreign markets were discussed and designed at this planning seminar.

LONG TERM RESULTS

The possibility of coordinating commercialization projects with government agencies (equipped with technical expertise) and private agencies exists. These projects would seek base-line systems for the traditional crops of potatoes, corn and quinua.

Finally, CRS has benefited in the following ways:

1. CRS has developed relationships with agencies and individuals who work in the field of rural development.
2. The seminar helped us coordinate agencies which work in handicrafts, especially knittings.
3. A contact was made with UN representatives and the Ministry of Agriculture in connection with the North Altiplano project.
4. There have been several meetings with Coneplan, the national planning organization, in order to define our action in the field of nutrition.

SEMINARIO NACIONAL DE PRODUCTIVIDAD, CALIDAD Y COMERCIALIZACION DE PRODUCTOS BASICOS EN BOLIVIA

Auspiciado por: Cáritas Boliviana, Banco Central, Catholic Relief Services, Instituto Interamericano de Ciencias Agrícolas.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Ministry of Rural and Agricultural Affairs

Ing. Raúl Salas Durán	Jefe de División de Economía Agrícola y Comercialización.
Ing. Gualberto Tapia	División de Economía Agrícola y Comercialización.
Sr. Wilfredo Garvizu	División de Economía Agrícola y Comercialización.
Sr. Roberto Delgadillo	División de Economía Agrícola y Comercialización.
Sr. Ramiro Martínez	División de Economía Agrícola y Comercialización.

Ministry of Industry and Trade

Lic. Alfredo Mercado A.	Director General de Comercio Interior
Lic. Manuel Herrera	Dirección de Comercio Interior
Lic. Freddy Alba	" " " "
Lic. Félix Flores	" " " "
Ing. Freddy Quezada R.	Dirección de Normas y Tecnología
Ing. José Paredes	" " " "
Ing. Roberto Espinoza	" " " "

Sr. Roberto Ramírez	Dirección de Proyectos e Integración
Lic. Yolanda Murillo	División de Agroindustria
Lic. Alberto Menacho	" " "
Sr. Gerardo Amézaga	División de Organismos Internacionales.

Institutions of Promotion and Commercialization

Lic. Javier Gutiérrez Z.	Gerente General, Empresa Nacional del Arroz. (ENA).
Sr. Luis Alberto Ramírez	Gerente General, Comité Boliviano de Fomento Lanero (COMBOFLA).
Lic. Napoleón Inofuentes	Gerente General, Comité Boliviano de Café (COBOLCA).
Lic. Antonio Aldunate G.	Asesor Económico, Comisión de Estudios de la Caña y el Azúcar (CNECA).
Lic. Emilio Ascarrunz	Gerente General, Asociación de Productores de Algodón (ADEPA).
Ing. Carlos A. Contreras	Gerente General, Beneficiadora de Carnes S.A. (BECASA).
Ing. Ramiro Carrasco	Asesor Economista, Beneficiador de Carne S.A.
Sr. Jaime Soria P.	COBOLCA
Sr. Guillermo Mattas	COBOLCA
Sr. Arturo Zurita	ENA
Ing. Luis M. :k Guzmán	ENA

Central Bank of Bolivia

Lic. Hugo Ossio	Asesor

Lic. Raúl Flores	División de Desarrollo
Lic.Angel Guzmán	División de Fomento a la Exportación
Lic. Freddy Velásquez F.	" " " " " "

International Technicians

Ing. José Mario Pérez	Sub-Representante del BID
Dr. Hugo Tórrez	Especialista en Comercialización, IICA
Ing. Jaime Muñoz Reyes	Experto del IICA
Ing. Ignacio Gonzáles	FAO -- Proyecto Integral del Altiplano Norte.
Sr. Juan Figueras	University of California, USA

Catholic Relief Services.

Sr. Miguel Gómez	Colombia
Sr. Lynn Renner	Colombia
Sr. Vernon Kicklin	Perú
Sr. Robert Parker	Bolivia
Lic. Edgar Soliz	Bolivia

Cáritas Boliviana.

Dr. Eduardo Bracamonte E.	Jefe Depto. Socio-Económico
Ing. Jaime Alba A.	Departamento Socio-Económico
Lic. Mario Montaño A.	" " "
Sr. Willy Limpias N.	" " "

Lic. José Ramírez R.	Departamento Socio-Económico
Nut. Teresa Calderón S.	" " "
Sr. Jorge Grágeda	Departamento Socio-Económico - Cochabamba.

Other Institutions

Sr. Emilio Tamayo Suárez	Grace y Cia.
Sr. Arnaldo Tellería M.	ORCABOL LTDA.
Ing. David Torrico Z.	Min. Planeamiento y Coordinación
Ing. José Luis Morató	CORDEPAZ
Sr. Rubén J. Montesinos	"
Sr. Javier Rojas	CIPCA
Lic. Cármen Sejas R.	Instituto Nacional de Cooperativas
Lic. Angel Acebey	COOPAS
Lic. Marcelo Méndez	Proyecto Abapó-Izozóg
Sr. Gerardo Munaw	Comité Central Menonita-Santa Cruz
Sr. Raúl Arze Días	" " " " "
P. Julio Tumiri	Fomento Cooperativo

Secretariat

Sr. Javier Seijo	CENCOS
Febe de Tejerina	CENCOS

Ruth de Zubieta	CARITAS - DSE
María Eugenia de Calderón	CRS
Pastor Maldonado P.	CARITAS - DSE
Félix Gutiérrez	CARITAS - DSE
Hugo Cáceres	CARITAS - DSE

La Paz, 31 Mayo - 4 Junio, 1976

Attachment V

Projected Training Activities
Sponsored by DPG Funding
(July, 1976 - March 31, 1977)

One of the primary conclusions of the first phase of activities sponsored by the DPG was that an essential ingredient of CRS's efforts to plan its development program is the participation and capability of persons at the local level in planning their own activities. Therefore, CRS together with local collaborating agencies has developed in each country a plan of training activities which varies according to the needs and existing activities. Below, we outline the types of activities being undertaken in each country:

Bolivia - The most ambitious attempt at developing a training program to reach local level personnel developed in Bolivia. This emphasis occurred in part because of the tremendous need for such activities as well as the professional capabilities of the Caritas Socio-Economic Department. Jointly with this Department, it was possible to put together a series of training activities, which will have a direct benefit to the development program supported by CRS in that country.

The two basic types of activities concerned were Planning Courses and Training for Local Personnel. The Planning Courses bring together representatives from various institutions within a geographical area in an effort to develop a common approach toward development. These institutions would include diocesan agencies, cooperative groups, and small farmer production associations. In all cases, the courses were organized at the invitation of local groups which have had previous contact with the Socio-Economic Department.

A second type of activity is the Training Course which attempts to prepare local leaders to undertake projects and specific activities according to the needs of the area. These courses are often in relation to specific programs, such as the Health Program in Chiquitos and in some cases relate directly to the plans generated through the Planning Courses given.

In addition, a specialized training seminar on nutrition is being organized. It is hoped that leaders from governmental and private agencies from various parts of the country will attend to bring about a greater awareness of the problems that must be confronted in this field. The primary organizer of this course is the nutritionist presently working with the Caritas Socio-Economic Department.

Ecuador - Considering the smaller size of the country, it was decided to organize two seminars with representatives from various parts of the country. The first seminar on methodology was directed to promoters who work at the local level. The seminar attempts to give practical instruction on how to organize and implement a project as well as provide the necessary background information so that

these individual local programs can be integrated into national efforts. The second seminar will bring together leaders of social action programs from throughout the country in an attempt to coordinate their development programs.

CRS was able to organize these seminars with the collaboration of several private agencies in Ecuador, who contributed both personnel and financial assistance for their realization.

