PN-AAP-535
ISN: 33902

Report of the

1979 AID/PVO CONFERENCE

A meeting for
representatives of Private and Voluntary Organizations and officers of the Agency for International Development

Sponsored by
Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation
Bureau for Private and Development Cooperation
Agency for International Development

May 15-16, 1979
National Academy of Sciences
Washington, D.C.

21

Report of the 1979 AID/PVO Conference

Sponsored by
THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Bureau of Private and Development Cooperation
Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation

Held May 15-16, 1979
At the National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC
For Representatives of Private and Voluntary
Organizations and Officers of AID

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20523

ASSISTANT
ADMINISTRATOR

Dear Colleague:

I am pleased to introduce the report of our May 15-16 conference with you by injecting a few thoughts of my own. First, I was quite satisfied with the conference: its constructive tone, the substance of the issues discussed, and the useful conclusions and recommendations which emerged from the two days. I want to thank you for your help in making this major effort pleasurable and productive.

You may remember that in my opening remarks to the Conference, I characterized the AID/PVO relationship as one of "creative tension." I hold to that phrase. In particular, we mean to work with you on a true partnership basis which enhances your independence, demonstrated competence and access to the problems of the poor. But another frequently competing force is that of ensuring proper accountability for public funds, all the more so when those funds are not infinite. Within this Bureau, we will continue to try to hold that tension level at a tolerable point. (I am convinced that it will not go away altogether.) And I personally pledge myself to spare no efforts to resolve those issues and tension points in a manner that doesn't whittle away at your independence and special importance.

From you, we need a measure of forbearance and understanding. I know you will tell us when we seem unnecessarily restrictive and restricted; and I hope you accept the fact that AID's needs and limitations are also real, and not simple bureaucratic hassling.

I hope you will review this conference report with care and write to me or to Tom Fox with your suggestions about

the many unresolved issues. We mean to continue to improve our increasingly important relationship.

Sincerely yours,

Calvin H. Raullerson
Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Private and Development
Cooperation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE - OPENING PLENARY SESSION

Remarks by Calvin H. Raullerson, Assistant Administrator for Private and Voluntary Cooperation, AID 1
Remarks by Representative Michael D. Barnes 3
Remarks by Robert H. Nooter, Acting Administrator, AID 7
Opening Panel: PVO Representatives on PVO Concerns 11

SECTION TWO - REGIONAL WORKSHOP SUMMARIES

A. Africa 14
Uganda Briefing 16
B. Latin America 18
C. Asia 20
D. Near East 22

SECTION THREE - GENERAL WORKSHOPS

I. The AID-PVO Relationship--What Should It Be? 24
II. AID Assistance to PVOs
A. Grant Definitions and Categories 31
B. Matching Grants 34
C. Management Services 38
III. Evaluation and PVOs: Management Tool and Learning Device 40
IV. Special Needs and Services--Refugees, Food for Peace, and Disaster Assistance 45
V. PVO-U.S. Joint University Venture 48

SECTION FOUR - CLOSING PLENARY SESSION

Workshop Reports 50
Needs of the New PVOs 52
Canadian Experience 53

SECTION FIVE APPENDICES

A. Conference Agenda 57
B. Documents 59
Excerpts from the International Development Cooperation Act of 1979 (H.R. 3324) 60
Excerpt from Report of Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on International Development Cooperation Act of 1979 61

Documents (cont.)
Letter to President Jimmy Carter from the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service 64

C. List of Participants 66
D. Abbreviations Used in the Conference Report 76

With the exception of remarks made by official personnel of the Agency for International Development and the Department of State, the views and interpretations of this publication are those of private sector participants and should not be attributed to the Agency for International Development or to any individual acting on its behalf.

SECTION ONE

I. OPENING PLENARY SESSION

Remarks by Calvin H. Raullerson,
Assistant Administrator for
Private and Development Cooperation, AID
Remarks by Representative Michael D. Barnes
Remarks by Robert H. Nooter, Acting
Administrator, AID
Opening Panel: PVO Representatives
on PVO Concerns

CHAIR: Calvin H. Raullerson

Mr. Raullerson welcomed participants to the AID-PVO Conference, saying that the gathering was an opportunity to reaffirm the "critical partnership" of public and private efforts in development. He described the AID-PVO relationship as one of "creative tension," with many issues and questions to be shared during the meeting.

A number of private initiatives during this past year have contributed to the ongoing dialogue about PVO concerns, he said. Among these initiatives were the Mohonk meeting on private resources and development education attended by PVO, corporate and foundation leaders; the many meetings convened by the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service on development education, Women in Development, refugee matters and other concerns; and the meetings of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid on global food security and on nutrition.

Mr. Raullerson shared some observations on the PVO role in development and some reflections on a recent field trip to the Middle East and Southeast Asia. In visiting village community development projects in Lebanon, India and Indonesia, he said, he was struck by the importance of PVO support, planning and assistance to local people engaged in realizing their own dreams. He was impressed by the spirit of the PVOs and the high regard in which they are held by the people with whom they are working. What he saw, he said, is people-to-people assistance in the highest sense. PVOs have often been ahead of AID in areas of need in the Third World, and, he said, "one suspects they may well outlast us."

Mr. Raullerson commented that the tensions of the AID-PVO relationship bring to the fore one of the most basic ethical questions underlying development work in the past twenty years: how do we achieve the benefits of development without destroying man's capacity to act freely? Part

of the answer is a matter of style. "It's not what we do, but how we do it," he said. "We must do it in a human way that enables the people involved to retain their dignity...in a way that creates a partnership between equals, not a two-tier relationship." He emphasized the importance of examining the values and attitudes implicit in the donor-donee relationship and called for more "sensitivity, understanding and awareness as we engage in the highly complex act of helping others...to reduce inequity throughout the world"--through empowerment of indigenous peoples struggling to control their own lives.

REMARKS: Representative Michael D. Barnes, Democrat of Maryland

Representative Barnes presented the following prepared remarks to the session:

Nearly two years ago one of the most creative minds in American history set to work examining and rethinking the process by which the United States offers its hand in partnership with the developing nations of the world. Hubert Humphrey remained convinced--as I am and as you are--that the United States bears a special responsibility—not only to others, but also to ourselves—to do our fair share toward the elimination of the worst aspects of poverty, disease, hunger, and malnutrition, as well as toward building the foundations which can offer every citizen of this earth a decent opportunity at education, shelter, productive employment, and a sense of accomplishment and hope which the present generation might transmit to our children.

But Senator Humphrey was also convinced that we weren't doing our job as well as we might...that our efforts were uncoordinated, not always well-managed, and too often unrepresented in the councils of major national decision-making.

In his final hours Hubert Humphrey completed drafting legislation to reorganize United States governmental machinery for official development assistance. I do not have to tell you what that legislation is all about. You people were dealing directly with that legislation while I was still trying to get Maryland public utilities to supply energy at a fair price. (I'm afraid you've made more progress than I.)

But you know that the intent of the Humphrey bill was to affiliate all U.S. governmental programs dealing with foreign assistance within a coordinating framework known as the International Development Cooperation Administration. And the intent was not merely to give those programs coordination, but, just as importantly, to give them power--

...to give them power to address development programs without undue foreign policy influences;

...to give them power to prepare and manage their budgets within the context of long term planning and concepts, rather than year-by-year or month-by-month political interests;

...to give them power to represent global development concerns within the councils which decide not only United States policy on foreign aid, but United States policy on trade, commodities, debt, technology, environment, and a dozen other interrelated factors;

...and to give them power to speak directly to the President of the United States, and even to the people of this country, on the needs and rights of the world's poorest peoples.

Today, nearly a year and a half after Hubert Humphrey completed his bill and left us the responsibility for enacting it, we are dealing not with legislation but with executive outline...and we are vesting this "IDCA" with only a limited capacity to coordinate and an unlimited authority to urge, plead, and beg.

The President's "Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1979" is, in my judgement, a disappointment. We knew it would be disappointing when Ambassador Owen first sketched it in February, two weeks after the Congressional deadline for a formal proposal. Actually, we knew it would be disappointing several weeks earlier than that. We knew disappointment was ahead when one of the most committed, articulate, and sincere individuals ever to serve as administrator of America's bilateral assistance program was sacked precisely because he kept pushing for the very principles which Hubert Humphrey had proposed. Jack Gilligan lost his fight...and, I regret to say, in my judgement, so did the rest of us.

Not Far Enough

It is not that the President's proposal goes in the wrong direction. It is simply that, as so often on this subject, it doesn't go far enough in the right direction.

A new umbrella agency is to be created.

This International Development Cooperation Agency will include the Agency for International Development, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, a new Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation, and the Development Coordination Committee.

The Director of IDCA will report directly to the President.

However...

The Department of the Treasury will continue to select and control United States executive directors of the multilateral development banks. The Director of IDCA is authorized to let the Secretary of the Treasury know what he thinks. The Secretary of the Treasury has already said what he thinks of the role of the IDCA Director.

The Department of State will continue to be a tripartite member of the committee which determines Food for Peace allotments...an irrelevant role if Food for Peace is strictly to help hungry people and make use of U.S. surpluses...a wrongful role when Food for Peace is manipulated to support governments when Congress has limited other forms of aid to prop them up.

I do not want to give you the wrong impression. I will not vote against the President's Reorganization Plan. Although the plan is disappointing, a little coordination is, after all, better than none—or, as Chairman Zablocki put it, "When you're hungry, isn't half a loaf better than none?"

But I did want to make clear for the record that this proposal is not what we had hoped for. The President could have done better. Perhaps, in fact, he still can. That too is why I'm speaking out now...and I hope that you, too, will continue to communicate to the President your hopes that IDCA be made stronger. He can do it now by amending his reorganization plan. Or he can do it later, either by further altering his delegation of authorities, or simply by making clear to his subordinates the direction in which he would like to have things move.

And most importantly, he can make IDCA stronger by appointing to its leadership individuals who can truly offer leadership—capable administrators, imaginative planners, articulate spokespersons, and effective politicians. And hopefully, each of the officers will possess all of those qualities.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to spout off about our development cooperation machinery in general. Now I'd like to take a few moments to address the particular issue of PVOs.

When the President's reorganization plan was first outlined, some of us noticed two specific institutional questions which had not been addressed. Senator Humphrey had connected these together in an "International Development Institute" -- to include the Peace Corps and governmental support activities for private and voluntary organizations and cooperatives.

Two of my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee moved quickly to address the Peace Corps question: Congressman Bonker proposed to establish the Peace Corps as an independent foundation, and Chairman Zablocki countered with an amendment to make the Corps a subordinate unit of IDCA.

But everyone seemed to be forgetting about the PVOs. So I proposed to revive the Humphrey plan, modifying it somewhat by giving it an independent advisory board and a streamlined directorate, and calling it an "International Development Service."

I am happy to report that the net effect of my proposal was to delay the confrontation between Chairman Zablocki and Congressman Bonker long enough for them to work out a compromise on the Peace Corps -- a compromise, I believe, far superior to either of the original proposals -- but alas, still neglecting to deal with the PVO questions.

That neglect is not necessarily unhappy. I know that some of you in the PVOs and cooperatives were never entirely convinced of the desirability of having the support function taken out of AID. Others of you were not particularly thrilled with the prospect of being connected to the Peace Corps. And no one wants a plan that is not carefully developed and examined.

That is why we agreed to include in our Committee's report a request to the President to review "the present structure of PVO relationships with AID and to consider the establishment of a unit within IDCA to finance and provide support functions for the development-related activities of the

private and voluntary organizations and cooperatives." We directed the President to report on his findings and proposals by January 1, 1980.

I hope that the President will make this an open and creative examination of how the United States Government can help PVOs to do the jobs that they do best. And I hope that you, as representatives of the private and voluntary organizations and cooperatives, will be given full opportunity to participate in this examination and in the formulation of proposals for the President.

To help assure that you have a role in that, I'd like to hear your suggestions and ideas now. And I'd appreciate your detailing them in writing, either to me or to Chairman Zablocki. That way, as the Committee conducts its own review, and when we consider the President's report in January, we can have an inventory of the issues which concern you most, and we can look to be sure that the President's proposals address them.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS: Robert H. Nooter, Acting Administrator, AID

In reviewing events of the past year, Mr. Nooter commented that he was "pleased to see that the OPG program continues to prove itself useful for the AID program and, I hope, for the PVOs." He noted that earlier predictions had come true that the Institutional Grant arrangements would be under some pressure on the down side and that there would be increasing Congressional resistance to money that is not spent abroad. Most importantly, the Matching Grant program is beginning to proceed.

He noted that the Matching Grant program is not without problems. "We find, as anticipated, that the geographic bureaus--which, I feel, have an important role to play in all of these matters because they are the ones with the close contacts to our field operations--have a hard time not laying their hands too heavily on PVO activities. That's a management problem for us, to try to keep that delicate balance that Hank Raullerson mentioned. I think that on the whole the working relationships are beginning to smooth out. Some of the regional bureaus are farther along in understanding it than others. I gather that some of you are having some difficulties, but the Matching Grant is a device that can be made to work and one that gives you a great deal more flexibility and leeway in expanding what are essentially your own programs in contrast to the OPG, which is designed to be an extension of AID's program.

"Another event this year has been the arrival of Tom Fox.* Tom has already demonstrated his understanding of your problems and I assure you that he represents them very well internally in trying to work through our bureaucratic maze with your interests in mind.

"The level of spending that goes to the PVO program continues to expand. From our bilateral program funds now, without counting P.L. 480 Food for Peace at all, a little more than 10 percent is handled and spent through the Private Voluntary Organizations."

Mr. Nooter continued with a comment on the current development assistance reorganization. "There is a compromise of the original Humphrey plan to try and bring all aid elements into one unit. The compromise would create a small staff (the International Development Corporation Administration--IDCA), which is something more than a coordinating staff and less than a line organization, and which would have policy and budget control on constituent parts of the agencies involved in development (including AID), but without operating control over those offices. Other elements will

---

*Mr. Fox was appointed Director of the AID Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation in November 1979.

include the Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation in its present form, retaining its board of directors. IDCA will also exercise some controls in regard to [U.S. involvement in] multilateral institutions like the banks and the United Nations Development Program. The question of where the Peace Corps will end up is still in doubt.

"What does this mean for the PVOs?" Mr. Nooter asked. "It's hard to say. First, to the degree to which IDCA will review policy issues in foreign aid, I assume it will also review policy issues having to do with PVOs. Second, at an operational level, I assume that the AID-PVO relationship would remain essentially the way it is now; that is, I doubt the Insitute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation will be heavily involved in PVO activities. The AID organizational structure will be essentially the same as it is now and I assume--I hope--that we will be forced to live together for another twenty years under the same organizational arrangements except for the policy consideration at the IDCA level. So it behooves us to try to continue to work out the kinds of operational arrangements we have with each other.

Poor Year for Foreign Aid

"The other event on the horizon is that this is not the world's best Congressional year for foreign aid. The last two or three years were actually an improvement over prior years. Funding levels did increase and margins of support in votes on key legislation were more comfortable than any time in the past. But fear of inflation and Proposition 13-type sentiments, among other things, have combined to make this the hardest year we've had in a long time on the Hill. Changes in the membership of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have brought some significant changes. And of course the loss of Hubert Humphrey, one of the great friends of foreign aid in the past, is perhaps the most important single event. This year's bill is nearly finished. I understand that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is recommending a 17 percent cut in the bilateral development program, which is where the bulk of the PVO funds come from. We hope that the committee will try to defend its recommendations against further cuts but now all we can do is wait to see what happens on the floor of the Senate. There is a threat to the program and additional cuts would be a serious threat indeed.

"In regard to some of the questions which are up for consideration at this conference, there are two which come to my mind. First, the role of the indigenous PVOs in regard to American PVOs. We are doing a lot of different things with regard to the indigenous PVOs. There is a certain amount of Congressional support for that movement, but at least in my own mind exactly what those relationships should be is not quite clear. It bears some clarification and discussion over the course of this next year. Second, I happened to be here when someone mentioned the different role of a

non-constituent, non-profit organization as opposed to a constituent-supported PVO. This is a problem that has concerned me for some time. Those organizations do have a certain different element in them which perhaps should require that they be handled in a different manner. We would appreciate hearing comments on this."

Mr. Nooter's formal remarks were followed by a question-and-answer session:

Question: I was interested in your comments about OPGs. Do you anticipate an increase in central funding or do you think it will be going more towards the OPG model?