Colombia - CRS has concentrated its attention in this country in bringing together the many well organized local and national agencies, especially those working in rural development. A seminar on Small Farmer Development was organized with the participation of campesino leaders and private and governmental agency representatives to focus on the key bottlenecks for this group's advancement. A second activity is also being organized to study the broader question of rural development in Colombia with the participation of various leaders from private and governmental agencies in this field. From these activities, CRS hopes that it can thereby plan its own activities with a much sounder foundation.

Finally, CRS is also supporting a seminar bringing together the rural leaders of the Diocese of Duitama. It is hoped that this meeting will lay the basis for an integrated development plan. CRS intends to give the necessary assistance toward the development of this plan and its eventual implementation.

We have no planned seminar activity in the country of Peru, although it is included in the Andean region. We are still studying proposals for potential activities along the lines of those described above for the other three countries.

Calender of Projected Training Activities

Bolivia:

July 24 - 30	Regional Planning Course	Alto Beni
August 22 - 30	Regional Planning Course	Trinidad
September 19 - 25	Regional Planning Course	Chapare
October 15 - 23	Training Course for Local Personnel (Health Program)	Chiquitos
November 10 - 14	Planning Course - Archdiocese of Sucre	Sucre
November 22 - 26	Nutrition Training Seminar	Tomonoco
-	Training Local Personnel	Trinidad
-	Training Local Personnel	Potosi
-	Training Local Personnel	Cochabamba
January	Regional Planning Course	Altiplano (La Paz)

Ecuador:

September 20 - 25	Seminar on a Methodology for Local Development Projects
November	Seminar on Planning Social Action

Colombia:

September 6 - 9	Seminar on Small Farmer Development
October 18 - 22	Course on Rural Socio-Economic Conditions
-	Seminar on Rural Development - Diocese of Duitama

REPORT ON THE DPG FOR THE CENTRAL AMERICA/CARIBBEAN REGION

April, 1975 - June, 1976

As originally envisioned, the DPG comtemplated the provision of three major services to field staff in this region for the purpose of improving their capability to undertake rural development programs:

1. the advice of a Planner-Evaluator whose chief responsibility would be the strengthening of skills in planning, management, and evaluation,

2. the services of a Rural Development Consultant who would assist staff with the design and implementation of rural development programs within specific national settings; and

3. a series of annual training seminars to focus on problems identified jointly by the field staff and technical advisors, as being of critical concern to CRS programming in the region.

Although the agency grant approval carried an initiation date of April 1, 1975, activities in this region did not commence until September with the appointment of Mr. Alan Taylor as Planner-Evaluator. After orientation in New York and attendance at the regional training seminar on Nutrition Planning (Santo Domingo, September 21-30), a work plan was prepared to orient Mr. Taylor's activities for the six months between November, 1975 and April, 1976. This work plan, copy of which is attached, contemplated a visit to nine of the ten country programs in preparation for a thorough-going analysis of the current situation in the region - with a view to examining all the factors, both conceptual and objective, which impinged upon CRS' ability to support development activities. It was intended that this examination be undertaken jointly by Mr. Taylor and all staff, and would culminate in the first seminar to be held under the grant, originally scheduled for June. The focus of the seminar would be the determination of a regional strategy for development, created through a collegial problem-solving approach. The strategy would serve as the guideline for all future activities in the region, and orient the DPG for the remaining two years of the program.

The objectives of Mr. Taylor's work plan were substantially accomplished. Unfortunately, the period was marked by considerable conflict engendered by the attitude of certain Caritas counterparts, who

objected to Mr. Taylor's appointment on a number of grounds and refused to accept the use of his services. Their strenuous objections resulted in Mr. Taylor's separation from CRS this summer, and a postponement of the regional conference until November, 1976.

A comprehensive final report entitled, "An Evaluation of the Problems Limiting the Promotion of Rural Development and the Effective Relief of Suffering" was submitted by Mr. Taylor to the Executive Director on September 24, 1976. This report has served as the primary documentation for three task forces which met during October, and will be further utilized at the November meeting. The plans for these meetings have been filed separately. Additionally, it is expected that the report will provide a vehicle for critical discussion of CRS policy and operational strategy on an agency-wide basis.

It should be noted that a Rural Development Consultant was never employed by CRS. Instead, it became apparent that the funds could more effectively be utilized to contract consultants on a case-by-case basis in each country to provide advice on current rural development programs of a significant nature as well as new proposals. A modification to that affect was approved by AID to commence during the second year of the program. While no funds were expended for this purpose during the April, 1975 - June, 1976 period, several proposals have recently been approved, and disbursements are expected to increase after the regional conference.

Further plans for the employment of another Planner-Evaluator and for the implementation of other DPG activities are pending the outcome of the November meeting.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: James Noel

FROM: Alan Taylor

DATE: November 7, 1975

RE: Planner-Evaluator Work-Plan
November 1975 - April 1976

Objectives

1. To assemble a 'factual' picture of relevant aspects of present reality, of resources currently available to CRS, and of the existing limitations on its work

a) for each country
b) for the region as a whole.

Extra-Institutionally

1. In particular, to assemble in one place (a regional fact sheet analysis) a 'factual' picture of aspects of life which might fall within the purview of an agency dedicated to the relief of suffering and the promotion of development.

2. To identify existing and potential indigenous institutions and individuals, with whom CRS does and/or might in the future, collaborate for the purposes of channelling resources for the relief of suffering and/or promotion of development.

Intra-Institutionally

In particular, to determine and to collect together in one place, information describing:

3. The type and level of existing CRS activities in the region, their separate logical foundations and the extent of their intercompatibility, if any.

4. The current availability and distribution of funds as between country and type of activity.

5. Where pertinent to the determination of a future policy: the historical origins of present CRS activities in the region.

6. The biographical orientations of CRS staff in the region, including resources represented in personal histories, present motivations and future ambitions.

7. The major areas of difficulty encountered by CRS regional staff in performing their present functions.

8. Projected or imagined difficulties in pursuing any particular course(s) of action or implementing any particular type(s) of policy.

2. To assemble a picture of conceptual units

a) implicit in present CRS activities
b) useful for future development of the region's policy.

Extra-Institutionally

1. In particular, to attempt the exteriorization of the values governing the selection of the relevant 'facts'; the value positions taken in relation to them and the definition of the resulting set of development and/or relief 'problems' to which CRS might wish to address itself.

2. Also, to attempt a preliminary categorization of alternative and/or complementary types of hypothesis relating to the causes of the problems selected above.

Intra-Institutionally

In particular, to estimate:

3. The type and level of sophistication of conceptual tools used in CRS work; their separate logical foundations and the extent of their intercompatibility, if any.

4. The present intellectual and ideological orientations of CRS staff in the region.

5. Major areas of conceptual difficulty presently encountered.

6. Major areas of conceptual difficulty likely to inhibit development of a regional and country policies.

7. The training resources available to CRS staff, in-country and within the region.

Methods

1. Visits in the company of, and open-ended discussions with

   a) CRS regional staff (Regional Director and Assistant; Program Directors and Assistants), and
   b) persons, communities, and institutions which address themselves to the resolution of humanitarian and development problems.

2. The use of existing CRS country fact sheet analyses, country progress reports and current budgets, as starting points for discussion.

3. The active participation of CRS regional staff in the collection of relevant data and its presentation in the resulting country and regional planning discussion documents, especially in respect of Objective #1 - the 'factual' picture.

NOTE

The intention is that the successful completion of the current work-plan period, with the substantial achievement of the above objectives, will lead into preparation for the first regional seminar called for under the DPG proposal. This seminar will, among other things, provide the regional and country staff with the opportunity to confer together, as a group, and work towards the determination of a regional policy, collectively thought out by all likely to be involved in its implementation.

lo

III. EVALUATION

The first headquarters - level evaluation meeting was held on December 22, 1975. A report was forwarded to AID.

An Africa Region evaluation was held in Dakar on March 23-24, 1976. A report was forwarded to AID.

A Performance Analysis Review was held on July 8-9, and the worksheets and summary of this evaluation have been sent to AID under separate cover.

Evaluation of the DPG in the South America Region took place at the Regional Seminar and at the country level seminars as an on-going process rather than at a specific meeting for evaluation.

A three day meeting was held in Rome, November 30 - December 2, 1975 to review OPG activities as well as DPG implementation plans.

The performance analysis review indicates that satisfactory progress is being achieved towards fulfilling the purpose of this grant, however, we have fallen behind our original time table.

Attached is a copy of the summary of the Performance Analysis Review. Annex I.

IV. FINANCIAL REPORT AND OVERVIEW

The following financial report is a summary of expenditures, according to line items, from inception through July 31, 1976.

Using the balances available as of August 1, we have projected expenditures through the end of the second grant year (March 31, 1977).

A total of $650,000 was made available to CRS for the first two years of the project. At the end of these two years, we expect to have a balance of approximately $170,190.

This report clearly reflects the slow start which CRS has experienced in implementing the various activities under this grant. The projections, however, show an accelerated rate of expenditures which is a reflection of the costs of four regional seminars and other increased training activities. The projections do not include any expenditures for the Asia/Pacific Region. If the DPG program for this region can be implemented, it will, of course, mean additional expenditures before the end of the second grant year.

NORTH AFRICA/NEAR EAST REGION:

A Planner/Evaluator was hired as of April 1, 1976. His duties are as follows:

In consultation with headquarters, regional and CRS country and counterpart personnel, he will review, during the second year, information on techniques, policies, resources and needs, as they relate to design and evaluation of development plans and projects for countries within the region. In the second year, he will identify priority countries and potential programs, with the ultimate goal of design and stimulation of development programs within the region. He will also review on-going development programs and projects with a view to establishing a basis for the formulation of an approach to improved planning, implementation and evaluation conformable to the general structure of the agency. To this end, he will address himself to the major areas of development problems and needs in the countries of the region; consult on current program activities, particularly nutrition education, which could effectively accommodate agricultural and husbandry components; develop alternative elements of interventions and select those likely to be most effectively responsive to resource availability, including CRS project experience; assist country level staff and local entities (counterparts, cooperative societies and individual project holders) in upgrading their planning and programming capabilities, through seminars and workshops, with a focus on training project planners and implementors.

As of the date of closing of this report, no seminars had been held. A complete report on this Region's activity will be provided when available.

ASIA/PACIFIC REGION:

No activity has been implemented to date.

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM GRANT AID/PHA-G-1117

Summary of Expenditures (April 1, 1975 - July 31, 1976)

		Year 1	Year 2	Total	Budget	Balance Aug. 1, 1976
I.	TECHNICAL PERSONNEL					
	Personnel	$ 26,222.93	$24,675.69	$ 50,898.62	$168,602.00	$117,703.38
	Travel	4,178.55	8,296.07	12,474.62	49,760.00	37,285.38
	Per Diem	7,602.17	2,485.17	10,087.34	48,600.00	38,512.66
	Partial Office Support	3,458.12	3,869.09	7,327.21	31,850.00	24,522.79
II.	TRAINING	51,669.41	13,583.02	65,252.43	246,000.00	180,747.57
III.	CONSULTATION/EVALUATION	2,679.92	12,812.96	15,492.88	105,188.00	89,695.12
	TOTALS	$ 95,811.10	$65,722.00	$161,533.10	$650,000.00	$488,466.90

Nov 75 - July 31 76
= 9 months

Monthly Rate = 5 - 8

...19...

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM GRANT

Projection of Expenses (August 1, 1976 - March 31, 1977)

		Balance Aug. 1, 1976	Projected Expenditures	Projected Balance 3/31/77
I.	TECHNICAL PERSONNEL			
	Personnel	$117,703.38	$ 62,655.82	$ 55,047.56
	Travel	37,285.38	12,089.96	25,195.42
	Per Diem	38,512.66	12,509.61	26,003.05
	Partial Office Support	24,522.79	14,706.00	9,816.79
II.	TRAINING	180,747.57	165,175.03	15,572.54
III.	CONSULTATION/EVALUATION	89,695.12	51,140.00	38,555.12
	TOTALS	$488,466.90	39,[illegible]00 $318,276.42	$170,190.48

1st Year = 54,280

2 " = 40,000

3 " = 56,000

40,000 [illegible] expended 5-1-77 - 3-31-77

56,000 3/31/77 - 3

INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS DESIGNED

OPG.

SUB-SAHARA AFRICA REGION			Total Value of Project
Cameroon	74/9	OPG Rural Health Training	$ 212,000
Ethiopia	74/5	Dana Resettlement Site Development	3,420
Senegal	76/10	Wassadou Agriculture (in planning)	197,869
Sierra Leone	70/7	Matotoka Chiefton Development	50,000
Tanzania	73/4	Development in Ujamaan Village	54,900
Upper Volta	72/5 (A)	Dam Construction	209,883
	(B)	Agriculture Development	420,000

CENTRAL AMERICA/CARIBBEAN REGION			
Mexico	76/2	Tizimin Fri Dimensional Development Program, Yucatan	$ 194,107
Costa Rica	76/1	Nutrition Education & Agriculture Prod.	232,000
Dominican Rep.	75/4	Conasaja Integrated Agricultural Project	198,000
Haiti	75/11	Gros Morne Health & Development Training Program	138,000
Jamaica	76/1	Small Farmers' Support (OPG)	249,175

INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS DESIGNED

NORTH AFRICA/MID-EAST REGION			Total Value of Project
Jerusalem West Bank	75/1	Rural Development Project	$ 852,401
Jordan	75/5	Integrated Dev. in the field of Agriculture, Health & Education	1,310,000
Yemen	76/14	Integrated Development Project	1,118,346
SOUTH AMERICA REGION			
Colombia	75/01	San Gil Integrated Project	779,000
Bolivia	75/01	Mobile Health Program	110,000
Ecuador	75/01	Ambato Integrated Program	214,000
Uruguay	75/01	Durazno Integrated Program	140,000

PROGRAM DESIGN & EVALUATION SEMINAR

The following CRS personnel have completed the above referenced course:

Joe Casey

Elaine Edgcomb ✓

Ken Hackett ✓

Glen Knapp ✓

Tom Lyons

Fr. Mulkerin ✓

Mr. J. Noel ✓

Harry Nugent ✓

Ray Panczyk ✓

Dan Santo Pietro ✓

Darline Ramage ✓

Rich Redder

Dr. Frances Rothert

Jewel Slingerland ✓

Julie Villaume ✓

Bob Walsh ✓

John Wingerter

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS REPORT (SUMMARY)

covering the period April 1, 1975 - July 31, 1976

AID/PHA-G-1117

CRS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM GRANT

This report covers a sixteen month period instead of the prescribed first year of the grant for the following reasons:

This grant was approved and funds were committed by AID as of June 30, 1975. However, the first year grant period was approved to begin April 1, 1975 and run through March 31, 1976. While this retroactive date allowed CRS to cover expenses for a seminar held in Africa during April, 1975, it effectively eliminated four months of activity in the other regions of CRS. Actual cash was not available to CRS until November 10, 1975, when the Letter of Credit was issued.

Under the CRS DPG, each of the five Regional Directors are responsible for planning, organizing and implementing the activities of DPG in their respective regions in coordination with the technical officer. In our evaluation of the progress of this project, we completed a set of work sheets for each region. This procedure was adapted because of the diverse activities of each regional program and the different approaches being used.

The following is a composite summary of all activities carried out under the auspices of the DPG during the period April 1, 1975 - July 31, 1976, as they affected implementation and progress towards achievement of the stated objectives (logical framework):

INPUTS:

AID funds for year one ($250,000) made available through Federal Reserve Letter of Credit November 10, 1975.

Second year funds ($400,000) made available March 31, 1976 along with the approval of a modification of implementation plan for four of the five CRS regions.

With these funds, three Planner/Evaluators and one Rural Development Advisor were employed full-time. One Planner/Evaluator and seven Rural Development Advisors were employed on a part-time basis.