Mr. Nooter: I think we have a much better chance of obtaining funds that are intended to go overseas and that it will be hard to defend funds that appear as though they are being spent in the United States. I think that's going to be not just with PVO grants but with research grants, with Title XII funds for land grant universities--across the board, in other words. That's the way Congress is leaning. Tom Fox is making an excellent case for a certain amount of institutional support in special cases, and he's doing better than I might have anticipated a year ago, but there will be an overall policy limit on it."

Question: The 10 percent figure [of AID funds going to or through PVOs] is very encouraging. Do you see this increasing in the future?

Mr. Nooter: I think so. Bringing the PVOs into developmental work is still on an upward curve and I would look for those numbers to continue to rise, although we don't have a target figure in mind.

Question: I want to bring you back to your comment about "another twenty years of an AID-PVO relationship." As I read the Congressional reports this year, they see the issue as an open one of whether the PVOs would relate to AID or to the IDCA in some sort of new structure. You assume that the report that AID has been asked by Congress to prepare at the end of the year would recommend a continued AID linkage--or is that larger question still open?

Mr. Nooter: There is of course some Congressional sentiment that it would be better for the PVOs to be linked to the Peace Corps in some arrangement more separate from AID. I won't try to predict the outcome of the study because I won't be making it personally. But having looked at that problem, I can't help but have some views on it. Those views relate to two factors that make me think that the present relationship is preferable, difficult as it sometimes is, in a long term sense.

One, the present relationship permits a linkage to the programs through the OPGs which provides a level of funding which I believe would be difficult to justify just on a Matching Grant basis. It is difficult to see how the OPG relationship could possibly be as close if the PVOs were handled through a separate organization.

Second, the Title II food aid also would have somehow to be accommodated in that other kind of relationship, and I don't know how one breaks Title II from Title I or Title III and shifts them to a new organization.

Those look to me as strong arguments for saying that the present arrangements should continue.

PANEL: PVO Representatives on PVO Concerns

John Rigby, Executive Director of International Voluntary Services and Chairman of the Executive Committee of PACT (Private Agencies Collaborating Together)
Allie Felder, Vice President of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.
Frank Kiehne, Vice President of CODEL (Cooperation in Development) and Executive Director of the International Division of the International Board of the YMCA
Paul McCleary, Executive Director of Church World Service and Chairman of the American Council on Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service.

John Rigby opened the panel discussion, which he called an "open caucus" for the PVOs, by citing five areas of concern which he hoped the panelists would address:

--concerns about program resources;

--concerns about financial resources;

--concerns about communications (between PVOs and their constituents, PVOs and AID, etc.);

--concerns about the quality of PVO performance, and

--concerns about organizational and structural issues.

Allie Felder responded on behalf of the Advisory Committee on Overseas Cooperative Development (ACOCD), an ad hoc body of executives representing most of the major national cooperative organizations, including most of those collaborating with AID. Mr. Felder noted that the cooperatives have a special or even a "peculiar" role among the PVOs. They are business organizations first and foremost, with the international departments only an appendage to other, larger-purpose organizations. With some exceptions, they are not dependent on AID for their funding from year to year but rely on membership dues. As non-profit businesses, they re-distribute profits to members. The historical development of the cooperatives has focused on work with small farmers and the poor, and on institutional development, all of which are areas of particular relevance to international development work. Mr. Felder said that the co-ops see their greatest area of strength in institutional development -- building a relationship to an indigenous Third World enterprise, and offering management expertise and technical assistance. However, the DPGs have allowed the cooperatives to develop improved programming capability and that in turn with OPGs have given them the chance to diversify their programs. With regard to financial resources, he explained that co-ops do not see themselves as funders for overseas projects but as technical assistance agencies. They helped create and continue to contribute to CARE (which is a cooperative) and Church World Service and Catholic Relief Service, among others. They encounter some difficulty in assuming the risk and responsibility of AID grants and contracts. They are not set up to be funding agencies or fundraising agencies like some other PVOs.

The key question in judging performance, he said, is whether the agency, in this case the cooperative, has been in on the planning of a project from the beginning. Cooperatives also feel strongly about the need for projects of more than two years' duration and would support the award of more non-competitive grants.

Most cooperatives report to their elected boards of directors at least three to four times a year, which serves to communicate to the cooperative public the extent to which program goals are being achieved and also builds a wider constituency for AID-supported programs.

Finally, he noted that cooperative institutions are responsible institutions, held accountable by their members. ACOCD comes as close as anything to being a coordinating body for international development work.

Frank Kiehne began by suggesting that AID consider a program of familiarization for PVOs with its technical assistance resources, and noted that CODEL's participation in AID courses have helped their staff tremendously.

Mr. Kiehne said that the whole area of development education in the United States needs to be stressed by PVOs and by AID "if we want to build a more equal relationship between the First and Third Worlds." He commented that he thought it was a pity that the United Nations NGO Liaison Office is the only resource Americans can go to for development education assistance in this country, and that he wished the U.S. Government could develop the sophistication and capacity to move into this important area. Mr. Keihne applauded the new AID initiative mentioned by Mr. Raullerson to address the needs of the urban poor. He also underlined the need for assistance to PVOs who are trying to understand the new environmental impact guidelines for development assistance, and the need for more attention to refugee concerns by development agencies.

For both CODEL and the International YMCA, the DPGs have been very helpful, he said. He disagreed with the idea that AID is giving too little money to the PVOs, saying he thinks the PVOs have "as much funding as they can handle." Instead of increased AID funding, he emphasized the need for development assistance by all three sectors in American life--government, private enterprise, and non-profit organizations. He saw a need for incentives like income tax deductions for businesses to get more involved in development.

With regard to communications, Mr. Kiehne noted the need for public and private officials to get to know each other better. "Why can't we get together to discuss values more? Why can't we have meetings on topics such as the connections between human rights and development or the arms race and development?"

The advantages of PVO organizations, he remarked, focus on their decentralization and diversity, and their ability to preserve their individual identities, and on that basis to appeal to different parts of the American public for support. They have strengths and unique characteristics which the government can never duplicate.

Paul McCleary opened his comments by noting that his impression of the relationship of the voluntary agencies to AID is that it remains "uneasy." In many cases the Congressional intent is still not the same as the agency's

implementation. An example of this is Congress' often-expressed support for voluntarism in the U.S., which is not always reflected in relations between AID and the PVOs, where many voluntary agencies feel under great pressure to carry out AID's program objectives instead of pursuing, with AID assistance, their own programs. They are made to feel that the identity of the PVO must be submerged into AID's, instead of retaining the independence which gives PVO work in development its unique value.

Mr. McCleary noted "an apparent arbitrariness" in the grant-making style of AID. He said he was a member of eleven boards, and of these eight receive AID grants, yet he can never understand how the grant-making process works. Some agencies can get a grant in a short time, others take a very long time. Why? He criticized the uncertainty of funding and said it needed to be better paced and measured out. Finally, he said, the PVO relationship to AID suffers from the repeated reorganizations of AID and the repeated transition of key staff.

Addressing himself to the PVO community, Mr. McCleary noted that involvement in development is still relatively new to PVOs and that all of them approach it with different philosophies. Nevertheless, he said, "I think we would benefit, in relations with Congress and AID, if we 'unionized' and came to some agreement among ourselves about the degree to which we can cooperate.... We need to take a specific and direct role in talking to Congress, and Congress needs to hear a slightly less dissident voice from the PVOs.... More agreement would help us be more effective in being creatively involved in the Third World."

* * *

After the panel, Mr. McCleary's comment was echoed by Tom Fox, Director of the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation of the Bureau for Private and Voluntary Cooperation. At this conference, he said, "we hope to listen to the questions, concerns and recommendations that PVOs have for AID as the agency prepares its report for Congress on January 1, 1980.... It's very clear to me that if anything is going to happen, it's going to happen because the PVO community wills it. Similarly, probably nothing will happen if there is no groundswell of interest and concern from the PVOs."

SECTION TWO

REGIONAL WORKSHOP SUMMARIES

A. AFRICA

Haven North, Deputy Assistant Administrator, represented the Africa Bureau. He introduced Stanley Siegel, a new special assistant in the Africa Bureau, and Donald Parker, currently of the PVC Office, whom he is trying to "lure" to the Africa Bureau, he said. Both these gentlemen represent the special interest that the Africa Bureau has in a continuing relationship with the PVO community. Mr. North noted that the Bureau has the largest share of PVO grants of all the regions and that the amount is increasing rapidly. It was approximately $22 million this fiscal year.

He also noted that the House Foreign Affairs Committee has been supportive of the PVO cause, although the budget for assistance to Africa was dropping as new projects and countries are being added. At present, the Bureau has projects in 39 countries; if Uganda is added, that would make 40.* In 1980 there will be a new program in Nigeria, he said. This program will start modestly, concentrating on reimbursable assistance in agriculture. The country is a priority within the Bureau, since serious food deficits are expected there in the next ten years. Mr. North also mentioned start-up programs in Rwanda and Burundi, and expressed the Bureau's interest in working in Mozambique in agriculture and health.

Mr. North expressed his belief that PVOs are a more efficient and more economical vehicle of addressing the people-to-people problems of rural development than AID missions, whose programs are rightly the provision of assistance to individual country infrastructures and mainline governmental support.

Mr. North next spoke of the potential role for a proposed African Development Foundation, to be modeled somewhat after the Inter-American Foundation in Latin America. Although Africa is a very different continent, he said, the Bureau is interested in exploring this model and now has staff in the field discussing possible advantages with government officials in several African countries. Such a foundation could provide indigenous PVOs with small-scale funding for small-scale projects. Mr. North reported that initial reports from the field indicated a strong interest on the part

---

*See report below on Uganda situation.

of the Africans. He urged the PVOs to consider this issue carefully and report their interests to Congress and the Africa Bureau. A concern of the Bureau was that such a foundation should be financed out of new funds and not from the central budget.

Mr. North reviewed the OPG situation in the Bureau: authority for approving projects up to $500,000 is decentralized to the field, and major missions can authorize up to $5 million, after a PID (Project Identification Document) has initially been submitted to AID/Washington.

Overall, Mr. North said, the number one problem of the continent is food production--Nigeria's deficit may come to be as large as India's. He also mentioned serious shortfalls that are expected in the Sahel, Cape Verde, and Southern Africa.

Another problem for the Africa Bureau is that many projects in the continent do not generate income in the short run. As a result, when donor funding runs out, the projects cannot be sustained, since the development budgets of many African LDCs cannot support the continuing costs even of good humanitarian projects. New formulas have to be worked out to include income generation earlier in the lives of projects.

Mr. North was asked to comment on the philosophical changes that have taken place in the development community from Rostow to Basic Human Needs. The questioner suggested that nowadays the "romance of rhetoric" is in full swing promoting a notion that everything that is indigenous is wonderful. He suggested that the PVOs are more realistic and flexible in their perspectives on such issues than AID. Mr. North agreed that the questioner had a valid point, and spoke of the "terrible tangle" of basic human needs with integrated growth projects, but he reiterated his earlier insistence that projects must have some income generation in their design if they are to be easily sustained in their implementation. He mentioned that at their upcoming June 1979 meeting, the African mission directors will be addressing this issue.

Another question pertained to the need for management training in Africa, and Mr. North agreed that the PVOs could play a vital role in this field, as well as in training in other technical fields.

Asked about the prospects for an AID program in Mozambique, Mr. North replied that there was a Congressional prohibition that could only be overridden by Presidential waiver. He hoped that this prohibition would be lifted this year, since he believes that the U.S. needs to be flexible in responding to the various needs of different countries of Africa.

Mr. North was asked for his views on how Title XII funds would be used in Africa and what role he foresaw for the land grant colleges in addressing the food deficit situation. He replied that there was close coordination between the Africa Bureau and BIFAD and that they have identified many new opportunities where the land grant colleges can work with African

institutions in the developing countries. There are also funds for some basic research, although the locations of these projects have not been decided. Mr. North remarked that one of the dilemmas in working with the land grants now in Africa is that many changes have taken place on the continent since the period about fifteen years ago when Americans were very involved in major institutional development--for instance, developing faculties of agriculture. He said that African officials are not very interested in returning to that model of institution-building, i.e., standard university enclave projects, and are very concerned to see that new programs are action-oriented, and focused on work in the field, especially in rural areas. So the question is how to get the Title XII institutions to work with the Africans on these kinds of programs.

Mr. North was then asked if he thought there could and should be some kind of interface between the PVOs and the land grant colleges in developing such action-oriented field projects in Africa. He responded that such collaboration was "an absolutely excellent idea" because it would draw upon the strengths of both PVOs and the land grant colleges and would help the Africans get the kinds of programs they needed. He added that he thought it would be possible to find ways in the AID procedures to make such collaboration possible.

Mr. North agreed with one questioner who mentioned his frustration at not being able to get small amounts of grant money from AID. He suggested that in some sectors--notably Women in Development and appropriate technology--the situation for small-scale funding was easier, and also mentioned the Accelerated Impact Projects, that could be granted by field missions in amounts up to $500,000.

Mr. North responded to a query as to how small PVOs could afford to go to the field to write up OPGs, and to a suggestion that missions might make initiatives directly to PVOs, by saying that most missions prefer to give funds to PVOs already in the country, but that there is some money available for exploratory grants.

A final question about funds for research projects was answered with the comment that funding would be difficult to obtain for esoteric, sophisticated or costly research, but that practical research related to applied action would always be needed, especially research related to small farm systems and Women in Development problems.

UGANDA BRIEFING

A special briefing was given on the situation in Uganda following the fall of the Amin regime. The briefing was given by Stanley Siegel, Coordinator for African Refugees and Humanitarian Affairs; Keith Wauchope, the State Department desk officer for Uganda; Christian Holmes of the Foreign Disaster Assistance Office of AID; and Shirley Erves, the AID Uganda desk officer.

A short summary of the briefing follows. (Since this is a rapidly changing situation, PVOs considering work in Uganda are urged to contact the Uganda desk officer for up-dated information.)

After the fall of Kampala on April 11, the State Department sent a team into Uganda on April 23 to prepare for the reopening of the U.S. Embassy. Congress had already voted to remove the prohibition on technical assistance for FY 80 and was considering legislation which would lift the prohibition for FY 79. The President lifted the trade embargo on May 15. Once the Embassy had been reopened in mid-June, it was anticipated that AID personnel could go out and recommence work. Initial efforts will focus on rehabilitation and relief and a detailed needs assessment, preparatory to resuming a regular bilateral aid program. Massive reconstruction of schools, hospitals and roads is foreseen, since much infrastructure deteriorated drastically during the Amin years.

Emergency needs were being met, maybe too well by too many donors. Among those active in the country are UNDP, France, West Germany, and Great Britain. Several PVOs have begun work, including MAP International and Catholic Relief Services. American PVO activity will be coordinated through a subcommittee of the American Council on Voluntary Foreign Aid chaired by Leon Marion and Charles MacCormick.

The overall situation is changing rapidly and development efforts are expected to resume slowly.

B. LATIN AMERICA

The Regional Workshop for Latin America was chaired by John Sanbrailo, Assistant Director for Development Finance in the Office of Development Resources. Also present from the Latin America Bureau were George Hill, Paul Maguire and Alfredo Cuellar.

Mr. Sanbrailo started his presentation with an overview of AID and PVO activities in the region since the 1940s. Currently, he said, the emphasis in the Bureau is on urban and rural poverty programs, which are areas in which PVOs had long been working. Mr. Sanbrailo noted that Latin America presents a different development model from the other AID recipient regions, with Latin America now considered a middle-income development region, which therefore receives a lower priority for assistance funds.

This is the burning issue of the region. There are two schools of thought. One notes that AID is not needed in an area with such a high per capita income; the World Bank and other donors can take over the funding of development programs in the area. The opposing school of thought contends that Latin America has geographic and political importance to the U.S., and that although per capita income in the continent is high, it is highly skewed in favor of the urban middle class, and there are large numbers of rural poor. This second view is that of the Latin American governments. Mr. Sanbrailo suggested that by the 1980s the situation will be somewhere between the two.

The development model now developing in Latin America involves assisting governments in dealing with serious rural health problems, non-conventional education and rural credit programs, Mr. Sanbrailo said. AID is looking at cost-effective mechanisms for new delivery systems. AID needs help from PVOs in this area to generate and test new ideas. Another model which is developing focuses on joint ventures between PVOs and indigenous organizations which are intended to build up the capacity of the local institution.