Please see attached financial report showing DPG expenditures from inception through July 31, 1976, and a projection of expenses through March 31, 1977, the termination date of the second year of the grant.

CRS Funds for DPG

Office established in July, 1975 with three professional staff (including technical officer) and three secretarial staff, to assist CRS Regional and CRS country level staff.

IMPORTANT OUTPUTS:

1) Seminars held:

		Planned to end of 2nd year
Regional	2	4
Country	3	18

Staff participating in training:

CRS (field)	50
Counterpart	99

Also, 10 CRS Headquarter staff and 3 DPG field staff have attended AID Project Design and Evaluation seminars. (Attached list).

2) Integrated rural development projects designed:

18 integrated rural development projects have been designed, 14 of which qualify under the definition of a rural integrated project as defined in the PROP. (Please refer to list of projects attached). The DPG has had some direct and/or indirect impact on most of these projects.

3) Revised system for planning, implementing and evaluating development programs:

a) all programs are using AID project design and evaluation system for the development of integrated projects until such time as CRS, with the help of I.Q.C., evolves its own design system.

b) a questionnaire relating to revision of CRS Socio-Economic Manual has been sent to all CRS field staff.

c) initial contacts and preliminary negotiations with (IQC) Strategies for Responsible Development were effected. SRD will help CRS revise its system for designing, implementing, and evaluating development programs.

PURPOSE:

"To improve the capability of CRS to plan, design, implement and evaluate programs with its indigenous counterparts."

We believe this evaluation confirms that the stated purpose is valid and that satisfactory progress towards this purpose is being achieved.

PERFORMANCE OF KEY INPUTS AND ACTION AGENTS:

Input or action agent	Performance Against Plan	Importance for achieving project purpose
1) CRS/HQ	Satisfactory	Medium
2) AID	Satisfactory	Medium
3) Participant training	Satisfactory	Medium/high
4) Staff Resources (use)	Unsatisfactory	Medium/high

Key factors determining this rating:

a) appropriate use cited as negative.

b) some technical staff not appropriate to project needs.

5) Counterpart	Unsatisfactory	Medium/low

Key factors determining this rating:

a) counterpart acceptance of and association with project purpose was very negative in the beginning.

b) use of project trained manpower not appropriate.

c) counterparts involvement varies greatly among regions.

NEW ACTIONS PROPOSED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION:

1) IQC should be contracted by January 1, 1977. CRS has made proposal to AID - Approval by AID is awaited.

2) New Planner/Evaluator should be hired for Central America & Caribbean Region to replace Planner/Evaluator who was terminated.

3) Use of consultants in South America Region and Central America Region should be clarified and, if necessary, modification in respective Regions' plans be requested.

4) Planner/Evaluator should be hired for Pacific Far East Region where no DPG activity has been initiated to date.

5) AID clearance procedure for international travel should be streamlined.

6) DPG activities should be more closely integrated into overall CRS programs.

Progress Review Worksheet

Evaluation for Period: April 1, 1975 to July 31, 1976

PROGRESS TOWARD CONDITIONS EXPECTED AT END OF PROJECT

A. CONDITIONS EXPECTED TO EXIST AT THE END OF THE PROJECT	B. METHOD (OR MEASUREMENT) OF VERIFYING CONDITIONS AT END OF THE PROJECT	C. PROGRESS AS SHOWN BY MEASUREMENT VERIFICATION
1) Increase number of integrated rural development projects in execution from 4 to 16 by 1978	Project Records Please see attached list of projects	18 projects have been designed of which 14 qualify under the definition of a rural integrated project as defined in the PROP
2) Increase from 13 to 25 the number of professional staff maintained by CRS totally dedicated to development programming at Headquarter & Regional levels	Personnel Records	New Staff 3 professional staff at Headquarters 4 professional at Regional level (field) 5 consultants used on part-time basis in specific activities in field 3 secretarial staff at Headquarters
3) 60% of all funds for development projects will be allocated through the planning system	Reports on funding	experimentation on regional level - Africa - too early to show progress. IQC input important to this condition.

PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVEMENT OF GOAL

While this aspect of our project was discussed briefly in the evaluation meetings, no significant indicators could be identified at this point to support specific progress towards achievement of the goal.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK: DPG PROPOSAL CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES- U.S.C.C.

	NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
GOAL	To increase participation of the poorest majority in solving their socio-economic problems.	1) Involvement of participants in planning projects 2) Involvement of representatives of participants in evaluation meetings. 3) Decisions of participants reflected in changes in implementation	1) Study of evaluations of five sample integrated projects	1) Integrated approach to rural development is more suitable to peasant needs. 2) Climatic conditions remain favorable at project sites. 3) No adverse changes in political, economic environment in project countries. 4) Counterparts able to maintain basic operational level.
PURPOSE	To improve the capability of CRS to plan, design, implement and evaluate programs with its indigenous counterparts	1) Increase numbers of integrated rural development projects in execution from 4 to 16 by 1978. 2) Increase from 13 to 25 the number of professional staff maintained by CRS totally dedicated to development programming at Headquarters and regional level. 3) 60% of all funds for development projects will be allocated through the planning system.	1) Project Records 2) Personnel Records 3) CRS Reports on Funding	1) Planning system incorporated in revised socio-economic manual will be utilized by CRS Program Staff 2) CRS will have budgetary resources to maintain sufficient professional staff after grant period 3) Funding from CRS or outside sources will be available for priority programs
OUTPUTS	1) Seminars held: - Regional - Country CRS staff participating in training Counterpart Staff participating in training 2) Integrated Rural development projects designed 3) Revised system for planning, implementing and evaluating development programs	YEAR 1 / YEAR 2 / YEAR 3 3 / 4 / 5 4 / 10 / 5 80 / 135 / 130 80 / 155 / 145 6 / 8 / 8 X	1) Reports of technical advisors 2) Seminar Reports 3) Existence of draft projects 4) Existence of revised socio-economic manual	1) Qualified staff will be available as programmed
INPUTS	I. AID A. Funds for 9 technical advisors 3 planners 5 rural development advisors 1 health education advisor B. Funds for Training Seminars II. Other Inputs (professional staff) A. CRS Headquarters technical officer for planning/evaluation (1) Other technical staff (12) B. CRS Regional level (5) C. CRS Country level (100) D. Counterpart Technical Staff (50)	9 person/years annually. (Refer attached budget) 1 person/year 6 person/years 2.5 person/years 36 person/years 15 person/years	1) Reports of Regional Offices, Technical Advisors 2) Financial Reports	2) Sufficient coordination with counterparts will be maintained 3. Advice provided by technical staff will be utilized by CRS and counterpart personnel

REGION III - SUB-SAHARA AFRICA

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

1. U.S. ACTION AGENT – [redacted],
or Voluntary Agency

for Period: 4/1/75 to 7/31/76

Agent: Catholic Relief Services-USCC

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THE ACTION AGENT:

Team - Planner/Evaluator and Agricultural Technician

Seminars and Meetings - Banjul, April/75 and Dakar, April/76

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS

1. EVALUATION FACTORS	Check if Not Applicable	PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN (✓) NA	Less	As Planned	Superior
a. Understanding project purpose				X	
b. Planning to achieve purpose				X	
c. Staff of proper size				X	
d. Timely arrival of personnel				X	
e. Technical qualifications of personnel				X	
f. Responsiveness to A.I.D. Directions				X	
g. Adherence to scope of work				X	
h. Adherence to work schedule				X	
i. Contractor's home office support				X	
j. Relations with cooperating country nationals				X	
k. Local staff training and utilization				X	
l. Effective administration of participants				X	
m. Management of commodities				X	
n. Timely submission of required reports				X	
o. Candor and usefulness of required reports				X	
p. Other (specify) _____					

2. OVERALL EVALUATION	Unsatisfactory 1	2	Satisfactory 3	4	5	Outstanding 6	7
(✓) Check one →					X		

D. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken and by whom to improve performance?