He noted that the PVO experience was very important to the work of the Latin American Bureau as a source of models and a seedbed for creative ideas. The PVO experience was older than AID itself. Mr. Sanbrailo supports the notion of U.S. PVOs providing assistance to indigenous organizations. In response to questioning, Mr. Sanbrailo noted that Congress wants funds to impact directly on poor people, and that therefore funding for research would be minimal.

In response to another question, Mr. Sanbrailo said that PVO activities funded by OPGs could be especially valuable when traditional U.S. foreign aid was cut off for human rights reasons. The OPG-funded activities could continue, bypassing the dictatorships, and helping the people directly.

Paul Maguire of AID noted that half of AID's OPGs in Latin America go to indigenous organizations, and Mr. Sanbrailo pointed out that although the dollar amounts of OPGs are smaller than in the other bureaus, the Latin

America Bureau gave out the largest number of grants.

One questioner suggested that the two viewpoints on Latin American assistance boiled down to a plan to reduce foreign assistance to a point where only Honduras and Bolivia would receive assistance. What could the PVO community do to change this policy? Mr. Sanbrailo responded by saying that future policy had yet to be determined, and the PVOs should make their views known to Congress and the President.

Definition of a PVO

Asked about the definition of a local PVO, Mr. Cuellar said that a Latin American local group is recognized by AID as a local PVO when it is officially recognized by the host government as a voluntary non-profit organization.

Asked whether Congress or AID had decided to give 50% of OPG funds to indigenous groups, the AID representative replied that it was an AID decision. Mr. Sanbrailo replied that the Latin American governments are often pluralistic in their character. The poor in the continent could be reached through right-minded individuals or groups within governments, even when the dictatorial nature of the government as a whole was reprehensible. Nonetheless, he said, AID's local PVO guidelines were under careful review.

Asked about liaison with PVOs at the local mission level, especially with regard to financial management, George Hill of AID said that all missions have one person who is the PVO liaison officer. This is the person PVOs should contact first, and that person could then refer PVO personnel to others within the mission.

Asked about dollar funding levels, Alfredo Cuellar noted that in this fiscal year some $7 million had been received by PVOs. This figure will rise to $12 million by FY 81.

In response to a question about the number of proposals received, Mr. Sanbrailo said that they were receiving more proposals from U.S. PVOs than they could fund, but they were not receiving as many proposals from indigenous groups as they would like.

C. ASIA

The Asia Regional Workshop was presented by two representatives of the Asia Bureau: Mike Snoddy of the PVO Liaison Office and Bob Halligan, Director of the Office of Development Planning. Mr. Halligan represented John H. Sullivan, the Bureau's Assistant Administrator, who could not be present since he was testifying on the Hill.

Mr. Halligan began by outlining the history of the Bureau's relationship with the PVO community. In particular he mentioned the concept of "co-financing", which had first been introduced in Indonesia, then started in Bangladesh in 1976, and which will be proposed by the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and India this fiscal year. This concept involves the mission's having both the money and the authority to spend it. Under the usual OPG mechanism, once the grant has been authorized in the field, the money then has to be transferred from Washington.

Mr. Halligan also spoke of some $1 million in OPGs in the South Pacific which have been granted this fiscal year to three PVOs (the Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific, the Summer Institute of Linguistics, and the International Human Assistance Program), with about $3 million planned for annual granting in the future.

He said that the Asia Bureau supports the concept of the Matching Grants, with the proviso that there should be early collaboration among the PVOs, AID missions and host country governments. He noted that Mr. Sullivan was "enthusiastic" about the role of PVOs, and that he was proud of being the instigator of some legislation that facilitates the role of PVOs in undertaking technical assistance in the field. He concluded his remarks by saying that his door is always open to all visitors from the PVO community.

OPGs and Matching Grants

A number of questions were asked about the potential conflict of OPGs and Matching Grants. Mr. Halligan referred the questioners to the special session on grants to be held the next day.

To a specific question on India, Mr. Halligan agreed that for various reasons India is not enthusiastic about new PVO projects. Mr. Halligan also reminded PVO members that in many cases the U.S. ambassador holds the AID director responsible for all assistance activities, and this means that it is appropriate for such directors to comment on Matching Grant applications.

Mr. Halligan agreed with the suggestion that some field missions do not have the staff to handle grants management and contracting, and noted that he would like to put such an item on the agenda for the controllers workshop to be held later in the year.

The Asia Bureau is now looking at the problem of registration of indigenous PVOs, he said, but will leave the funding of such organizations to the discretion of individual mission directors.

Asked about the situation in the Philippines, Mr. Halligan noted that the Mission will have a co-financing project there in the near future, and that the change of leadership in the Manila Mission will almost certainly mean a change of policy vis-a-vis PVO grants.

In Asian countries without missions, he said, OPGs are considered on a case-by-case basis only: in Korea, for instance, no OPGs will be considered beyond 1980. In general, OPGs will not be granted in countries not receiving bilateral assistance, except with a special waiver from the Administrator of AID.

Asked if he is satisfied with the Asia Bureau's funding levels, Mr. Halligan replied that this fiscal year there has been a total of $12.5 million in OPG requests, and that was far in excess of available funds, so there is a shortage of grant funds in the Asia Bureau. However, FY 79 is the first year that the Bureau has had a serious shortfall.

With respect to Burma, Mr. Halligan said that there will be a new program there starting in FY 80; AID's involvement will be slow in growing, and there will be a "long, tedious, tortuous process of learning" between the two governments.

With respect to Pakistan, he said, there are now legal injunctions against future assistance; programs using AID funds must be terminated by order of Congress. Development assistance to Indochina is currently prohibited by law.

Some further questions pertained to the problems specific PVOs have had with the reimbursement of their OPGs. Mr. Snoddy and Mr. Halligan said they were aware of these problems, and felt that steps had been taken to prevent their reoccurrence.

No assistance in development was foreseen for China, Mr. Halligan said, since the Chinese had indicated that they would pay for the U.S. expertise they were interested in.

In response to a final comment that the idea of leaving OPG allocations to the discretion of individual mission directors was a little disquieting to the PVOs, Mr. Halligan spoke of the country development strategy statements that have been submitted by each mission to Washington, and which provide an indication to Washington of the direction and strategy of each country program.

D. NEAR EAST

The Near East Regional Workshop was presented by Grace Langley of the Office of Technical Support. Also representing the Bureau were its two PVO Officers, Ann Gooch and Gerry Miller, as well as Peter Sellar, Katherine Fort, and Russell Mischeloff.

Ms. Langley noted that over the last few fiscal years the Bureau has averaged $7 million in grants to PVOs through OPGs annually. The heavy concentration of this amount is going to the West Bank, Gaza, and Lebanon.

She pointed to the special political imperatives under which AID operates in the region: the special needs of Israel and Egypt. In addition Congress has indcated the interest of the U.S. Government in the welfare of the Palestinian people.

She praised the PVOs working in the area for their "outstanding performance" over the past five years. In particular, she highlighted the special relationship of trust some groups have been able to establish with local groups. Overall the PVOs' work has been "a gutsy, sustained, effective and productive program." Special credit was given to the groups which had worked in Lebanon during the war; she noted that staff working in the West Bank, Gaza and Lebanon are under tremendous strain.

Ms. Langley explained that because of the unusual circumstances of working in an occupied territory or under conditions of civil war, as in Lebanon, there are firm guidelines in the Near East Bureau governing relations with PVOs in those two crisis situations. The Bureau, however, does not want to become rigid, and wants to work toward a partnership with the PVOs to meet regional needs. In particular, Ms. Langley noted, the Bureau would welcome opportunities for collaborative efforts, in which a PVO would undertake components of multi-sector endeavors. Such activities could be funded through OPGs and would give PVOs a chance to work with other organizations and government agencies.

There are relatively few PVOs operating in the Near East, she said, because there are few PVOs with experience working in Islamic countries or with the economic systems in the Middle East, which are primarily state socialistic systems, and which up to now have offered very few real roles for private groups. There are opportunities, however, for foreign PVOs to work with indigenous private groups by giving tehcnical and management assistance. Near East governments would prefer this sort of approach to foreign PVOs wanting to undertake their own programs. Ms. Langley noted that there is a special opportunity in Egypt, where there are over 7,000 registered PVOs, at least 2,000 of which are in rural areas.

She went on to outline sources of funding in the Bureau. The first is the mission budget, of which there are two types. Egypt, Israel, Syria and Jordan receive Economic Support Funds; the level of funding is legislated by Congress. Other AID funds such as regional PVO funds are not to be added to the ESF countries, which are already generously supported. Other missions in

the region are funded, as are missions in most LDCs, by development assistance budgets; these missions have OPG money to fund PVO projects which fit into the priorities of the mission's strategy.

The second source of funding, she said, is regional funds, of which $800,000 is set aside for PVOs in FY 80 and 81. These funds can only be used in development assistance countries such as Morocco, Yemen and Tunisia. Another $3 million is set aside for PVO activities in the West Bank and Gaza. In the West Bank and Gaza the funds are largely reserved for PVOs already working in the area and with established agreements with the administering authority. It is difficult for a new PVO to get recognition by the military government, although there have been exceptions on the part of the Government of Israel, which has expressed interest in seeing increased activity in Gaza.

A third source is regional cooperation funds available for joint Israeli-Arab projects. $5 million has been earmarked for this purpose but enterprises may be difficult. Activities in this area tend to favor PVOs who have established relationships of trust with the two countries.

In response to questions, Ms. Langely noted that although Near East programs are highly political, they were meant to be "as developmental as possible." Regarding specific countries, she singled out Yemen and Morocco as two countries with a renewed interest in PVO projects. Both Tunisia and Morocco are moving toward "graduating" from foreign assistance. It is not certain that aid to these countries will be extended beyond FY 81.

From the floor, Tom Fox suggested that another option for obtaining Near East funds would be through Matching Grant money. Ms. Langely commented, "We are concerned that so few of the early Matching Grant proposals include any activity in the Near East. It is important to get the private sector going again in some of these countries, given their long period of neglect."

SECTION THREE

GENERAL WORKSHOPS

I. WORKSHOP REPORT: THE AID-PVO RELATIONSHIP-- WHAT SHOULD IT BE?

Feedback for the Administration Report to Congress, January 1, 1980

CONVENER: Robert S. McClusky, Chief
Public Liaison Division, Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation

Summary of Discussion

During the two sessions, discussion centered on the present AID-PVO relationship with a particular eye to what attitude the PVO community should take towards the proposed International Development Institute. Views were exchanged on the advantages and disadvantages of current AID programs for PVOs, the proposed foreign aid reorganization plan, and the Institute.

There was throughout the discussion an emphasis on making clear the different and diverging purposes of the PVOs, as private, non-profit, constituency-based organizations working in development, and those of AID, as a government agency for bilateral development assistance, and how these differing purposes result in different needs, operating styles, funding mechanisms and organizational relationships which need to be recognized and valued. Both sessions concluded with calls for further discussion and clarification of the PVO stance to the IDI proposal before the January 1, 1980, deadline for the President to make his recommendation to Congress.

Following is a summary of remarks made by participants in these two sessions:

Session I

As the meeting began, Mr. McClusky suggested that the group of about forty participants review as background a section of H.R. 3324 (the International Development Cooperation Act of 1979) discussing the relationship of private voluntary organizations with AID.* He introduced Margaret Goodman, Alan Van Egmond, and Marian Chambers of the House Committee on International Relations staff and then opened the floor to discussion.

Charles MacCormack of the Experiment in International Living said he wanted to comment on the possibilities he saw in the proposed International Development Institute (IDI) as described in the original foreign assistance reorganization legislation. He said he is now convinced that the relationship

---

*See Appendix.

between AID and the PVOs cannot be fully productive. The public and private sectors dealing with development assistance have very different purposes, organizational styles and structures. AID, as a government entity, has its own agenda, including a political agenda, which does not necessarily match the objectives and goals of the private non-profit organizations. AID's programs for the PVOs, however well intended, often do not work out in practice and tend to encourage the wrong things in PVOs and discourage the right things. PVOs, he said, should be risktakers. They should be flexible and innovative, exploring new ways of doing things. The AID bureaucracy can't handle this and in many ways resists it. He concluded that he thought the private sector working in development needed to have its activities supported by a separate government agency such as the International Development Institute originally proposed by Hubert Humphrey. He added that in his experience quasi-government entities like the National Endowment for the Humanities were better able to deal with a multitude of small private groups and were more appropriate sources of funding for the voluntary sector.

Micro vs. Macro

James MacCracken of Save the Children said that he was horrified when he reviewed the past five years of AID-PVO interaction. The business of AID is macro--government to government; the business of PVOs is micro--people to people. AID grants like DPGs and OPGs were good ideas but the fundamental problem remained that the time period of such grants was too short and left the PVOs facing frequent termination of funding and disruption of activities. He said that in the initial phase of the DPGs, the cost of obtaining one of the grants was about $35,000; Save the Children, however, has spent up to three times that amount trying to secure a matching grant.

Stanley Siegel of the AID Africa Bureau remarked that there will be a place for the involvement of the private non-profit sector through the African Development Foundation presently under consideration, which would be modeled on the Inter-American Foundation. Peter Davies of Meals for Millions responded that the Inter-American Foundation deals only with indigenous organizations, which does not suggest that an African Development Foundation will help the non-profit sector in the United States do its work in Africa.

Alan Van Egmond of the House Committee on International Relations commented that although quasi-public foundations like IDI are not popular with Congress now, nonetheless Congress respects and is willing to support the PVOs, perhaps even through an IDI-like structure. At the same time, there is a feeling in some parts of Congress that the PVOs should be more accountable for the funds they receive. Margaret Goodman, staff consultant for the House Committee on International Relations, said that she is quite concerned with the lack of flexibility on the part of AID staff in adjusting development programs to make possible greater input from the private non-profit sector. She said the House Committee has not come to any conclusions about the role of the PVOs in development assistance and she invited comments from any of the agencies on this subject.

Jack Shaffer of AID remarked that there is no one way of delivering development assistance and that whatever model is formulated under the

reorganization should incorporate the various successful approaches which have emerged, including some programs which focus on the special strengths of the PVOs.

Robert Hancock of World Relief Corporation spoke of the need for the PVO community to draft an "ideal" funding organization of a global rather than regional type.

Leon Marion of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service said that PVOs need to be flexible and use the existing AID programs well, while investigating the possibilities of an IDI. He commented that under an IDI, PVO activity will become very visible and therefore vulnerable to Congressional reaction.

Bernard Confer of Lutheran World Relief said that after seeing what is happening in other countries, e.g., Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and Canada, it appears that the United States is still at the beginning stages of a positive relationship between the public and private sectors. He felt there is much to be gained in the concept of more multilateral development assistance. The private sector is very concerned with the fact that there are continual political upheavals in AID which in turn have an impact on the programs of PVOs. IDI might provide a buffer between the private groups and the government assistance programs to the benefit of both, he said.

Mr. MacCormack asked whether ACTION is a comfortable house for the Peace Corps. He further noted that one aspect of the whole development picture which has not and may never be addressed within AID is development education, a vital concern and need of the PVOs which they would be freer to pursue under IDI.

Mr. McClusky asked what the structure of the Food for Peace program, the AID regional bureaus and the AID missions would be in relating to the PVOs if an IDI were created.

NGO Visibility

Mr. McClusky then asked Romeo Maione to comment. Mr. Maione has responsibility at the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) for the agency's relations with PVOs--or, as they are known in Canada, NGOs. He began by saying that the format of the CIDA NGO office was based on the concept that there should be a mobilization of both private and public sector resources for development assistance. In Canada, he said, it would appear that the more visible the NGO sector--not only in terms of programs but in terms of money spent--the more positively Parliament looks at the NGO sector as a partner in development assistance. An example of this is that while there were cuts in the CIDA budget in every other department this past year, the NGO funds were increased. He cautioned that government policies and programs must be careful not to impede efforts of the private sector. In some instances additional funds to the private sector can actually work towards the destruction of NGO agencies.

The next statement was made by Charles Paolillo, Deputy Assistant Administrator of AID's Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, who was discouraged by the fact that more mileage could not be made in promoting the good efforts of the private sector in development assistance.

Is it impossible, he asked, for AID to adjust itself to carrying out the functions being proposed for the IDI? Does the private sector really want funding directly from Congress? Hasn't there been some progress within AID in recognizing the capabilities of the non-profit sector?

Surely there is a great need to change attitudes within AID if a positive relationship between the public and private sectors is to be achieved. At the same time, he said, he believes the two communities have increasingly common objectives, and that there is a greater willingness to increase support without having to fit into mission terms. He assumed those trends would continue. Nonetheless it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to integrate private foreign assistance into a bilateral government assistance program.