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

(Revised 12-72)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

II. INPUT. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Staff Resources

(If of particular significance to project, use a separate sheet for each major commodity group)

Type of Resources ~~XXXXXXX~~: _____

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THESE COMMODITIES

Planner/Evaluator - Ray Panczyk
Agricultural Technician - Glen Knapp
Agricultural Consultant - Fred Weber (Short Term prior to hiring of Knapp)

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS			D. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE		
Unsatisfactory 1 2	Satisfactory 3 4 (5)	Outstanding 6 7	Low 1	Medium 2 3 (4)	High 5

E. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	As Planned	Superior	Check if Important
1. ~~Resources~~ ~~XXXXXXXXX~~ Appropriate to Project Needs			x		
2. Timeliness of Procurement/Reconditioning			x		
3. Timeliness of Delivery to Point of Use			x		
4. ~~Storage~~ ~~XXXXX~~ Adequacy of Resources			x		
5. Appropriate Use			x		
6. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Training			x		
7. Records, Accounting, and Controls			x		
8. IQC Recommendations	x				

F. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to improve the effectiveness of commodity input?

(If additional space is needed, use reverse side of the worksheet)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ _____

III. INPUT - ~~PARTICIPANT~~ TRAINING
US Staff & Field Training

Training Program: [X] U.S. [ ] Third Country

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THIS TRAINING

Banjul Workshop - April/75
Dakar Meeting - April/76
AID/Washington Program Design & Evaluation Seminar - Ray Panczyk, Glen Knapp, Rev. T.S. Mulkerin, Ken Hackett

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS							D. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE				
Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding		Low	Medium			High
1	2	3	4	(5)	6	7	1	2	3	(4)	5

E. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
PREDEPARTURE					
1. English Language Ability *(U.S. Training)*	x				
2. Host ~~Country~~ Agency Funding (Caritas)	x				
3. Orientation	x				
4. Participant Availability			x		
5. Trainee Selection			x		
POST-TRAINING					
1. Relevance of Training to Project			x		
2. Recognition of Degree Equivalency	x				
3. Appropriate Facilities and Equipment for Returned Trainees			x		
4. Employment Appropriate to Project			x		
5. Supervisor Receptiveness			x		

F. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to make the participant element more effective?

We hope to have all Program Directors attend Log Frame Course.

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

IV. ACTION AGENT - COOPERATING ~~COUNTRY~~ Agency (Counterpart)

A. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT PREDOMINANTLY ON THE ~~HOST GOVERNMENT~~ Counterpart

Counterpart cooperation has been given less emphasis during the first year.

B. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS				C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE			
Unsatisfactory 1 . 2	Satisfactory 3 4 5	Outstanding 6 7		Low 1	Medium 2 3 4		High 5

D. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING — FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
PERSONNEL					
1. Competence/Continuity of Project Leadership					
2. Ability to Implement Project Plans					
3. Use of Project-Trained Manpower					
4. Technical Skills of Project Personnel					
5. Planning and Management Skills					
6. Technical Man-years Available					
7. Continuity of Staff					
8. Willingness to Work in Rural Areas					
9. Adequacy of Pay and Allowances					
10. Counterpart Acceptance of and Association with Project Purpose					
11. Management of Commodities					

FACTORS — OTHER FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
1. Cooperation within Host Government					
2. Host Government Cooperation with Non-Government Organizations					
3. Availability of Reliable Data/Statistics					
4. Adequacy of Project Funding					
5. Legislative Changes Relevant to Project					
6. Adequacy of Project-Related Organization					
7. Physical Resource Inputs					
8. Maintenance of Facilities and Equipment					
9. Political Conditions Specific to Project					
10. Resolution of Bureaucratic Problems					
11. Receptiveness to Change					
12. Actual Dissemination of Project Benefits					
13. Intent/Capacity to sustain and/or Expand Project Impact After U.S. Inputs are Terminated					

E. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to improve the performance of the ~~COUNTRY~~ Agency?

During second year we hope to offer the teams' services to counterpart organization .

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

VI. ACTION AGENT - A.I.D./W

A. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON A.I.D./W

Availability of Funds

Travel Authorization

B. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS							C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE				
Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding		Low	Medium			High
1	2	3	4	5	(6)	7	1	2	3	4	(5)

D. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact			Check if Important
		Negative	As Planned	Superior	
1. Provision of Personnel			x		
2. Provision of Commodities			x		
3. Provision of Adequate A.I.D./W Technical Backstopping			x		
4. Contract Negotiation	x				

E. ACTION REQUIRED: What Mission action(s) should be taken to stimulate improved A.I.D./W performance?

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

Progress Review Worksheet

PROJECT OUTPUTS - PROGRESS TO DATE

Evaluation for Period _____ to _____

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY TO DATE	CURRENT FY TO END	FY ____	FY 77	END OF PROJECT
1. Seminars - Regional Sub-Regional	PLANNED	1	1	1		1	4
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	1	1				
	REPLANNED						
2. CRS Staff Training	PLANNED	47 field 4 HQ	same				47 field 4 HQ
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	27 field 4 HQ	same				
	REPLANNED						
3. Integrated Rural Development Projects	PLANNED		7	2		3	11
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	5	5				
	REPLANNED						
4. Planning System	PLANNED	2 country plan	4 country plan	3		3	12 country plan
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	2	4				
	REPLANNED						

B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS	Comment:
1. Seminars	Banjul, 1975 - entailed planning & programming techniques. Dakar, 1976 - review among 4 countries DPG Team efforts Seminars were effective in obtaining stated goals.
2. CRS Staff & Counterpart participating in Training	All CRS/Directors went through Banjul Workshop. Four members(2 DPG Teams & 2 Regional) attended AID/Washingto Log Frame Course.
3. Integrated Rural Dev. Projects	See Attached list.
4. Planning System	DPG team & Regional have made recommendations on plannin techniques to be reviewed and utilized by IQC as an input to agency-wide planning and evaluation system and revised Socio-Economic Development Manual.

SUB-SAHARA AFRICA REGION

Integrated Rural Development Projects	How Affected by DPG?	
Cameroon 74/9 - OPG Rural Health Training	1	R
Ethiopia 74/5 - Dana Resettlement Site Development	1	R (DPG Team there now)
Senegal 76/10 - Wassadou Agriculture (in planning)	2	R
Sierra Leone 70/7 - Matotoka Chiefton Development	0	-
Tanzania 73/4 - Development in Ujamaan Village	1	-
Upper Volta 72/5 - Dam Construction - Agriculture Dev. (A-B)	3	R

0 = No impact

1 = DPG sponsored planning workshop - Banjul, May/75

2 = (1) plus DPG consultation

3 = (1) plus (2) Direct DPG Team intervention

This does not include Regional input which has also been affected by the DPG input and has pervaded all projects listed in Category R.

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

for Period: 4/1/75 to 7/31/76

1. U.S. ACTION AGENT – ~~Contractor, Executing Agency,~~ or Voluntary Agency

Agent: Catholic Relief Services-USCC

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THE ACTION AGENT:

Hired Consultants in each country as planned through 7/31
Held 3 in-country seminars (Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia)
Held Sub-regional Seminar
Three Integrated Projects Designed (not including San Gil)

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS as revised March/76

1. EVALUATION FACTORS	Not Applicable	PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN ✓			
		Poor	Adequate	As Planned	Superior
a. Understanding project purpose	X		X		
b. Planning to achieve purpose				X	
c. Staff of proper size				X	
d. Timely arrival of personnel				X	
e. Technical qualifications of personnel				X	
f. Responsiveness to A.I.D. Directions		X			
g. Adherence to scope of work				X	
h. Adherence to work schedule				X	
i. Contractor's home office support ...(Regional Office)				X	
j. Relations with cooperating country nationals				X	
k. Local staff training and utilization				X	
l. Effective administration of participants				X	
m. Management of commodities		X			
n. Timely submission of required reports				X	
o. Candor and usefulness of required reports				X	
p. Other (specify)					

2. OVERALL EVALUATION	Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
✓ Check one →				X			

D. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken and by whom to improve performance?