John McAward of the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee said he is encouraged by initiatives such as the new Matching Grant program, yet doubts that it will really work, since too many AID offices will insist on signing off on them. He said that if AID is amenable to change, it may be possible to work out a modus operandi which will make a meaningful relatioship possible between the public and private sectors. Unfortunately, there appear to be too many competing structures within AID for it to be flexible enough to take full advantage of the opportunity to work with the private sector. Some have described the AID-PVO relationship as one of "creative tension;" others, however, think the thread of the relationship is extremely fragile and at the breaking point. For his part, Mr. McAward feels that the private non-profit sector is doing the better job in delivering U.S. support to village-level development assistance programs.

Mert Cregger of CARE said that if an independent entity like IDI is seriously considered, precautions should be taken to see that its mandate is not too narrow. He said the creation of an IDI should not imply a reduction of the PVOs' base of funding resources. The channels to AID should be kept open, because they are of mutual benefit. The critical element in the establishment of an IDI would be its governance; if sufficient attention is not paid to the policy guidelines of such an organization, he said, "it could become more dictatorial and destructive than AID."

Michael Marquardt of the Overseas Education Fund said the PVOs' interest lies in putting their case before Congress. That would also force the PVOs to work on development education in order to mobilize public opinion.

John Upston of the Caribbeana Council said that he thought AID officials had really been trying to improve the relationship but there is still a good deal of "schizophrenia." There are too many horror stories. Second, in his opinion, the PVOs are an efficient and effective channel for putting taxpayers' funds to work in development. They deserve support, and to get it they have to go up on the Hill and advocate it. He was not sure, however, that a whole new institute is necessary.

Follow-Up Actions

Jack Shaffer said that this was a crucial moment for everyone to make their viewpoints known both on how AID needs to change and on the creation of an IDI. His opinion was that the IDI route was the best one to take. Others joined him in calling for follow up actions to the day's discussion to let Congress know where the PVO community stands. Leon Marion announced that the executive directors of PACT, CODEL and ACVAFS plan to discuss these issues and to prepare position papers to be forwarded to the appropriate offices within Congress and the Administration prior to January 1, 1980, which is the deadline set for the President to make his decision on the foreign assistance reorganization. Preliminary outlines and other papers will be distributed widely throughout the PVO community, he said, so that the discussion on strategy and policy can continue.

Session II

Discussion resumed after a brief summary of the earlier session and after a reading of a segment of the recent Senate Committee on Foreign Relations report on the International Development Assistance Act of 1979.*

Ernest Miller of the Salvation Army World Service Office questioned the perspective with which AID and the U.S. Government approach the dialogue with the PVOs. He stated his strong belief that the PVOs are not minor players in the total U.S. development assistance effort but that, instead, taken together, their contributions may be larger than the Government's. The question is whether the PVOs are a little group that can be pushed to one side or whether they are vital partners in the development effort.

David Scull of Partnership for Productivity felt that the Congressional deadline for comments on the reorganization presented the PVOs with an opportunity to reexamine the whole AID-PVO relationship. Does the relationship with AID encourage flexibility in the PVOs? Experimentation? Independence? How can PVOs speak with maximum independence? How do PVOs build greater citizen involvement and education into their work?

Robert Cronk of Project Concern International asked the group to examine openly the conflict of interest between AID and the PVOs stemming from AID's responsibility to U.S. foreign policy concerns.

Marina Fanning-Firfer of the Inter-American Development Institute said that the PVOs support AID's development agenda. But AID also has a legitimate political agenda, which the PVOs do not share, and this creates a conflict for them. She said that Congressman Barnes in his speech to the conference had called on the PVOs to fight for IDCA, and they should do so even if that means becoming visible and thus more vulnerable to Congressional pressures.

---

*See Appendix.

John Shade of the Pearl S. Buck Foundation said there is another side to all of this. It seemed to him that the PVOs want money but don't want very much accountability, he said. The criticism levelled at AID has not been helpful, although AID is being very helpful to the PVOs. He asked for an explanation of what the leadership of the larger PVO consortia were trying to change.

Peter Glenshaw of La Leche League International agreed that smaller and newer PVOs like his find the AID/PDC/PVC Office, as well as many of the AID missions and groups such as the New TransCentury Foundation, extremely helpful. Some AID mission staff are not open to PVO activity, of course, but many are. We need to seek out the sympathetic ones and work with them, he said. Many agencies are grateful to AID for the support provided.

Larry Minear of Lutheran World Relief and Church World Service commented that the question is not one of gratitude or ingratitude to AID, nor is the problem simply finding an individual mission director sympathetic to PVOs or educating AID staff about PVOs. There are essential and basically structural differences in the nature and modes of operation of AID's government-to-government efforts and PVO people-to-people programs. Similarly, the question of accountablity in his view is not whether PVOs accepting AID funds should be accountable to the U.S. Government, but what "reasonable accountability" should involve.

He expressed surprise and regret at Acting Administrator Nooter's statement to the conference that PVOs should remain within AID and that the PVO-AID relationship a decade hence would be structured along current lines. While Mr. Nooter later explained that this was his personal view rather than an attempt to prejudge AID's January 1980 position, Mr. Minear suggested that PVOs need to get together and seek consensus about how they would like to see relationships with AID structured. He personally would like to see a change in structural relationships since further incremental changes within AID seem unlikely to address the fundamental issues.

In response to a question, Mr. Minear elaborated on some of the underlying problems. AID policy is unavoidably subject to short term political considerations which frequently work against the humanitarian, non-political functioning of PVOs. Further, as AID continues its welcome stress on providing more assistance to governments in policy and planning, it becomes less preoccupied with program operations such as those in which PVOs are engaged. Finally, the nature of the AID bureaucracy is such that a true partnership with private agencies which are less complex, bureaucratic, and governmental becomes difficult and perhaps impossible.

Edith Wilson of the New TransCentury Foundation commented that one of the difficulties underlying the whole debate is that AID cannot be impartial in answering to Congress on this matter, having an obvious self-interest in the outcome of the reorganization and the distribution of funds. This suggests that the PVOs have to work all the harder to make their own needs and viewpoints heard, and must be careful to see that AID represents their opinions accurately.

A Less Political Mode

Mr. Paolillo said his mind was not made up on whether the AID system should be improved or whether the PVOs should be supported by an independent agency. The IDCA proposal provides that the IDCA Director report to the Secretary of State only for general foreign policy guidance, just as the Peace Corps director does. The intent of the new legislation, he said, is to move the entire development effort into a less political mode.

Frank Kiehne of the International YMCA said that if you want government funds, you will never get away from government supervision. The real question is, How can the United States, publicly and privately, affect the global development situation in a positive way? The PVO community would like greater visibility and it would be helpful to have it. The PVOs have valuable constituencies and Congress has faith in the people-to-people dimension of PVO organizations. The PVOs need more identity, as well as an organizational relationship with which it is easier to relate. At the same time, "we should seek a compromise in the reorganization, for we can use both AID and IDI. We can do OPG projects for AID and we can pursue other projects, such as educating American citizens about development problems, through IDI. We need to be flexible in our approach to the reorganization and in what we say to Congress about the reorganization."

II. WORKSHOP REPORTS: AID ASSISTANCE TO PVOs

A. Grant Definitions and Categories
B. Matching Grants
C. Management Services

A. WORKSHOP: Grant Definitions and Categories

Presenters: Tom Fox, Director, Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation
Bernard Fisken, Senior Associate, New Trans-Century Foundation
M. H. Snyder, Contracting Officer, Services Operations Division, Office of Contract Management

The following description of the different kinds of AID assistance to PVOs was prepared for the conference by the PDC/PVC Office. The workshop notes should be regarded as comments on the descriptions and on the grant process.

TYPES OF AID ASSISTANCE TO PVOs

1. Matching Grants (MGs)
   -- only for PVOs with established development programs
   -- only for PVOs with established fundraising ability
   -- program must be field-oriented and evaluable
   -- AID will match up to 50% of program's total cost
   -- limited AID oversight or management
   -- currently only available from PDC/PVC Office.

2. Operational Program Grants (OPGs)
   -- for development projects, usually in one country
   -- PVO must provide 25% of resources from non-AID sources
   -- regular AID oversight and management
   -- available from individual missions.

3. Development Program Grants (DPGs)
   -- for PVOs needing considerable headquarters support to be effective development agency
   -- none have been awarded in two years
   -- would only be awarded in exceptional cases, if then.

4. Institutional Development Grants
   -- usually only for PVOs who have received DPGs
   -- awarded only when DPG could not meet grant's objectives
   -- awarded only when PVO has a program of unique value
   -- grants made on declining basis
   --available, currently, only from PDC/PVC Office.

5. Institutional Support Grants
   -- awarded only to PVOs with established, quality programs
   -- awarded usually to PVOs with service or intermediary function
   -- PVO usually has difficulty raising private support
   -- very few grants in this category

-- support usually ongoing and constant in size
-- grants available from any bureau.

6. Other Grants
   -- ongoing support to some PVOs in particular program areas, e.g., population
   -- relationship to AID tends more toward service to AID program than do above categories
   -- grants available from any bureau.

7. Management Services
   -- provide technical, program or management assistance to PVOs (including indigenous PVOs).

8. Consortium Grants
   -- to encourage cross-fertilization and communication among PVOs
   -- usually consortium compatible with a particular purpose or priority of AID
   -- frequently also a means of facilitating grants to grass roots projects.

9. Ocean Freight Reimbursements
   -- for non-food commodities support to PVOs' programs
   -- allocations made regularly, based on demand and use
   -- available only from PDC/PVC Office.

10. Excess U.S. Government Property
    -- excessed USG equipment/property is awarded to PVOs to support their development projects
    -- available only via PDC/PVC Office.

11. Involvement in Food for Peace Program
    -- instead of grants, Public Law 480 food is awarded to PVOs for distribution and development projects.

12. Contracts
    -- are available from any bureau, almost always following competitive bidding.

WORKSHOP NOTES

Tom Fox, PVC Director, offered the following comments on the AID grants process:

If a grant is meant to carry out an AID-designed task, the grantee can expect considerable AID regulations and oversight. If, as with the Matching Grants, the grant is intended to carry out a PVO-designed task, it will be considerably more free.

There are of course grants to PVOs from other offices of AID - in the areas of population, energy, and nutrition, for example.

There is considerable disappointment among PVOs regarding the tapering-off of the DPGs. Some exceptions are possible but highly unlikely

in the present climate. Congress is not disposed to look favorably on money spent at the headquarters level by AID; the pressure is to keep funding at the field level wherever possible.

The "wave of the future" for centrally funded grants to PVOs is the new Matching Grant program. (See following section of this report.)

General requirements for all grants are: (1) registration with the Advisory Committee for Voluntary Foreign Aid (due to a change in legislation, this function will shift very soon to AID itself); (2) annual financial statements; (3) the PVO must have derived 20% of its income from private sources in the U.S. during the most recent audited 12-month period.

There was some discussion at the end of the workshop of the financial management problems encountered by PVOs receiving AID grants. Bernie Fisken of the New TransCentury Foundation commented that some auditors treat a grant as if it were identical to a contract, and treat the PVO as if it were a for-profit firm. He saw a need for a written statement on the difference between a grant and a contract from the audit and pre-award angle.

Mr. Fisken's second comment was to point out that as AID begins to move to field-intensive projects through devices such as Matching Grants and OPGs, the volume of the money is straining the accounting and grant management techniques and capabilities at four levels: first, the PVO in Washington trying to manage field activities of grants; second, the indigenous PVO whose accounting and management skills are weak; third, the host country institutions, such as local audit firms, affiliates of CPAs, professional accounting associations, etc.; fourth, the controllers or contracting officers of local missions, who need a philosophical exposure to what PVOs are all about and how grants differ from contracts. In short, he said, AID must prepare these groups to handle AID-to-PVO grant monies.

C. Payne Lucas of Africare commented that the pressure not to pay true overhead costs of PVO projects ends up hurting the programs when they do not get the management or support services they need from their organizations. He asked for more attention to this very real PVO need.

B. WORKSHOP: Matching Grants

Presenters: Tom Fox, Director, Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation
Donald B. Dickie, Contracting Officer, Overhead and Special Cost Branch, Office of Contract Management
Bernard Fisken, New TransCentury Foundation
Judith Johnson, Contract Specialist, Central Operations Division, Office of Contract Management
W. David Rossiter, Director--Policy, Plans and Programs, Office of the Auditor General
M. H. Snyder, Office of Contract Management

This workshop was primarily a question-and-answer session about the new Matching Grant program.

The general criteria for Matching Grants to PVOs are:

-- Only for PVOs with established development programs and a proven capacity to work overseas.
-- Only for PVOs with established private fundraising ability.
-- For PVO programs which are field-oriented, discrete and evaluable according to specific goals.
-- PVO must provide at least 50% of the program's total cost; AID will provide up to 50%.

For the convenience of those not yet familiar with the program, the following summary description from the PDC/PVC Office is printed.

AID's MATCHING GRANTS

A Summary Description

AID has introduced a new centrally-funded grant that should help both AID and U.S. PVOs expand their development efforts in the Third World. Called the Matching Grant, the new grant has a simplified format and a cooperative purpose. Among other advantages, the grant includes the following major innovations:

1. PVO overseas programs can be funded worldwide through a single grant.

   A major stipulation is that the individual projects within the primary program must be related in some clear way--by development approach, functional problem, target group, etc.

2. The grantee may pass amounts of money to sub-grantees without first receiving approval from AID.

   This arrangement should permit flexibility of response, funding of projects otherwise too small to be handled by a major donor, minimal administrative cost, and maximum timeliness.

3. PVOs will use grant money to expand their own development programs overseas.

   While programs receiving Matching Grants must be in harmony with AID's philosophy and Congressional mandate, they remain the PVOs' own, in true AID-PVO partnership. Such matching programs are not identified or administered as AID programs and are relatively free of the detailed requirements of specific support. (Annual evaluations, fund control, and AID-PVO communications provide the means for regular AID monitoring of public funds.)

In addition to its direct benefits for overseas development efforts, the Matching Grant program has some pragmatic goals in regard to the U.S. side of the AID-PVO equation. The program is designed to:

1. Increase the pool of money available for development assistance by offering the private sector an incentive to contribute more generously toward Third World development needs. (AID will match all private donations, making a private gift of double worth to the PVO beneficiary and perhaps giving greater satisfaction to the individual donor.)

2. Reduce the administrative and personnel costs of both the U.S. Government and the cooperating voluntary agencies by assigning more administrative scope to competent grantees and by transferring grant management to established PVOs. (Several studies have criticized AID's unduly high administrative costs. This program seeks to reduce these costs.)

3. Teach new lessons on development strategies by financing a series of topically-related projects through a single grant and asking grantees to report any geographic, intercultural, sectoral, or thematic lessons learned. (These lessons will be widely shared.)

Because usual levels of U.S. Government oversight are purposely reduced following the grant award, stringent qualifications have been set for recipients. Grantees must possess a proven record of accomplishment in the development assistance field, financial strength over time, a capability for self-monitoring including self-evaluation, a philosophy congruent with AID's New Directions, satisfactory personnel, procurement, programming, and fiscal systems, and, of course, a development proposal in accord with the program criteria of the Matching Grant.

Matching Grants may be written for as much as a three-year period, in amounts from $100,000 to $1 million per year. The base for the match can be any or all funds raised by a PVO from the private sector, U.S. or foreign. There are two restrictions, however. The PVO monies presented for the match must be in the primary grantee's budget, not in sub-recipient budgets. Also, PVO and AID funds must flow together into the same projects; that is, in any project using AID matching funds, there must also be equal or larger amounts of PVO money present.

The first Matching Grant, approved in September 1978, was awarded to the International Division of the YMCA for programs in skills training, youth employment, strengthening indigenous managerial capacity, and testing project concepts. The grant is funded at $980,000 in the first year and may be renewed for up to $1 million in FY 80 and FY 81.

AID plans to award 10-12 Matching Grants in FY 79 and to expand the program substantially in future fiscal years.

Workshop Notes

The workshop led by Tom Fox elaborated on the information above. It should be noted that the draft standard provisions (or "boilerplate") for the Matching Grant program were not available until after the workshop and the writing of this report. PVOs are urged to obtain a copy from the PDC/PVC Office.

In the discussion, the following points were made concerning the Matching Grants (MGs).

Proposal. While the program proposed by the PVO needs to be discrete and measurable, the proposal need not be as specific as that required for an OPG. The MG "is meant to be an investment in a known organization doing what it does best."

Awards to date. Three approved; four awaiting decision; five or six more expected by the end of FY 79.

Competition for available funds.

(1) About 20 applications are now in negotiation.
(2) There is a possible total demand for $15-20 million annually, which is more than AID funding can meet.
(3) AID granted a total of $2 million in FY 78, which will rise to an estimated $5-6 million in FY 79, $8-9 million in FY 80, and perhaps $12-14 million by FY 81.

Maximum/minimum grant amount. MGs will be provided for up to $1 million each year for no more than three years. There is a minimum of $100,000 per year.

PVO Collaboration. It would be possible for a PVO consortium to ask for a Matching Grant.

Role of the AID mission directors and regional bureaus. This is not fully resolved. The intent of the policy statement language is that mission directors and regional bureaus should participate in reviewing proposals. The procedure for appeal of an adverse decision is not yet clear. PVO consultation with mission directors, however, is obviously desirable.

Making the match. For every dollar from AID, there must be at least one dollar from a private source. This flow of dollars need not be simultaneous, but it must come out even at the end of the year and it must flow in during the same fiscal year. It is possible to make adjustments in situations where the entire match is not made in the first or second year, but it must be made by the end of the third year.

Federal matching grants policy requires that in-kind contributions will be recognized but in this case AID policy will be to emphasize cash contributions. Too large a proportion of in-kind contributions would mean that the PVO would become dependent on AID for cash.

Matching funds must be private from American or foreign sources. As of this writing, PVOs cannot use funds from a host country government or from other governments. Similarly, it is hoped that there will not be a total restriction on the use of indirect government money by a PVO, e.g., funds from PACT, CODEL, UNDP or Interamerican Development Bank.

Financial management.

(1) It is anticipated that a waiver of travel notification will be granted to MG recipients.
(2) There must be an "audit trail" established so there is a means to determine that no prohibited expenditures are made with U.S. Government funds.
(3) The grantees may pass amounts of money to sub-grantees without first receiving approval from AID. The key here is that AID has an opportunity in advance to examine the PVO's system of making such agreements, so that once the PVO system is approved, the rest of their actions will flow from established and agreed-upon guidelines.
(4) Questions have been raised regarding the possibility of an AID audit for an indigenous PVO sub-recipient of grant funds. This could happen if the audit of the grantee is not satisfactory, but it is hoped that the instances will be few and, where necessary, there will be "maximum advance notification and the least possible disruption."
(5) Home office expenses can be included as direct costs, but the program should be as field-oriented as possible.
(6) The contract for a Matching Grant is drawn for one year but the cover letter will refer to a three-year eligibility period "dependent on performance and availability of funds." It is not a three-year obligation but a "three-year term with a one-year obligation." If the PVO makes the match, then they proceed to the second year.

C. WORKSHOP: Management Services

CHAIR: Tom Fox, Director
Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation

The meeting focused on a discussion of the kinds of management services currently available to PVOs and what additional services might be needed. Tom Fox asked for feedback from PVOs about their needs in this area and commented that from his point of view the direction of management services is open-ended and can take any form that the PVOs need and want.

He cited some examples of grants from the PVC Office that funded services to the PVO community: a grant to TAICH (the Technical Assistance Information Clearinghouse) administered by the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service; a grant to the New TransCentury Foundation for technical assistance in a range of activities for PVOs; a similar grant to Planning Assistance, Inc., to undertake workshops and seminars in management in the field.* Recently PVC funded workshops in environment and development.

In the future the PVC Office hopes to use its management services funds to help both the established and the newer PVOs to meet their specific needs.

A variety of PVO needs were suggested:

1. The need for courses in management training, procurement, and staff training in a range of personnel issues. (Some of these courses are given in federal government training programs already open to PVOs).

2. The need for a mechanism for PVOs to help each other by sharing management expertise. Mr. Fox wondered whether small grants from his office would facilitate such intra-community assistance.

3. The need for PVO staff with common problems to meet together on a regular basis, as some PVO controllers have begun to do.

4. The need for a management training program for international and indigenous PVOs in financial management both in the U.S. and in the field.

5. The need for better dissemination of information concerning PVO-AID matters.

6. The need for technical assistance to help PVOs compete for AID contracts.

---

*Please note that access to these services is directly through the grantee organization.

It was suggested by one speaker that international PVOs might benefit by studying mechanisms used by other government agencies to fund activities of domestically-oriented private and voluntary organizations such as the Model Cities program, Community Services Administration PVO grants and the Challenge Grant program of the National Endowment of the Arts. Mr. Fox noted that the PVC Office was looking at the experience of cooperatives in the American South in just such a way and that the PVC Office felt that the Southern U.S. cooperatives represent one of the few areas where domestic development experience might be directly usable in projects overseas.

Some participants felt that as the source of funding moved to the field with more decentralized grants, there was a strong need to empower field staff of PVOs to deal effectively with AID and an equal need to educate AID field staff to deal effectively with PVOs.

III. WORKSHOP REPORT: EVALUATION AND PVOs: MANAGEMENT TOOL AND LEARNING DEVICE[1]

Issues, Techniques, Next Steps

CHAIR: Ross Bigelow
Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation
Bureau for Private and Development Cooperation

The workshop on evaluation took place over three sessions during the second day of the conference. The aim of the first session was to prepare an inventory of issues and problems related to evaluation which participants felt needed to be addressed by the PVO community and its donor agencies. The purpose of the second session was to suggest appropriate courses of action to be pursued over the next few months in order to do something concrete about those issues and problems. The third and final session of the workshop focused on the findings and methodology of a study undertaken for the PDC/PVC Office by Development Alternatives, Inc. The study is entitled "Final Report - The Development Impact of Private Voluntary Organizations: Kenya and Niger."

The three workshop sessions were chaired by Ross Bigelow, who at the outset emphasized that they were intended to be a forum in which PVO representatives could raise issues and problems of concern to them and share their knowledge and experience. AID's role was seen as facilitating a dialogue and resolution of the PVO concerns. He said that AID was willing to provide assistance toward the achievement of these ends in ways deemed appropriate by the PVO community. He urged the PVO representatives at the workshop to generate a concrete agenda to which his office could respond.

Michael Rohla of the Institute for the Promotion of Creativity served as consultant to the workshop. He had been asked by the PDC/PVC Office to solicit the views of a sample of PVOs on evaluation and to prepare an agenda for the workshop. Mr. Rohla distributed two papers to workshop participants which summarized the results of his brief survey.[2]

Jim Pines and Josh Beardsley of the New TransCentury Foundation assisted in preparing and presenting the workshops. They will also participate in the evaluation work which will follow the conference.

---

1. This report is excerpted from a 20-page summary prepared by Josh Beardsley, which is available from the Office of Private and Development Cooperation (AID/PDC/PVC), Agency for International Development, Washington DC 20523. Those who attended the conference have already received this report.
2. Copies of these papers are also available from AID/PDC/PVC, as is the final report prepared for AID by Michael Rohla.

There was no debate over the importance of evaluation. Evaluation was viewed by all participants who contributed to the discussion as an essential element in PVO development projects and programs. The increasing pressure from donors for accountability was recognized as a factor in some of the interest in evaluation methods and systems. But, of much greater significance was the PVO's obligation--the "moral obligation," in the words of one participant--to its constituents to keep learning, to keep trying to do things more effectively and efficiently. Evaluations were seen as a means to achieve this goal. To paraphrase two contributors, evaluations can become a celebration of a project's achievement and even of its failures, if they involve persons who are directly affected by the evaluations and are conducted with an eye to building for the future.

There was wide variation among the PVOs represented in terms of experience with evaluation. Some had experimented with several methods and had developed ongoing evaluation systems; others were just beginning to grapple with the problem. The commitment to evaluation as a learning tool, however, was manifest. Thus, the discussion focused on a host of conceptual and methodological issues, from what should and can be evaluated to ethical considerations involved in the use of evaluation results.

The Politics of Evaluation

Several participants who had experienced successful evaluations underscored the wisdom of involving all concerned parties in the design and implementation of evaluation studies and systems. It was noted on at least one occasion, however, that the dynamics of that process are very complicated, primarily because a list of concerned parties in most cases would be very long. It could include PVO staff and boards, donor agencies, both government and non-government host country organizations, direct project beneficiaries and other local peoples affected by, though not directly involved in, a PVO project.

Definitions. Several participants expressed the need for a common language describing the purposes, levels and types of evaluation and evaluation systems. At the outset of the workshop, Mr. Rohla remarked that little progress had been made toward developing a generally accepted definition of evaluation since a conference on evaluation sponsored by TAICH in 1975. At that time, he said, there were radically different views within the PVO community as to what the term evaluation meant. The present situation, according to his brief survey, is no different.

Mr. Pines suggested a framework for defining evaluation terms. The framework consists of four levels, defined by the following four "simple" questions:

1) Are we doing what we said we would do--when we said we would do it?

2) Are we spending money as we said we would--at the rate and on the things we said we would?

3) Is what we expected to happen actually happening?

4) What else is happening?

Utilization of evaluation results. Of great concern to many participants were issues related to the utilization of evaluation results. Of particular interest were the issues of comparability, attribution and quantification. To a number of PVOs it was neither appropriate nor fair to make comparisons across projects and programs. It was suggested that the present state of the art of benefit/cost analysis in the development field did not allow for meaningful benefit/cost ratios to be developed.

In short, discussants expressed skepticism of evaluation methodologies which use cross-project comparative approaches or highly quantitative approaches.

Selection of appropriate evaluation methodologies. It was pointed out on several occasions during the discussions that the relevance of a particular evaluation methodology is contingent upon a large number of variables. The variables mentioned include (1) the type and dimensions of the project being carried out, (2) the purposes of the project, (3) the basic intervention approach used by the PVO, i.e., whether the PVO intervenes into a Third World community at its own initiative or responds to expressed community needs, (4) the size and type of PVO, (5) the environmental context of the project, (6) the purposes of the evaluation (e.g., to fulfill donor requirements, to develop the state of the art in a particular area, to constitute part of total educational experience of beneficiaries) and (7) whether the project is a pilot project or part of an ongoing program.

What to evaluate. The question of what to evaluate received the lion's share of attention during the first session. Participants were unanimous in calling for a realistic assessment of what can be expected from evaluation efforts--given the state of the art, resource constraints, and the context of many PVO projects. Several participants throught it important to distinguish between monitoring questions (are we doing what we said we would do?) and project impact questions (what does our work mean?).

The lofty mandates with which PVOs often operate are, in the opinion of several participants, a source of many of the misunderstandings and problems between PVOs and donors over evaluation requirements. These mandates are translated into goal and purpose statements ("in many cases simply to receive project funding") that would stretch the resources and wills of most governments much less a small PVO. It was important to recognize at the outset of a relationship that a PVO has a very limited capacity to affect project beneficiaries at the so-called purpose or goal level. It was felt that both donors and PVOs should be more modest at the project planning stage; this in turn would result in more realistic goals being set for evaluation.

Beneficiary participation. A number of PVO representatives suggested that project beneficiaries should play a direct role in the evaluation process. In their opinion, people affected by a project's activities constituted the best source of feedback.

An impact study by Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI), on PVO projects in Kenya and Niger was reviewed as a case study.

Participants thought it would be useful to share examples of different evaluations and evaluation systems and discuss them in terms of the

variables listed above.

Evaluation of evaluations. In view of the unhappy experiences several PVOs have had with external evaluators it was suggested that the PVO community strengthen its capacity (and will) to evaluate evaluators and evaluations. It was also suggested that criteria for selecting evaluators be developed.

Sharing and pooling of resources. Because of limited resources it was felt that few PVOs are able to assess the impact of their programs and projects on a significantly large scale. It was suggested that PVOs might explore ways to pool evaluation resources and collaborate in efforts to probe broader impact questions.

Evaluation of PVO values. One participant thought it incumbent upon each PVO to bring into its evaluations a consideration of its own values--those values which are inherent in the PVO's goals, purposes and objectives but which, he argued, too often remain implicit and unchallenged.

Conducting evaluations in a cross-cultural setting. One participant particularly felt the need for learning more about how to carry out evaluations in a cross-cultural setting.

Evaluation guidelines and principles. It was suggested that the PVO community establish a set of "generally acceptable evaluation guidelines and principles" comparable to those in the accounting profession.

Suggested Courses of Action

Specific activities. It was suggested that a conference or series of conferences be organized to address specific issues generated during the workshop and solicited by a questionnaire to be distributed to the larger PVO community after the workshop. It was recommended that a central clearinghouse function be developed and the bibliographies on particular evaluation topics be prepared.

Task force/formative committee. It was further suggested that a task force be established to be responsible for organizing and maintaining a community-wide forum on evaluation. The task force would be inclusive; membership would be solicited through the workshop's follow-up questionnaire. It was recommended that the task force aim to organize a first conference on evaluation by early fall of this year.

In order to coordinate initial efforts, e.g., identification of priorities within the PVO community, it was suggested that a formative committee be established made up of representatives of PACT, CODEL and the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service.

Concluding remarks--a suggestion to think less about successes and failures and more about development hypotheses. Mr. Pines urged those present to search for ways to build up the record of what works and doesn't work without associating it so directly with a particular PVO. Discussions of appropriate strategies in a particular setting, he finds, are inevitably linked to the PVO which happens to be involved, and this often clouds the

important issues and inhibits learning.

Moreover, an overemphasis on quantification, he said, leads to "skimming the cream"--to doing the easy things, with people who are ready to work with you. He urged the PVO community to educate AID and other donors to the fact that their "numbers" will be small for the simple reason that outcomes are more closely related to the context within which a PVO works than to a particular development strategy employed. He also cautioned against using evaluation strategies which are inevitably taken as a reflection of the PVOs and not of the context within which they work.

In a final remark, Mr. Pines urged all those present to think less about PVOs and less about successes and failures and more about development hypotheses and how improvements in current activities can be made.

IV. WORKSHOP REPORT: SPECIAL NEEDS AND SERVICES

Refugees, Food for Peace, and
Disaster Assistance

Tony Schwarzwalder, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Private and Development Cooperation
Chas Freeman, Deputy to Ambassador Clark
Christian Holmes, Office of Disaster Relief Assistance
Robert Chase, Food for Peace

CHAIR: Mr. Schwarzwalder

Mr. Schwarzwalder described for the group the role which the Bureau for Private and Development Cooperation plays regarding refugees. This involves the Offices of Foreign Disaster Assistance, Food for Peace, and Private and Voluntary Cooperation.

Mr. Freeman reviewed the appointment in February 1979, of former Senator Dick Clark as Ambassador-at-Large and as United States Coordinator for Refugee Affairs with oversight over all U.S. domestic and international refugee programs. Also, a new Bureau for Refugee Programs is being established within the State Department. The U.S. Coordinator's Office is still very new and the nature and structure of its relationships with other agencies and interested groups is still evolving. An effort is being made to coordinate the work of the Offices of Refugee and Migration Affairs, Food for Peace, and Disaster Assistance, as well as HEW, Justice, Labor and Agriculture's domestic refugee programs. Mr. Freeman said the United States would shortly be adopting the United Nations definition of a refugee as a person outside his homeland with a well-founded fear of persecution if he ventures home.

Current developments concerning Vietnamese refugees were discussed, including recent initiatives such as the Family Remuneration program by the United States and the statement by the Vietnamese government that they would be releasing 10,000 refugees a month.

Mr. Freeman was questioned about the jurisdiction of the new office; if a PVO wanted to undertake work in refugee camps, with whom would the organization be working? He replied that long term overseas refugee resettlement programs would continue in AID. Assistance to refugees in a state of first asylum would be the responsibility of the State Department's new Bureau for Refugee Programs. The interagency committee chaired by Ambassador Clark would oversee these and other refugee activities, but would become directly involved only to resolve outstanding issues.

The need for more predictable funding for refugee assistance was discussed, and for greater amounts of funding. The United States is already spending $750 million annually on refugees, including 50% of the funding of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees programs in Indochina and one third of the UNHCR's African programs.

With respect to the role of PVOs in refugee resettlement, Mr. Freeman said that some government positions would be eliminated and replaced with PVOs working with refugees in Southeast Asia. The United States was not encouraged by the results of its efforts to encourage refugee resettlement in the Third World--Brazil, for example, had been negative to such suggestions. International financial and loan institutions should become involved in encouraging the resettlement of empty lands in Latin America and Africa by Indochinese refugees, making use of their skills for economic development.