1) Greater Commitment H.Q.'s to revise planning system.
2) Revision Activities by Program Directors in each country to stress training seminars and short-term Technical Assistance.
3) SARO must define purpose next international seminar - Questionnaire sent inquiring as to personnel needs.
4) SARO needs to clarify information required and how will use "work plans" (See point 1).

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of this worksheet)

(Revision 12-72)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ - _____

II. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Staff Resources
(If of particular significance to project, use a separate sheet for each major commodity group)

Type of Resource ~~XXXXXXX~~: _____

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THESE ~~XXXXXXXXX~~ Resources

Organized and participated in in-country seminars (esp. Bolivia & Ecuador).

Organized and participated (3) in Sub-regional Seminars.

Coordinator (EB) assisted in development of planning activities in each country.

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS			D. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE			
Unsatisfactory 1 (2)	Satisfactory 3 4 5	Outstanding 6 7	Low 1	Medium 2 3 (4)		High 5

E. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
1. ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Staff Appropriate to Project Needs		x			x
2. Timeliness of Procurement/Reconditioning			x		
3. Timeliness of ~~XXXXXX~~ to Point of Use Arrival			x		
4. ~~Storage~~ Adequacy of Resources		x			
5. Appropriate Use		x			
6. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Training of Staff			x		
7. Records, Accounting, and Controls			x		
8. IQC Recommendations	x				

F. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to improve the effectiveness of commodity input?

1) Maintain technical assistance coordinator.

2) Utilize short-term technical assistance in function of specific tasks.

3) Provide for limited interchange internationally through seminars and specific technical assistance jobs.

(If additional space is needed, use reverse side of the worksheet)

Performance Analysis
INPUT - US Staff and Field Staff Training
III. [redacted]

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

Training Program: ☐ U.S. ☒ Third Country

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THIS TRAINING

15 CRS
99 Counterpart personnel participated in training seminars

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS							D. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE				
Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding		Low	Medium			High
1	2	3	4	(5)	6	7	1	2	3	(4)	5

E. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
PREDEPARTURE					
1. English Language Ability *(U.S. Training)*	x				
2. Host Agency Funding	x				
3. Orientation			x		
4. Participant Availability			x		
5. Trainee Selection			x		
POST-TRAINING					
1. Relevance of Training to Project			x		x
2. Recognition of Degree Equivalency	x				
3. Appropriate Facilities and Equipment for Returned Trainees	x				
4. Employment Appropriate to Project			x		
5. Supervisor Receptiveness	x				

F. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to make the participant training more effective?

1) Research needs of CRS personnel (to be done by questionnaire)

2) Each country program design seminars in-country in response to need as determined by grass-root personnel

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

IV. ACTION AGENT - COOPERATING ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Counterpart

A. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT PREDOMINANTLY ON THE HOST ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Agencies

Caritas Co-sponsored Seminars developed with CRS strategy toward devising "work plans" including seminar activities

B. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS							C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE				
Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding		Low	Medium			High
1	2	(3)	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	(4)	5

D. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING — FACTORS — PERSONNEL	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
1. Competence/Continuity of Project Leadership					
2. Ability to Implement Project Plans			x		
3. Use of Project-Trained Manpower		x			
4. Technical Skills of Project Personnel			x		
5. Planning and Management Skills			x		
6. Technical Man-years Available			x		
7. Continuity of Staff			x		
8. Willingness to Work in Rural Areas			x		
9. Adequacy of Pay and Allowances			x		
10. Counterpart Acceptance of and Association with Project Purpose			x		x
11. Management of ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Resources			x		

FACTORS — OTHER FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
1. Cooperation within Host ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Agency			x		
2. Host Government Cooperation with Non-Government Organizations	x				
3. Availability of Reliable Data/Statistics			x		
4. Adequacy of Project Funding			x		
5. Legislative Changes Relevant to Project	x				
6. Adequacy of Project-Related Organization			x		
7. Physical Resource Inputs	x				
8. Maintenance of Facilities and Equipment	x				
9. Political Conditions Specific to Project			x		
10. Resolution of Bureaucratic Problems			x		
11. Receptiveness to Change			x		
12. Actual Dissemination of Project Benefits			x		
13. Intent/Capacity to Sustain and/or Expand Project Impact After U.S. Inputs are Terminated			x		

E. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to improve the performance of the Cooperating Country?

1) CRS should involve more agencies and concentrate on training diocesan level staff.
2) CRS must decide whether to continue DPG in Peru considering poor counterpart collaboration

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

Progress Review Worksheet
PROJECT OUTPUTS - PROGRESS TO DATE

Evaluation for Period _____ to _____

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY TO DATE	CURRENT FY TO END	FY 77	FY ____	END OF PROJECT
1. Seminars - Regional and In-country	PLANNED	0	1 Reg 1 4 Ctry.	1 Reg 1 13 Train-courses	1 Reg 1 8 T.C.		3 Regional 25 Training Cou
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	1 3				
	REPLANNED						
2. Participants	PLANNED	CRS counter part	19 130	19 310	not planned		approx. 19 440
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	CRS counter part	15 99				
	REPLANNED						
3. Integrated Projects Designed	PLANNED		See Attached list				
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
4. Revised Planning System	PLANNED	tentative work plans for 4 countries			CRS work plans for each country		5 countries with work plans
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	tentative work plans for 3 countries					
	REPLANNED						

B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS

1. Seminars

Comment:

1) S. America Peru Seminar not held - inter-agency cooperation lacking.
2) Seminars were successful in achieving their objectives.

2. Participants

Comment:

1) Good participation
2) Participant action after training not yet measured

3. Projects Designed

Comment:

See attached list

4. Revised Planning System

1) Questionnaire on Manual sent out
2) Recommendations from Seminars taken under consideration

SOUTH AMERICA REGION

Integrated Projects Designed	How Affected by DPG?	
Colombia 75/01 - San Gil Integrated Project (Am't Requested - $779,000)	1	FR
Colombia 74/06 - Leadership Training (Am't Requested - $ 33,930)		
Colombia 75/05 - Tool Bank (Am't Requested - $ 5,900)		
Colombia 75/07 - Model Farms (Am't Requested - $ 27,300)		
Bolivia 75/01 - Mobile Health Program (Am't Requested - $110,000)	1	F
Ecuador 75/01 - Ambato Integrated Program (Am't Requested - $214,000)	1	F
Uruguay 75/01 - Durazno Integrated Program (Am't Requested - $140,000)	0	FR
Uruguay 74/01 - Bee Raising (Am't Requested - $ 42,245)		
Uruguay 76/02 - Bee Raising (Am't Requested - $ 25,000)		

R = Regional office technical assistance
F = Program office input only

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

for Period: 4/1/75 to 7/31/76

1. U.S. ACTION AGENT - [redacted], or Voluntary Agency

Agent: Catholic Relief Services-USCC

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$	$	$

See attached budget and expense schedule

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THE ACTION AGENT:

1 Regional Seminar
16 CRS Staff Trained
- Counterpart Staff Trained
- Designed Rural Development Projects

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS as Revised March/76

1. EVALUATION FACTORS	Check if Special Cost	PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN (✓) NA	Unsat.	As Planned	Superior
a. Understanding project purpose	X		X*		
b. Planning to achieve purpose	X		X*		
c. Staff of proper size	X		X		
d. Timely arrival of personnel	X		X		
e. Technical qualifications of personnel	X				X
f. Responsiveness to A.I.D. Directions		X			
g. Adherence to scope of work	X				X
h. Adherence to work schedule	X				X
i. Contractor's home office support	X		X		
j. Relations with cooperating country nationals	X		X		
k. Local staff training and utilization	X		X		
l. Effective administration of participants	X			X	
m. Management of commodities		X			
n. Timely submission of required reports	X		X		
o. Candor and usefulness of required reports	X				X
p. Other (specify)					

2. OVERALL EVALUATION	Unsatisfactory 1	2	Satisfactory 3	4	5	Outstanding 6	7
(✓) Check one →		X					

D. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken and by whom to improve performance?

*Please note - Purpose understood well by Regional Office & field staff, but not by Executive level.

1) New Planner/Evaluator should be hired asap - by Executives and Regional Office.
2) Seminar, preceded by Task Forces should be implemented Sept.-Nov. period - needs Executive approval, Regional office follow through.
3) Use of Rural Development Consultancy funds should be promoted by Regional Office.
4) Plan for next period should be prepared by Regional Office, Country Staff jointly at regional seminar.

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

(Revised 12-72)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

II. INPUT ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Staff Resources
(If of particular significance to project, use a separate sheet for each major commodity group)

Type of Resource ~~Commodity~~: Technical Staff

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$ -	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THESE ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Resources

1 Regional Seminar
16 CRS Staff Trained
Counterpart Staff Trained
Rural Development Projects Designed

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS			D. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE			
Unsatisfactory 1 (2)	Satisfactory 3 4 5	Outstanding 6 7	Low 1	Medium 2 3 4		High (5)

E. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	As Planned	Superior	Check if Important
1. ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Resources Appropriate to Project Needs		x			x
2. Timeliness of ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Hiring			x		x
3. Timeliness of Delivery to Point of Use Arrival on site			x		x
4. ~~XXXXX~~ Adequacy of resources			x		
5. Appropriate Use		x			
6. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Training					
7. Records, Accounting, and Controls		x			x
8. IQC Recommendations	x				

F. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to improve the effectiveness of commodity input?

Planner/Evaluator should be hired to replace Mr. Taylor who would be able to build upon his ground work/reports, but who would not carry negative factors (i.e.-Caritas problems, religious factors) - someone with more tact.

(If additional space is needed, use reverse side of this worksheet)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ - _____

III. INPUT - PARTICIPANT TRAINING

Training Program: ☐ U.S. ☐ Third Country

US Staff and Field Training

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THIS TRAINING

16 CRS Staff Trained
Counterpart Staff Trained

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS							D. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE				
Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding		Low	Medium			High
1	(2)	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	(5)

E. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	As Planned	Superior	Check if Important
PREDEPARTURE					
1. English Language Ability *(U.S. Training)*	x				
2. Host ~~Country~~ Agency Funding (Caritas)	x				
3. Orientation	x				
4. Participant Availability			x		
5. Trainee Selection	x				
POST-TRAINING					
1. Relevance of Training to Project		x			x
2. Recognition of Degree Equivalency	x				
3. Appropriate Facilities and Equipment for Returned Trainees	x				
4. Employment Appropriate to Project	x				
5. Supervisor Receptiveness	x				

F. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to make the participant element more effective?

Seminar as planned by C.A./Caribbean Regional office should be rescheduled for November 15 - 24. To be preceded by 3-4 mini-seminars (task forces)

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

IV. ACTION AGENT - COOPERATING ~~COUNTRY~~ Agencies - Counterparts

A. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT PREDOMINANTLY ON THE ~~COOPERATING COUNTRY~~ Counterparts

- Counterpart Staff Trained

B. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS					C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE			
Unsatisfactory 1 2	Satisfactory 3 4 5			Outstanding 6 7	Low 1	Medium 2 3 (4)		High 5

D. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING — FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
PERSONNEL					
1. Competence/Continuity of Project Leadership	x				
2. Ability to Implement Project Plans	x				
3. Use of Project-Trained Manpower	x				
4. Technical Skills of Project Personnel	x				
5. Planning and Management Skills	x				
6. Technical Man-years Available	x				
7. Continuity of Staff	x				
8. Willingness to Work in Rural Areas	x				
9. Adequacy of Pay and Allowances	x				
10. Counterpart Acceptance of and Association with Project Purpose		x			x
11. Management of Commodities					

FACTORS — OTHER FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
1. Cooperation within Host Government	x				
2. Host Government Cooperation with Non-Government Organizations	x				
3. Availability of Reliable Data/Statistics	x				
4. Adequacy of Project Funding	x				
5. Legislative Changes Relevant to Project	x				
6. Adequacy of Project-Related Organization	x				
7. Physical Resource Inputs	x				
8. Maintenance of Facilities and Equipment	x				
9. Political Conditions Specific to Project	x				
10. Resolution of Bureaucratic Problems	x				
11. Receptiveness to Change		x			x
12. Actual Dissemination of Project Benefits		x			x
13. Intent/Capacity to sustain and/or Expand Project Impact After U.S. Inputs are Terminated					

E. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to improve the performance of the Cooperating Country?

New Planner/Evaluator should be, at least, a neutral factor in CRS-Caritas relationships. However, DPG in C.A./Caribbean should primarily be seen as a CRS resources to enable us to increase our capacity to work with a series of counterparts, not just traditional Caritas agencies.

(if additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

VI. ACTION AGENT - A.I.D./W

A. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON A.I.D./W

- Availability of funds for hiring Planner/Evaluator
- Travel

B. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS							C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE				
Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding		Low	Medium			High
1	2	3	(4)	5	6	7	1	2	3	(4)	5

D. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact			Check if Important
		Negative	As Planned	Superior	
1. Provision of Personnel	x				
2. Provision of ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Funds			x		x
3. Provision of Adequate A.I.D./W Technical Backstopping	x				
4. Contract Negotiation			x		x

E. ACTION REQUIRED: What Mission action(s) should be taken to stimulate improved A.I.D./W performance?

AID/W should remove bureaucratic delays re: movement of personnel within region - (travel clearance)

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

Progress Review Worksheet

PROJECT OUTPUTS-PROGRESS TO DATE

Evaluation for Period 4/1/75 to 7/31/76

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY TO DATE	CURRENT FY TO END	FY ____	FY ____	END OF PROJECT
1. Seminars - Regional Country	PLANNED		1 Reg'l	1 Reg'l 3 Country	1 Reg'l		2 Reg'l 3 Country
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE		0				
	REPLANNED			1 Reg'l 3 Country			
2. Participants	PLANNED		21	21	45		66
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE		0				
	REPLANNED						
3. Integrated Rural Projects Designed	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
4. Revised Planning System	PLANNED		PE Report on Region	*	*	IQC Recomm.	Revised system & Integration into overall agency system
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE		Report Completed				
	REPLANNED						

B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS

1. Seminars

Comment:

Central America Seminar cancelled by CRS/NY. Replanned for November 14 - 24.

2. Participants

Comment:

3. Integrated Rural Designed Projects

Comment:

See attached list.

4. Revised Planning System

IQC presented to AID for approval.
Questionnaire on Socio-Economic Manual under preparation.

*Study and application of Report.
*Model for planning specific country plans.

CENTRAL AMERICA CARIBBEAN REGION

Integrated Rural Development Projects Designed 4/75 - 7/76		How Affected by DPG?	
Mexico 76/2 - Tizimin Fri Dimensional Development Program, Yucatan	(Value $194,107) (Am't Requested - $148,000)	0	F
Costa Rica 76/1 - Nutrition Education & Agricultural Prod. (possibly OPG)	(Value $232,000) (Am't Requested - $117,000)	1	R
Dominican Republic 75/4 - Conasaja Integrated Agricultural Project	(Am't Requested - $198,000)	0	F
Haiti 75/11 - Gros Morne Health & Development Training Program (OPG)	(Am't Requested - $138,000)	1	R
Jamaica 76/1 - Small Farmers' Support (OPG)	(Am't Requested - $249,175)	0	R

R = Regional office technical assistance
F = Program office input only

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Evaluation for Period: 4/1/75 to 7/31/76

1. U.S. ACTION AGENT – [redacted], or Voluntary Agency

Agent: Catholic Relief Services-USC

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THE ACTION AGENT:

Planner/Evaluator hired

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS as revised March/76

1. EVALUATION FACTORS	Check if Signific. Devat	PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN (✓)			
		NA	Prob.	As Planned	Superior
a. Understanding project purpose					X
b. Planning to achieve purpose				X	
c. Staff of proper size				X	
d. Timely arrival of personnel					X
e. Technical qualifications of personnel					X
f. Responsiveness to A.I.D. Directions				X	
g. Adherence to scope of work				X	
h. Adherence to work schedule				X	
i. Contractor's home office support				X	
j. Relations with cooperating country nationals				X	
k. Local staff training and utilization				X	
l. Effective administration of participants		X			
m. Management of commodities				X	
n. Timely submission of required reports				X	
o. Candor and usefulness of required reports				X	
p. Other (specify)					

2. OVERALL EVALUATION	Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(✓) Check one →					X		

D. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken and by whom to improve performance?