Questioned as to the allocation of $5 million for Zambabwe-Rhodesian refugees, the group was told that $1 million had gone to the International Committee of the Red Cross, but that the other $4 million had not been expended.

Mr. Freeman admitted that shortage of staff had led to shortfalls in monitoring African, European and Latin American refugee problems. This would be overcome by the addition of new staff. In short-run refugee situations, such as that in Honduras, the U.S. would stress the role of multilateral agencies such as the Red Cross or the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees rather than bilateral efforts. The U.S. was already spending a total of three-quarters of a billion dollars each year on refugees, at a time of financial austerity in the U.S. The office was therefore looking for new financial resources, and encouraging fair contributions from Japan, Europe and Latin America.

Asked about the possibilities of using Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers in refugee work, Mr. Freeman felt that the UNHCR staff could well be supplemented by "the right people in the right places," especially since the U.N. was under financial and other constraints in the hiring of new staff. It was suggested that Peace Corps volunteers in Southeast Asia might be extended for a third year, with relevant PVOs picking up their monthly salaries.

Mr. Freeman concluded the session by telling the group that even if there were no new refugees from this moment, there was such a backlog of refugees qualified to enter the U.S. from Southeast Asia that it would take two and a half years to catch up. Congress is being asked for an additional $105 million for refugee activities in FY 79.

Note on the Office of the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs

In February 1979, President Carter appointed former Senator Dick Clark to the new position of U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs. The Office of the U.S. Coordinator was established to provide policy guidance and

coordination for all U.S. refugee programs, both international and domestic.

Ambassador Clark carries out his role of policy coordination through a new Interagency Coordinating Committee for Refugee Affairs, which meets regularly under his chairmanship. The committee consists of representatives of all federal agencies involved in U.S. refugee programs, including the Departments of State, Justice, HEW, and the Agency for International Development. When necessary, the committee also meets with representatives of other agencies and departments.

As well as coordinating international and domestic programs, Ambassador Clark's responsibilities include developing overall U.S. policy on refugee assistance and resettlement, guiding the development and presentation of budgets for refugee programs, advising the Attorney General on admissions policies for refugees, and facilitating liaison between the federal government and the voluntary agencies and state and local governments concerned with the domestic resettlement of refugees. Clark also has responsibility for developing reorganization plans for refugee programs wherever necessary to ensure a coordinated refugee effort.

V. WORKSHOP REPORT: PVO-U.S. JOINT UNIVERSITY VENTURE

At an optional lunchtime meeting, Mert Creeger, Deputy Assistant Director of CARE, Leon Marion, Executive Director of ACVAFS, and Mark Freeman, Director of the Center for the Improvement of Mountain Living at Western Carolina University, spoke to a group on a PVO-U.S. University Joint Venture. Following is a statement they distributed at the workshop.

PRIVATE NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS/ACADEMIC COMMUNITY JOINT VENTURE IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT

For approximately one year a group of representatives of universities and colleges in the southern Appalachian region and voluntary agencies with operations overseas have been working on the development of a mechanism which would facilitate a complementary relationship between voluntary agencies in rural development work in the Third World and universities which have special concerns for domestic and, in some instances, international rural poverty-related problems. The work has been carried on through a series of personal exchanges and meetings with representatives from 13 private non-profit groups, the Appalachian Consortium, the Southern Appalachian Research Resources Cooperative, the Center for the Improvement of Mountain Living, and Western Carolina University. The effort has now reached the stage where a definite structure has been identified.

Over the years there have been a variety of relationships established between individual voluntary agencies and universities, but, in general, they have been very specialized and not readily available to other groups or universities.

The objective is to develop a matrix program which will be readily available to interested private non-profit groups and academic communities, will provide mutual benefit, and will be able to develop a flexible program with broad application and practical orientation. Thus far this objective has been addressed by taking advantage of the commonly held position that there are many similarities between rural poverty in areas such as southern Appalachia and countries of the Third World and that institutions and people involved in addressing these problems have much to learn from one another.
While the precise activities to be undertaken under this plan are to be defined by a Board of Advisors, the following have been identified for initial study:

1) An exchange of experiences between personnel of the participating organizations.

2) Development of training programs for personnel undertaking overseas assignments.

3) In-service programs of professional replenishment for field

and base staff.

4) Exchange of personnel between organizations for specific periods of service.

5) Information processing and exchange.

6) Development of a capability index of persons within and without the organizations to serve as a resource base for the program.

7) Applied research projects.

8) Preparation of occasional papers or technical bulletins for general use.

The structure of the venture will require the Center for Improvement of Mountain Living (CIML), located on the campus of Western Carolina University, to be the administration unit to coordinate the new organization.

Policy development will be the responsibility of an advisory board comprised of carefully selected persons from private voluntary organizations and the cooperating universities. These persons should have a broad understanding of the problems of rural poverty in Appalachia and/or the Third World. They should also be in a position to know about the resources and capabilities of their respective institutions and organizations. The advisory committee will set policy, determine priorities for project definition and development and advise the executive director of CIML on project implementation. As areas of interest and concern are identified, the advisory committee could appoint technical committees of specialists in these areas. These technical committees, principally drawn from the personnel of the cooperating organizations, would be available to carry out problem analyses and state-of-the-art assessments, and provide technical assistance to project staff.

The first formal meeting of the board is tentatively scheduled for late July in Asheville, North Carolina.

Anyone wishing more information should contact:

Dr. Mark Freeman, Director
CIML
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, North Carolina 28723

or

Mr. Leon O. Marion, Executive Director
ACVAFS
200 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10003

SECTION FOUR

CLOSING PLENARY SESSION

Workshop Reports
Needs of the New PVOs
The Canadian Experience

CHAIR: Mr. Raullerson

The closing plenary session began with reports on workshops given by PVO rapporteurs.

Evaluation

The three sessions on evaluation were summarized by Michael Marquardt of the Overseas Education Fund. The first session was described as an attempt to inventory issues related to evaluation of PVO projects in the Third World. Fifteen issues were discussed, including how to increase the quality of the participation of program beneficiaries in these evaluations; how to control external evaluations; the resource requirements for ongoing evaluation; how to select evaluators; how to avoid the fear-of-failure syndrome; how to integrate evaluation into the total planning and management process; the role of AID in evaluation; and cross-cultural issues in evaluation.

The second session tried to identify strategies PVOs might take for improving their evaluation skills. A clearinghouse and a bibliography on evaluation were suggested. AID has indicated it is distributing a questionnaire to the PVOs about evaluation problems. Some participants suggested that the PVOs form their own task force to develop evaluation guidelines for PVOs. A workshop or conference on PVO evaluation issues was proposed for the fall, perhaps to be held under the auspices of PACT, CODEL and ACVAFS.

At the third session general problems of evaluation were discussed. An impact study by Development Alternatives, Inc., on PVO projects in Kenya and Niger was reviewed. The process of evaluation and the difficulty of doing it well were discussed. Special concern was expressed about the feasibility and efficacy of evaluating PVO development strategies on comparative cases. The pros and cons of quantification of PVO results were also debated.

AID-PVO Relations

The two sessions on AID-PVO relations were summarized by Peter Davies of Meals for Millions. He said a common thread of concerns ran through both sessions. For example, Charles MacCormack of the Experiment for International Living expressed the views of many, if not all, when he spoke in favor of the proposed International Development Institute (IDI) for support of the private, non-profit sector's work in development. Many feel that AID is not able to be responsive to the unique needs of PVOs, Mr. MacCormack said. He felt that there were crucial structural differences between AID and the PVO community in terms of size, mode of operation, responsiveness, innovativeness, risktaking, accountability and in constituencies served (government vs. grass roots). Others at the workshop added that they recognized that the new funding mechanisms such as DPGs, OPGs and now AID's new program of Matching Grants represent valuable progress in AID support for the PVOs' work in development. Nevertheless the structural differences remain between AID's government-to-government program and the PVOs' people-to-people programs.

There was discussion of the proposed African Development Foundation, to be modeled after the Inter-American Foundation. While there was support for this sort of assistance to indigenous PVOs, it was pointed out that this proposal, since it is directed to indigenous groups, did not represent a solution to American PVO needs. There was also discussion of the requirement that PVOs be accountable to Congress as they receive increased amounts of government funding and how this would affect their independence and the private and voluntary nature of their programs.

One problem relating to the IDI proposal, Mr. Davies said, was that the PVOs would become more visible to Congress as a single budget line item and thus more vulnerable to attack.

Some thought the solution was to improve the AID structure, not to create an entirely new structure, Mr. Davies said. The question is, Can the elephant work with the mouse? So there is a divided opinion about whether it is necessary to create a new instrumentality because of the structural differences or whether there is a need for PVOs to work as a community with AID in improving existing mechanisms such as the Matching Grants.

Mr. Davies reported that Romeo Maione of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) had commented that CIDA has consciously maintained an arm's-length relationship with the PVOs, letting them pursue their own programs in many diverse ways.

Other problems raised about a new separate agency like IDI were the resulting distance which would be created between AID and the PVOs. This might measurably cut down AID-PVO interaction and dialogue that

There was frequent allusion to the January 1, 1980, Congressional deadline for AID to report its views on the proper place of PVOs in the reorganized development assistance structure. The participants saw this as a very important moment for PVOs to organize themselves and to make their views about the reorganization known to AID and to Congress. In taking a position, it was suggested that PVOs examine again other models of government-PVO relationships, especially that of Canada.

Bernard Confer of Lutheran World Relief was quoted as saying that we are still in an early stage of VO-government relations and that it is time to recognize the need for a buffer mechanism between AID and the PVOs which an instrumentality like IDI would provide. Such an agency would be particularly useful in maintaining a healthy distance between the U.S. Government and the PVOs.

There was, however, no consensus on the reorganization plan and how it affects PVOs.

Finally, it was announced that the executive directors of PACT, CODEL and the ACVAFS will be meeting periodically to discuss the report to Congress and would circulate their preliminary working papers widely in the PVO community asking for feedback and participation from their colleagues.

New PVOs' Needs

Peter Glenshaw of La Leche League International reported on the impromptu session held for PVOs relatively new to international development assistance and to AID.

Mr. Glenshaw said that the newer and smaller PVOs feel they are a long way behind, battling to catch up with the more established groups. There is a feeling, he said, that they were left out of the DPG era. There is some envy of the older, more established PVOs; on the other hand, they are being warned not to compete with them because the pot is limited. They are urged to work with the established PVOs, he reported, to try and make them feel their concerns, which, after all, were their own concerns just a few years ago. They were also told by a Congressional aide at the session that the House Foreign Affairs Committee would like to hear their concerns and suggestions.

The newer PVOs drafted two resolutions, he said. First, that the newcomers would like some special recognition of their problems in catching up and special recognition of their need to develop their potential for the overseas work their constituencies support. In particular, of course, they would like some special financial help for this.

Second, they would like AID to give them a chance in meetings between now and the report to Congress to make their voice heard. They would like to have a few meetings with old and new PVOs working in development to express their views clearly and to share them with Congress.

Matching Grants

Tom Fox made a few summary remarks on the sessions on grants. There are a number of organizations, he said, that believe they have a real capability to work overseas but seem to have come too late to benefit from the DPG era. That was one theme of this conference and it got considerable discussion. "I hope it won't end up solely in the halls of Congress but that it is also something we can discuss creatively and seek some sorts of solutions to within our limitations. You know it is of interest to me; I hope some kind of solution will be found, although I know it won't be a new DPG era--I'm confident of that."

A second theme of the conference is also related to the needs of less experienced PVOs. There is considerable potential in what have been called "management services," he said, both in working with some of the newer instutions which haven't benefitted from Institutional Support Grants but also in assisting organizations in day-to-day project development, evaluation, and financial management. The PVC Office will be working hard in the coming year to come up with ways to respond to needs that people have expressed in their questionnaires as well as in the workshop on this subject.

Mr. Fox also expressed satisfaction at the session on AID's new program of matching grants, through which AID will offer financial support for PVO field programs equal to financial and in-kind support raised by the PVO from its own constituency. The program has been slow in starting because of many questions about the relationship of AID to the PVOs and of the U.S. Government to other governments. "But almost all questions of grant approval processes and grant management problems have been resolved," he said, "and we can now proceed with the vision of a new relationship between the PVOs and AID, as we intended a year ago when the idea was first suggested."

The Canadian Experience

Romeo Maione, an official of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), spoke to the conference. In Canada, he said, they believe their job is "mobilizing human and financial resources, public and private, in favor of international development." There is a separate division in CIDA to service the NGO community that is now ten years old. Development to them is not just something that happens overseas. Part of the task is to have citizens who really think interdependently about development. With the PVOs, we need to have not just the leadership involved but also the membership. We want not just the leadership of a major cooperative, for example, but their 8 million members. We try to use fundraising for mobilization, particularly with our matching grants. To judge what Canadians feel about foreign aid, Maione said, we look not at opinion polls but at the donations they give to international development. They have been going up every year. CIDA's philosophy is that if people are willing to tax themselves voluntarily for development by giving to the NGOs, CIDA should trust the NGOs too. In fact, the best auditing and accountability system you can have is the way that dollar is shepherded by the PVO because the PVO is totally accountable to the people who give them money.

Mr. Maione offered some thoughts about a recent trip to India. He commented on the difference between the macro-developmental approach of governments and the micro-developmental approach of PVOs. Governments, he said can build big dairy plants, large irrigation systems and other major components of a development infrastructure, but they can't successfully launch micro projects like small farmers cooperatives or credit unions. They have neither the time nor the patience nor the fiscal flexibility to do micro projects. Those sorts of projects were done by private initiative in Canada and will be done the same way in India--or they won't be done at all. It's not a question of what governments want to do: they won't do it because they can't do it.

For example, he said, you go into Gujurat and meet a person who has been developing a credit union. He brings out a passbook and shows you in the passbook that in one year a landless laborer was able to save five rupees, which is a miracle for that landless laborer. But how can any bank or government make that operation accountable or profitable? It is impossible administratively. It's got to be done by some nut who has got a lot of time on his hands and who is willing to sit there and work out the five rupee system and then bring it to the bank--and then the bank reports up to the government and says, "See, we are lending money to the poor!" But if it hadn't been for the private initiative, it wouldn't have happened.

This is why there is no contradiction between government development programs and PVO development programs, he said. The PVOs are now starting to come into their own, not because they are smarter than government but because the development watershed has been crossed. In a lot of countries the infrastructure phase--the large economic infrastructure-building process for which governments have the expertise and capability--is starting to move away. Now what is needed is the development of social projects at the local level, and there the PVOs come into their own. And that's why the PVOs have got to pull up their socks. It's no good going around saying, "Oh, we've got some beautiful micro development projects, come see them!" The PVOs have also got to take the responsibility of moving from micro to macro projects, without losing their creativity. Another challenge is for PVOs to develop more efficient structures for granting and disbursing money since most governments are now starting to pour more money into them. If PVOs don't develop more efficient structures, they are going to send all the Third World PVOs totally crazy and over the hill, like lemmings running to the sea!

We must dream up new ways of doing things, Mr. Maione said. PVOs always say they are more advanced than governments. I say *** to that. Governments now have all kinds of different structures they can use for various political situations. The PVOs are only equipped bilaterally. They still haven't been able to develop some kind of multi-lateral fund that can do things private groups can't. I would

urge you not to throw your arrows just at governments but to start looking at yourselves, because the challenge now is upon the PVO community. How do you really speed up the process of international development at the local level--where you are the ones who have the expertise?