Greater formal guidance from the Technical Officer with regard to specific project activities would be of assistance.

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

(Revised 12-72)

Staff Resources Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

II. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

(If of particular significance to project, use a separate sheet for each major commodity group)

Type of Resource ~~XXXXXXX~~: _____

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THESE ~~XXXXXXXXXXX~~ Resources

Planned visit to Jordan - not approved by AID
Reviewed country programs
Planned Regional Seminar to be held in November
Planned trip to Egypt for October

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS			D. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE			
Unsatisfactory 1 (2)	Satisfactory 3 4 5	Outstanding 6 7	Low 1	Medium 2 3 (4)		High 5
E. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable		Actual Impact: Negative	As Planned	Superior	Check if Important
1. ~~Staff~~ ~~XXXXXXX~~s Appropriate to Project Needs			-	x		x
2. Timeliness of Procurement/~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~				x		
3. Timeliness of ~~XXXXXX~~ to Point of Use arrival				x		
4. ~~Stocks~~ Adequacy of resources				x		
5. Appropriate Use			x			
6. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Training of Staff				x		
7. Records, Accounting, and Controls				x		
8. TOC Recommendations	x					

F. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to improve the effectiveness of commodity input?

Planner/Evaluator must be able to visit countries according to plan or his effectiveness will be hindered.

Better understanding and coordination with AID to avoid cancelling of plans of PE because AID does not allow travel for one reason or another.

(If additional space is needed, use reverse side of the worksheet)

Performance Analysis

U.S. Staff & Field Staff Training

III. INPUT - [redacted]

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

Training Program: ☐ U.S. ☐ Third Country

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THIS TRAINING

Planner/Evaluator attended AID Project Design and Evaluation Seminar

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS							D. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE				
Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding		Low	Medium			High
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5

E. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
PREDEPARTURE					
1. English Language Ability *(U.S. Training)*	x				
2. Host Country Funding	x				
3. Orientation			x		
4. Participant Availability	x				
5. Trainee Selection	x				
POST-TRAINING					
1. Relevance of Training to Project			x		x
2. Recognition of Degree Equivalency	x				
3. Appropriate Facilities and Equipment for Returned Trainees	x				
4. Employment Appropriate to Project			x		
5. Supervisor Receptiveness	x				

F. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to make the participant element more effective?

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

IV. ACTION AGENT - COOPERATING XXXXXXXX Counterpart

A. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT PREDOMINANTLY ON THE XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Agency-CRS

Counterpart not involved - too early

B. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS							C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE				
Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding		Low	Medium			High
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5

D. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS PERSONNEL	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important	FACTORS OTHER FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
1. Competence/Continuity of Project Leadership						1. Cooperation within Host Government					
2. Ability to Implement Project Plans						2. Host Government Cooperation with Non-Government Organizations					
3. Use of Project-Trained Manpower						3. Availability of Reliable Data/Statistics					
4. Technical Skills of Project Personnel						4. Adequacy of Project Funding					
5. Planning and Management Skills						5. Legislative Changes Relevant to Project					
6. Technical Man-years Available						6. Adequacy of Project-Related Organization					
7. Continuity of Staff						7. Physical Resource Inputs					
8. Willingness to Work in Rural Areas						8. Maintenance of Facilities and Equipment					
9. Adequacy of Pay and Allowances						9. Political Conditions Specific to Project					
10. Counterpart Acceptance of and Association with Project Purpose						10. Resolution of Bureaucratic Problems					
						11. Receptiveness to Change					
11. Management of XXXXXXXXX funds						12. Actual Dissemination of Project Benefits					
						13. Intent/Capacity to sustain and/or Expand Project Impact After U.S. Inputs are Terminated					

E. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken to improve the performance of the Cooperating XXXXXX Agency?

Country Programs should benefit from increased emphasis by the Region on the DPG.

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

Performance Analysis

Evaluation for Period: _____ to _____

VI. ACTION AGENT - A.I.D./W

A. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON A.I.D./W

Funds for (Planner/Evaluator
(Regional and Country Seminars

Travel authorization

B. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS			C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE		
Unsatisfactory 1 2	Satisfactory (3) 4 5	Outstanding 6 7	Low 1	Medium (2) 3 4	High 5

D. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact: Negative	Actual Impact: As Planned	Actual Impact: Superior	Check if Important
1. Provision of Personnel	x				
2. Provision of ~~XXXXXXXXX~~ Funds			x		x
3. Provision of Adequate A.I.D./W Technical Backstopping		x			x
4. Contract Negotiation			x		

E. ACTION REQUIRED: What Mission action(s) should be taken to stimulate improved A.I.D./W performance?

Regional Planner/Evaluator was employed with AID approval as requested.

Seminars planned for Jordan did not take place because AID support was withheld, due to inaccurate understanding by AID of the purpose of the planner/evaluators requested trip to Jordan.

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

Progress Review Worksheet

PROJECT OUTPUTS-PROGRESS TO DATE

Evaluation for Period _____ to _____

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY TO DATE	CURRENT FY TO END	FY 77	FY 78	END OF PROJECT
1. Seminars - Regional and in-country	PLANNED	0	(Jordan) 1 cancelled	(Jordan) 1	Rome 1	Rome 1	3 (+ other country seminars)
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	0				
	REPLANNED			0	3 Egypt, Yemen, Jordan 1 Rome	Rome 1	5 (+ other country seminars)
2. Participants	PLANNED	0	0	?			
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	0				
	REPLANNED			?			44 + country seminars
3. Projects Designed	PLANNED	?	See attached list				
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE		*				
	REPLANNED			?			
4. Revised Planning System	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						

B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS	Comment:
1. Seminars	One Seminar intended for Jordan, May/76 was cancelled by AID. One Seminar for Jordan is re-planned after August/76. One Seminar for Egypt is planned for Oct./76-participants ind One Seminar for Yemen is planned for Jan./77-participants ind One Regional Seminar is planned for November/76. No Seminars were planned in the first year. A restructuring of the Region affected original plans.
2. Participants	Except for the Regional Seminars for 2nd and 3rd years for which total participants planned are 44, the number of participants for in-country seminars is undertermined so far.
3. Projects Designed	No regional target is established for number of integrated projects. Three attempts were made to design integrated projects. Jerusalem R.D.; Yemen Integrated; Jordan R.D. According to the criteria for integrated projects, they do not formally qualify, although all 3 contain elements of the criteria.
4. Revised Planning System	The Region has not devised a Regional Planning System. However, the AID format and guidelines for project planning & design have been promulgated with Region programs. Regional staff have attended the AID/W seminars.

(Jordan R.D.

* 3 (Jerusalem R.D.,

NORTH AFRICA/MID-EAST REGION

Integrated Rural Development Projects Designed 4/75 - 7/76

How Affected by DPG?

Jerusalem West Bank 75/1 - Rural Development Project
(Value $852,401)
(Am't Requested - $643,401)

Jordan 75/5 - Integrated Development in the fields of Agriculture, Health & Education
(Value $1,310,000)

Yemen 76/14 - Integrated Development Project
(Value $1,118,346)