SECTION FIVE

APPENDICES

A. Conference Agenda

B. Documents

C. List of Participants

D. Abbreviations

APPENDIX A. Conference Agenda

AID-PVO CONFERENCE
National Academy of Sciences
2100 C Street NW
Washington DC

AGENDA

Tuesday, May 15, 9:00 am--7:00 pm

9:00 am — Plenary Session
Chair: Calvin H. Raullerson
Assistant Admininstrator for
Private and Development Cooperation

1. Welcoming Address--Mr. Raullerson
2. USG-PVO Relations (including Legislative Initiatives)
   --Congressman Michael Barnes
   (D.--Maryland)
3. Remarks--Robert H. Nooter
   Acting Administrator, AID
   Questions from the floor
4. Explanation of Conference Workshops and General Information--Tom Fox, PVC Director
5. PVO Concerns--Panel Discussion
   Paul McCleary
   John Rigby
   Frank Kienhe
   Allie Felder
   Comments from the floor

1:00 am — Lunch - NAS Cafeteria

2:30 pm — Regional Workshops: Africa and Latin America
Chair: Senior Staff of Regional Bureaus

4:05 pm — Regional Workshops: Asia and Near East
Chair: Senior Staff of Regional Bureaus

5:30 pm — Reception--Foreign Service Club

Wednesday, May 16, 8:30 am--4:00 pm

8:30 am — Optional Briefing Session on Uganda
Chair: Stanley Siegel, Africa Bureau

9:30 am

Workshops
--Grant Categories and Definitions
Chair: Tom Fox, PVC Director
--Evaluation as Management Tool and Learning Device
Chair: Ross Bigelow, PVC Office
--PVO-AID Relationship--What It Should Be
PVO Feedback for Administration Report to Congress
Chair: Robert S. McClusky, PVC Office

11:05 am

Workshops
--Management Services
PVO Needs for Management and Other Technical Assistance
Chair: Tom Fox
--Evaluation--Review of Potential AID and PVO Strategies for the Future
Chair: Ross Bigelow
--PVO-AID Relationship (repeat of morning workshop)

12:30 pm

Lunch

1:15 pm

Informal Meeting--PVOs new to AID
Chair: Peter Glenshaw, La Leche League International

1:30 pm

Optional Briefing Session
--PVO-US University Joint Venture
Chair: F. Merton Cregger, CARE

2:00 pm

Workshops
--Special Needs and Services--Refugees, Food for Peace, Disaster Assistance
Chair: Tony Schwarzwalder, Deputy Assistant Administrator, PVC/PDC
--Evaluation--Panel Discussion on DAI PVO Impact Study
Chair: Ross Bigelow
--Matching Grants
Chair: Tom Fox, with representatives from the Auditor General and Contract Management Offices

3:15 pm

Plenary Session
Chair: Mr. Raullerson
Reports from Selected Workshops
Summary Statements

APPENDIX B. Conference Documents

Excerpts from International Development Cooperation Act of 1979 (H.R. 3324)
Excerpt from Report of Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on International Development Cooperation Act of 1979
Letter to President Jimmy Carter from the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., April 30, 1979

Excerpts from International Development Cooperation Act of 1979 (H.R. 3324)

PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

The committee recognizes the important contribution made by private and voluntary organizations to the larger U.S. development assistance program. Small-scale, people-to-people activities in which many PVO's specialize, as well as their flexibility to operate in areas and ways not open to official development assistance, provide a significant broadening of U.S. assistance efforts.

Recognizing this unique contribution, the International Development Cooperation Act of 1978 proposed in the Senate by the late Senator Hubert Humphrey and in the House by Representative Zablocki and others, called for creation of an International Development Institute to finance and support the development activities of the private and voluntary organizations and to better coordinate their programs with those of the Peace Corps. President Carter endorsed this concept in his initial response to the Congress regarding the Humphrey bill.

The committee is concerned that present organization and requirements imposed by the Agency for International Development do not effectively utilize the important resources of the private and voluntary organizations and cooperatives. The committee therefore notes its intention to review in detail the various relationships between the Agency and the PVO's, and requests the President to review also the present structure of PVO relationships with AID and to consider the establishment of a unit within the International Development Cooperation Agency to finance and provide support functions for the development-related activities of the private and voluntary organizations and cooperatives. The President is directed to report to the Congress by January 1, 1980, on his recommendations and steps necessary to implement them. He is also requested to explain the reasons for his withdrawal from his original decision to proceed to create an International Development Institute for the PVO's and the Peace Corps.

Section 120—Registration of private voluntary agencies

This section amends sections 123(b), 607(a), and 635(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act and sections 104(f) and 202(a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to change the responsibility for registration of private voluntary agencies for assistance under the foreign assistance program from the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid to the Agency for International Development. This amendment will relieve the Advisory Committtee from involvement in operational decisions relating to the registration process, thus enhancing its ability to focus on policy aspects of reinforcing positive relations between AID and private voluntary agencies.

While the Committee supports this change, it is not the Committee's intention that this section be construed to confer official government approval on any individual private voluntary organization.

Excerpts from Report of Sentate Co 'ttee on Foreign Relations on the Inter. ational Development Cooperation Act of 1979

Private and Voluntary Organizations

This Committee has, on numerous occasions in recent years, sought to give prominence to the partnership role with AID which U.S. private and voluntary organizations (PVOs) and cooperatives are to play in advancing the "New Directions" objectives of meeting the basic human needs of the poor majority through an equity-oriented development strategy.

In 1978, the Committee added a new Section 123 to the Foreign Assistance Act which recognized the PVOs "as an important means of mobilizing private American financial and human resources." The Committee found it to be in the national interest for the PVOs and cooperatives to "expand their overseas development efforts" using federal funds "without compromising their private and independent nature." The Committee also expressed concern that AID should better facilitate the work of PVOs in light of testimony in 1977, 1978, and once again this year, which has reinforced the view that the creative potential of such organizations remains underutilized.

The Committee wishes to state its ongoing concern that the Administration give fresh attention to revised structural arrangements not only to serve the needs of the PVOs and cooperatives, but also to enhance further their potential as effective development instruments. In a time when basic reorganizational matters are up for discussion between the Executive Branch and the Congress, it would be unfortunate for the contributions of the voluntary private sector to be treated as an afterthought.

Last year, this Committee urged AID "to make a determined effort to consult extensively with representatives of PVOs and cooperatives in seeking their suggestions for improving private and voluntary cooperation." Therefore, we once again reiterate this concern and encourage AID to involve the PVOs and cooperatives in a process for finding organizational and other means for improving private and voluntary cooperation.

The Committee also expresses its disappointment that report language in the International Development Assistance Act of 1978, which advised that ". . . the Executive Branch should consult with PVOs and cooperatives during consideration of revisions in the organizational framework and the coordination of U.S. development assistance activities, as they relate to the programs of these organizations . . ." apparently went unheeded. The Committee, therefore, reiterates the seriousness with which it takes these policy initiatives and fully expects the appropriate sensitivity to these initiatives on the part of the Executive Branch.

Cooperative Development

Over the years, the Committee has become convinced of the important role which cooperatives can play in development assistance efforts overseas. The Committee has directed that AID should ensure that cooperatives are afforded adequate opportunity and the means to play this role. We have concluded that it is in the U.S. interest that cooperative development organizations expand their development efforts overseas by supplementing their own resources with appropriated public funds.

Therefore, the Committee is concerned that, although some progress has been made in providing cooperatives with the kind of support required, there appears to remain a tendency within AID to regard cooperative activities as being outside the mainstream of U.S. development assistance efforts. The importance of the development contributions of cooperatives has yet to be fully understood or creatively facilitated by AID.

Support of cooperative development activities should be expanded further by AID through existing and new funding mechanisms. Operational Program Grants have proven to be one effective means of supporting such activities, and funds provided through such grants should be substantially increased. Core Support grants should be provided for the U.S. cooperative development organizations in a manner which will assure the increased availability of the technical assistance and project management capabilities represented by these on a renewable basis for a minimum of three to five years. Further consideration of a small loan window and/or special cooperative development fund which would provide loans and grants of up to $1 million for cooperative organizations overseas would be highly desirable. The Committee urges that such a proposal for the creation of such facilities be contained within the FY 1981 AID Congressional Presentation.

In the past, AID has tended to insist that cooperative development projects be of limited duration. This tendency to overload local institutions with short-term implementation periods, usually of no more than three years, has frequently led to unrealistic schedules, extension of projects, and subsequent frustration when targets were not met. Better results would be obtained by starting out with longer and more realistic implementation periods.

In previous years, under Section 111 of the Foreign Assistance Act, Congress has specified the minimum support which should be provided for cooperative development technical assistance activities through U.S. cooperative development organizations. No such action is recommended at this time in the hope that AID will respond favorably to the needs of cooperative development without the continuation of this rigid mandate. However, the Committee points out that the potential contributions of cooperatives to development clearly warrant much higher levels of support than have been provided thus far. To cite but one cooperative sector, when it is considered that by 1980 credit union development activities in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and Latin America will have generated the equivalent of 60 percent of the total AID budget for these areas for FY 1980 in domestic savings for self-help efforts, it is not unreasonable to expect that AID should allocate a modest minimum of two to three percent of its annual development assistance budget to cooperative development activities.

Although supporting significant increases in U.S. public funds used for cooperative development activities through these organizations, the Committee is also concerned that AID be most sensitive to the needs of these organizations to retain a high degree of independence of action as private institutions. U.S. cooperative development organizations should never be considered to be simple extensions of the technical assistance capability of AID, nor should they be viewed as agents under the direction and control of the Agency. AID should move to identify effective means which will assure a greater degree of flexibility and independence for these organizations, even when utilizing public funds.

It is also the view of this Committee that U.S. cooperative organizations are called upon to provide the necessary human resources and skills to assist in the development of cooperative institutions in the developing nations. Unlike many humanitarian organizations which

are charitable institutions having fund-raising as one of their primary objectives, it is unreasonable to expect that cooperative development activities should be supported to any significant extent by the voluntary contributions of U.S. cooperatives. AID should view the U.S. cooperatives as an important source of technical assistance which should be integrated more fully into its overseas programs.

The Committee is also concerned over the bureaucratic burdens placed upon cooperatives both in Washington and overseas. It should be possible to improve coordination within AID to reduce or eliminate the necessity for cooperatives to maintain contact with a large number of bureaus and agency offices in pursuit of their activities. The creation of a separate high-level Cooperative Office within AID would seem appropriate, or the establishment of an International Development Institute should receive further study. AID is requested to submit its views on these options by January 1, 1980.

As the Committee stated last year, in dealing with AID, cooperatives often encounter a bureaucratic labyrinth, rife with time-consuming and sometimes contradictory procedures. Therefore, we recommend that AID examine the extent to which cooperative programs amounting to less than $500,000 over the life of the project can be subjected to streamlined review procedures and to what extent existing contracting, procurement, travel and other requirements can be reduced or waived without jeopardizing adequate safeguards over the use of public funds. At a minimum, the Committee believes that a Collaborative Assistance method should be established and implemented for U.S. cooperative development organizations within the next year. The Committee recommends that AID establish a procedure which would allow the waiver of competitive bidding requirements for cooperative development projects. This would permit the utilization of the unique capabilities of U.S. cooperative development institutions to the greatest extent possible. The U.S. cooperatives should not be viewed as consultants or contractors but an important source of technical assistance.

The Committee has also learned of instances when voluntary non-profit and cooperative organizations have been prevented from bidding on certain AID technical assistance contracts because of small business set aside requirements. The Committee does not believe that set asides should be used indiscriminately by AID so as to exclude from the bidding process those very same non-profit groups which have unique capability in the field and which have developed this capability over the years with the assistance and investment of AID resources.

The Committee received testimony this year from various U.S. cooperative organizations reflecting a growing concern over the termination of AID assistance to "middle income" countries which still have large pockets of dire poverty. This is particularly true in Latin America where the growth of urban poverty is accelerating and will soon replace rural poverty as the single most important problem in the region. The Committee supports an increase in resources for certain of these countries which should be channeled into cooperative institution-building programs, especially those impacting upon the urban poor.

Given the significance which the Committee assigns to cooperative development and the limited progress that has been made in implementing the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee in 1978, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development is directed to submit an annual report to the Congress which outlines what actions have been taken by AID in support of cooperative development activities and in the furtherance of the recommendations of this Committee. The report should be included in the Agency's regular annual reporting as required by the Congress.

LT. ADMIRAL PAUL F McCLEARY
HONORARY CHAIRMEN
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
HONORARY ASSOCIATES

American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc.
200 PARK AVENUE SOUTH, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
(212) 777-8210 • CABLE: ACVAFSERVE TELEX: 667828

April 30, 1979

President Jimmy Carter
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

Voluntary agencies and other non-profit groups with programs overseas have followed with interest the current foreign assistance reorganization discussions. Our interests in policies and programs to improve the quality of life of persons in need overseas, makes us enthusiastic about the proposal to create an International Development Coordinating Administration to improve the ability of the U. S. to relate to development country needs. We have also read with interest the latest response of the Administration to these issues in the form of Reorganization Plan No. II of 1979.

One of the elements which we found intriguing about the original I. D. C. A. proposal, propounded by Senator Humphrey, was a suggestion that a semi-autonomous International Development Institute be established which would, among other functions, facilitate the overseas work of private non-profit U. S. institutions. Although the Development Coordination Committee on behalf of the Administration endorsed the creation of such an institute in a communication to the Congress last year, the newly unveiled reorganization proposal contains no such element. We regret that at a time of rethinking and reshaping recent U. S. foreign assistance organization arrangements, the people to people humanitarian and development efforts of private agencies have not received due consideration. There appears to be broad agreement in Congress and elsewhere of the important contributions which the private non-profit sector is capable of making in this field. We were pleased, therefore, that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has requested from you, by January 1980, a report

considering whether improved structural arrangements are necessary to allow such agencies to come into their own as full partners with the U. S. Government in these important development assistance efforts. We urge that these private agencies be included as full participants in the process of framing your response to the congressional request.

We stand prepared to assist in whatever ways you wish, as you review this issue and make recommendations which, we are confident, will enable the U. S. to make an even more significant contribution to persons in need throughout the world.

Sincerely,

Paul F. McCleary

Paul McCleary
Chairman

PMcC/r

APPENDIX C.

PARTICIPANTS FROM PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

Jerry Aaker
Heifer Project International
PO Box 808
Little Rock AR 72203

A. E. Adams
Overseas Development Opportunities
PO Box 61
Silver Spring MD 20907

Wilson Adams
Project Concern International
3802 Houston Street
San Diego CA 92110

Elizabeth Aiken
International Eye Foundation
7801 Norfolk Avenue
Bethesda MD 20014

Sheila Anderson
Salvation Army World Service Office
1025 15th Street NW
Washington DC 20005

Elwood R. Angstadt
Holyland Christian Mission
2000 East Redbridge Road
Kansas City MO 64131

David W. Angevine
Volunteer Development Corps
1629 K Street NW
Washington DC 20006

William Bartieri
International Educational Development
315 Second Avenue
New York NY 10017

Tony Barclay
Development Alternatives, Inc.
1823 Jefferson Place NW
Washington DC 20036

Pepe Barron
El Congreso Nacional de Asuntos Colegiales
One Dupont Circle/Suite 400
Washington DC 20009

John Beardsley
New TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road NW
Washington DC 20009

B. Tartt Bell
American Friends Service Committee
1822 R Street NW
Washington DC 20009

Dennis Berard
General Board, Church of the Nazarene
6401 The Paseo
Kansas City MO 64131

Lili Bermant
American Red Magen David for Israel, Inc.
888 Seventh Avenue/Suite 403
New York NY 10019

Richard Bertucco
National Board, YMCA
219 Broadway
New York NY 10007

Lucille Bloch
World Federation for Medical Education
5920 Bradley Boulevard
Bethesda MD 20014

Anne Block
Pioneer Women
315 Fifth Avenue
New York NY 10016

Frank Boshold
World Vision Relief Organization
919 West Huntington Drive
Monrovia CA 91016

James M. Brinks
International Nursing Services
PO Box 15086
Atlanta GA 30333

Samuel Bunker
National Rural Electric
Cooperative Association
1800 Massachusetts Avenue NW
Washington DC 20036

David Brunell
New TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road NW
Washington DC 20009

Charles Burwell
Heifer Project International
PO Box 808
Little Rock AR 72203

Mary Ellen Burgess
TAICH
200 Park Avenue South
New York NY 10003

J. R. Busche
Lutheran World Relief
360 Park Avenue South
New York NY 10010

Lawrence Campbell
Helen Keller International
22 West 17th Street
New York NY 10011

Blanche A. Case
Consortium for Community
Self Help
515 Park Avenue
New York NY 10022

Claudia Casey
International Reading
Association
800 Barksdale Road
Newark DE 19711

Mykola Cenko
United Ukranian-American
Refugee Committee
1319 West Lindley Avenue
Philadelphia PA 19141

Marian Chambers
House Foreign Affairs Committee
House of Representatives
Washington DC 20515

Elsa Chaney
Solidarity
8021 Park Overlook Drive
Bethesda MD 20034

Jane Chaplin
International Rescue Committee
1728 Eye Street
Washington DC 20006

Jean J. Chenard
Catholic Relief Services
1011 First Avenue
New York NY 10022

Ping-sheng Chin
International Institute of Rural
Reconstruction
1775 Broadway
New York NY 10019

Allen Choate
The Asia Foundation
2301 E Street NW/Suite 713
Washington DC 20037

Heather Clark
International Voluntary Services
Incorporation
1717 Massachusetts Avneue NW/#605
Washington DC 20036

Bruce Clemens
Agua Del Pueblo
PO Box 3841
St. Louis MO 63122

Bernard Confer
Lutheran World Relief
360 Park Avenue South
New York NY 10010

Alex Costas
Pan American Development Foundation
1625 Eye Street NW/Suite 622
Washington DC 20006

John H. Costello
Helen Keller International, Inc.
22 West 17th Street
New York NY 10019

F. Merton Cregger
CARE (Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere)
660 First Avenue
New York NY 10016

Robert Cronk
Project Concern International
3802 Houston Street
San Diego CA 92110

James Cudney
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association
1800 Massachusetts Avenue NW
Washington DC 20036

Ellsworth Culver
Food for the Hungry, Inc.
3331 North Hayden Road
Scottdale AZ 85251

H. Arthur Dale
Operation Bootstrap/Tanzania
1055 East Wayzata Boulevard/312
Wayzata MN 55391

Stephanie Daley
National Council of Negro Women
1819 H Street NW
Washington DC 20036

Peter J. Davies
Meals for Millions Foundation
815 Second Avenue/Suite 501
New York NY 10017

Joseph Deering
International Eye Foundation
7801 Norfolk Avenue
Bethesda MD 20014

Dolores DelComa
Project Hope
Millwood VA 22646

Hector F. De Leon
National Council of La Raza
1725 Eye Street NW
Washington DC 20006

Egbert DeVires
Obor Inc.
16 Kelsey Town Bridge Road
Clinton CT 06413

Tony DiBella
Evaluation Technologies, Inc.
2020 North 14th Street
Washington DC 20009

Nancy Dimock
National Council of La Raza
1725 Eye Street NW
Washington DC 20006

Larry Dixon
MAP International
PO Box 50
Wheaton IL 60187

John A. Donnelly
Catholic Relief Services
1011 First Avenue
New York NY 10022

George W. Doud
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association
1800 Massachusetts Avenue NW
Washington DC 20036

Jerry Drew
Sister Cities International
1625 I Street NW/Suite 424
Washington DC 20006

Ann Dyer
League for International Food Education
1126 16th Street NW/Room 404
Washington DC 20036

Brenda Eddy
New TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road NW
Washington DC 20009

Susan Eisenstat
Consortium for Community Self Help
515 Park Avenue
New York NY 10022

Marina Fanning-Firfer
The Inter-American Development Institute
11 Dupont Circle/Suite 803
Washington DC 20036

C. Vijitha Fernando
The Sri Lanka Overseas Foundation, Inc.
PO Box 57015 West End Station
Washington DC 20037

Jeffrey Fiedler
Asian American Free Labor Institute
815 16th Street NW
Washington DC 20006

David Fisk
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
600 North River
Ypsilnti MI 48197

Jeane Finuchane
Caribbeana Council
1626 I Street NW
Washington DC 20006

Bernie Fisken
New TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road NW
Washington DC 20009

Roger Flather
International Human Assistance Programs
7720 Wisconsin Avenue
Bethesda MD 20014

Robert R. Frankel
American Committee for Shaare Zedek Hospital
49 West 45th Street
New York NY 10036

Marian Fuchs-Carsch
New TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road NW
Washington DC 20009

D. Gedhu
Planning Assistance, Inc.
141 Fifth Avenue
New York NY 10010

Peter Glenshaw
La Leche League International
9616 Minneapolis Avenue
Franklin Park IL 60131

Cynthia Gilliam
Opportunities Industrialization Center, International
240 West Tulpehocken Street
Philadelphia PA 19144

Jennifer Gillispie
Action: Office of Voluntary Citizen Participation
806 Connecticut Avenue NW
Washington DC 20525

Lillo P. Gloriso
National Economic Development Association
1730 M Street NW/Suite 707
Washington DC 20036

T. Gochenous
Experiment in International Living
Brattleboro VT 05301

Margaret Goodman
House Foreign Affairs Committee
House of Representatives
Washington DC 20515

Nihal Goonerwardene
The Sri Lanka Overseas Fdn. Inc
PO Box 57015 West End Station
Washington DC 20037

T. J. Grosser
Amigos de Las Americas
5618 Star Lane
Houston TX 77057

Robert L. Hancock
World Relief Corporation
1800 K Street NW/Suite 801
Washington DC 20006

Rosalind Harris
International Social Service
291 Broadway
New York NY 10017

Beverly Heinberg
La Leche League International
9616 Minneapolis Avenue
Franklin Park IL 60131

James Hoc' schwender
Partnership for Productivity
2311 18th Street NW
Washington DC 20009

James L. Hope
Institute for Services to
Education
2001 S Street NW
Washington DC 20009

Marilyn Hoskins
Diversified Development
Services
3500 Culmore Cour· #3
Falls Church VA 22041

Gordon Hurd
Credit Union National
Association
1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW/810
Washington DC

H. Ivanhoe
American Dentists for Foreign
Service
619 Church Avenue
Brooklyn NY 11218

Margarete Jason
Rizal MacArthur Foundation
1290 Greenway Terrace/Apt. 3
Brookfield WI 53005

Thomas B. Keehn
World Education
1414 Sixth Street
New York NY 11375

V. Keerikatte
International Program for
Human Resources Development
7720 Wisconsin Avenue
Bethesda MD 20014

Brian R. Kelsey
Medical Care Development, Inc.
3000 Connecticut Avenue NW/Suite 138
Washington DC 20008

Frank Kiehne
National Board of YMCA
291 Broadway
New York NY 10007

Gary D. Kilmer
Technoserve
11 Belden Avenue
Norwalk CT 06857

Juan Kister
Heart International Foundation
PO Box 1322
Rosslyn Heights NY

Mike Kraft
Project Hope
Millwood VA 22646

Marvin Leff
American Mizrachi Women
817 Broadway
New York NY 10003

Pierre Leger
Medical Care Development, Inc.
3000 Connecticut Avenue NW/Suite 138
Washington DC 20008

Viola Lennon
La Leche League International
9616 Minneapolis Avenue
Franklin Park IL 60131

Lewis Thornton
New TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road NW
Washington DC 20009

Dawn Liberi
Office of International Health
Department of HEW
600 Fishers Lane
Rockville MD 20852

Boyd Lowry
Coordination in Development, Inc. (CODEL)
79 Madison Avenue
New York NY 10016

Theodore M. Luberoff
International Executive Service
Corporation
622 Third Avenue
New York NY 10017

C. Payne Lucas
Africare
1601 Connecticut Avenue NW
Washington DC 20009

E. David Luria
Partners of the Americas
2001 S Street NW
Washington DC 20009

Charles MacCormick
Experiment in International
Living
Brattleboro VT 05301

James MacCracken
Save the Children Foundation
48 Witton Road
Westport CT 06880

Jeanne MacDaniels
International Rescue Committee
1732 I Street NW
Washington DC 20006

William Magrath
Volunteers in Technical Assistance
3706 Rhode Island Avenue
Mt. Rainer MD 20822

Romeo Maione
Canadian International
Development Agency
200, Rue Principale
Hull, Quebec, Canada K1A064

Leon Marion
American Council of Voluntary
Agencies for Foreign Service
200 Park Avenue South
New York NY 10003

John McAward
Unitarian Universalist Service
Committee
78 Beacon Street
Boston MA 02108

Paul McCleary
Church World Service
475 Riverside Drive
New York NY 10027

James McCloud
AMIDEAST
1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW/Suite 100
Washington DC 20036

Tom McClure
Salvation Army World Service Office
1025 15th Street NW
Washington DC 20005

R. McIlvaine
African Wildlife
1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW
Washington DC 20036

John D. McCrone
Western Carolina University
School of Arts & Sciences
Cullowhee NC 28723

D. McMeekin
African Wildlife Leadership Federation
1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW
Washington DC 20036

Mary G. McMutry
The Foundation for the Peoples of the
South Pacific
158 West 57th Street
New York NY 10019

Robert Meaders
International Eye Foundation
7801 Norfolk Avenue
Bethesda MD 20014

Jennifer Messersmith
American Public Health Ass'n.
1015 18th Street NW
Washington DC 20036

Aviva Meyer
Robert R. Nathan Associates
1200 18th Street NW
Washington DC 20036

Keith Meyer
National Board of YMCA
291 Broadway
New York NY 10007

Carol Michaels
Inter-American Foundation
1515 Wilson Boulevard
Rosslyn VA 22209

Ann Micou
World Education
1414 Sixth Avenue
New York NY 10019

Lt. Col. Ernest Miller
Salvation Army World Service
Office
1025 15th Street NW
Washington DC 20005

Donald Miller
MAP International
Box 50
Wheaton IL 60187

Larry Minear
Church World Service
475 L'Enfant Plaza/Suite 2720
Washington DC 20024

Diana Montengro
Rizal MacArthur Foundation
1290 Greenway Terrace/Apt. 3
Brookfield WI 53005

Ann Morales
American Institute for Free
Labor Development
1015 20th Street NW
Washington DC 20036

Dorothy Moss
Hadassah
50 West 58th Street
New York NY 10019

Christopher Mould
National Board of YMCA
291 Broadway
New York NY 10007

James Mundell
Chol-Chol Foundation for Human
Development
PO Box 9665
Friendship Station
Washington DC 20016

Louise Murray
World Relief Corporation
1800 K Street NW/Suite 801
Washington DC 20006

Olga Navia
Ser: Jobs for Progress, Inc.
529 14th Street/Suite 27
Washington DC 20045

Oui Nguyen
Opportunities Industrialization
Centers, International
240 West Tulpehocken Street
Philadelphia PA 19144

David Niederman
RavTov
125 Heyward Street
Brooklyn NY 11206

Henry R. Norman
Volunteers in Technical Assistance
3706 Rhode Island Avenue
Mt. Rainer MD 20822

John O'Melia
National Board of YMCA
291 Broadway
New York NY 10007

Thomas O'Toole
Western Carolina University
Collowhee NC 28723

Agnes Pall
National Board of YMCA
291 Broadway
New York NY 10007

C. Patterson
Planning Assistance, Inc.
141 Fifth Avenue
New York NY 10010

Mary Frances Peters
Girl Scouts of USA
910 17th Street NW/10th Floor
Washington DC 20006

Don Phillips
Asian American Free Labor Inst.
185 16th Street NW
Washington DC 20006

Chuck Post
Esperanca, Inc.
5901 West Indian School Road
Phoenix AZ 85033

Donna-Jean Rainville
Foster Parents Plan
155 Plan Way
Warwick RI 02887

Robert Ransom
Goodwill Industries of America
9200 Wisconsin Avenue
Washington DC 20014

Ned Rauss
Winrock International
Route 3
Morrilton AR 72110

Joseph Recinos
IDEAS, Inc.
Magnolia Star Route
Nederland CO 80466

Richard Redder
Save the Children Foundation
48 Witton Road
Westport CT 06880

Charney Regenstein
Pan American Dev't. Foundation
1625 I Street NW
Washington DC 20006

Richard Reid
Experiment in International
Living
Brattleboro VT 15301

John Rigby
International Voluntary Services
1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW
Suite 605
Washington DC 20036

Harold Roberts
Helen Keller International
22 West 17th Street
New York NY 10011

William B. Robertson
Booker T. Washington Foundation
2000 K Street NW
Washington DC 20006

Joan Robinson
Salvation Army World Service Office
1025 15th Street NW
Washington DC 20005

J. Romm
Planning Assistance, Inc.
141 Fifth Avenue
New York NY 10010

Guadalupe Saavedra
National Council of La Raza
1725 Eye Street NW
Washington DC 20006

Rupert Scofield
AIFLD-American Institute for Free
Labor Development
1015 20th Street NW
Washington DC 20036

Rick Scott
International Voluntary Services
1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW/Suite 605
Washington DC 20036

William A. Senn
MAP International
Box 50
Wheaton IL 60187

David Scull
Partnership for Productivity
PO Box 170
Annandale VA 22033

John Sever
Rotary International
1600 Ridge Road
Evanston IL 60201

J. Shade
Pearl S. Buck Foundation
Green Hills Farm
Pervasie PA 18944

Sarah Shane
American Mizrachi Women
817 Broadway
New York NY 10003

John F. Shaw
Overseas Development
Opportunities
PO Box 61
Silver Spring MD 20907

Roselle Silberstein
American Mizrachi Women
817 Broadway
New York NY 10003

Peter Snoad
International Voluntary Services
1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW
Washington DC 20036

George Soloyanis
Goodwill Industries of America
9200 Wisconsin Avenue
Washington DC 20014

Shelby Southard
Cooperative League of USA
1828 L Street NW/Suite 1100
Washington DC 20036

William Sorenson
Agricultural Cooperative Development International
1012 14th Street NW/Suite 201
Washington DC 20005

Dao Spencer
American Company of Voluntary
Agencies Foreign Service
200 Park Avenue South
New York NY 10010

Russell Stephenson
Agricultural Development
Council
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York NY 10019

Edgar Stoesz
Mennonite Central Committee
21 South 12th Street
Akron PA 17501

Carolyn Strembau
Private Agencies Collaborating
Together, Inc.
777 United Nations Plaza
New York NY 10017

John H. Stucky
Rotary International
1600 Ridge Road
Evanston IL 60201

Molly Tatel
Robert R. Nathan Associates
1200 18th Street NW
Washington DC 20036

Mary Louise Taylor
The Institute of International
Education
809 United Nations Plaza
New York NY 10017

Charles Thomas
Project Partner, Inc.
1506 East Lewis Street
Wichita KS 67211

Jerry E. Tolle
International Educational Development
815 Second Avenue
New York NY 10017

Edward L. Towle
Island Resources Foundation
PO Box 4187
St. Thomas US VI 00801

Lester Trachtman
African-American Labor Center
815 16th Street NW
Washington DC 20006

Karen Troxel
Institute of Cultural Affairs
4750 N. Sheridan
Chicago IL 60640

John E. Upston
Caribbeana Council
1625 I Street NW/Suite 412
Washington DC 20006

George Varky
Vellore Christian Medical College
Board, Inc.
518 Nordhoff Drive
Leonia NJ 07605

Wilson Velandia
Media & Contents, Inc.
45 Rockefeller Center
New York NY 10020

Harry Wainwright
Institute of Cultural Affairs
4750 North Sheridan
Chicago IL 60640

Ned Wallace
National Council for
International Health
2121 Virginia Avenue NW/Suite 600
Washington DC 20037

Cade Ware
New TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road NW
Washington DC 20009

Carol Waslien
League for International
Food Education
1126 16th Street NW/Room 404
Washingtin DC 20036

John Watt
American Bureau for Medical
Advancement in China
1790 Broadway
New York NY 10019

George Weaver
American ORT Federation, Inc.
2020 K Street NW/#440
Washington DC 20006

Jonathan Weaver
Operations Crossroads Africa
150 Fifth Avenue
New York NY 10011

Alfred A. Whittaker
Institute for International
Development, Inc.
360 West Maple Road/Suite F
Vienna VA 22180

Louis Wiesner
International Rescue Committee
1732 Eye Street NW
Washington DC 20006

John Wiggins
Salvation Army World Service Office
1025 15th Street NW
Washington DC 20005

Warren Wiggins
TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road NW
Washington DC 20009

Simon Williams
IDEAS, Inc.
Magnolia Star Route
Nederland CO 80466

Edith R. Wilson
New TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road NW
Washington DC 20009

Wilbur Wright
Council of International Programs
1001 Huron Road/Room 209
Cleveland OH 44115

APPENDIX D.

ABBREVIATIONS

ACVAFS	American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Services, Inc.
ACOCD	Advisory Committee on Overseas Cooperative Development
AID	Agency for International Development
BIFAD	Board of International Food and Agricultural Development
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CODEL	Cooperation in Development, Inc.
DPG	Development Program Grant
ESF	Economic Support Funds
IDCA	International Development Cooperation Administration
IDI	International Development Institute
LDC	Less Developed Country
MG	Matching Grant
NGO	Non-Government Organization
OPG	Operating Program Grant
PACT	Private Agencies Collaborating Together
PID	Project Identification Document
PVO	Private and Voluntary Organization
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

The Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation wishes to thank the New TransCentury Foundation for assistance in preparing this report. Particular thanks for reporting and editing work are due to Edith Wilson, Josh Beardsley, Marian Fuchs-Carsch and Cade Ware.

Queries on this report should be addressed to the Office of Private and Development Cooperation (PDC/PVC), Agency for International Development, Washington, DC 20523