

268

A REVIEW OF COOPERATIVE PROJECT EVALUATION  
ACTIVITIES IN  
1982-1983

Prepared By:

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.  
2924 Columbia Pike  
Arlington, VA 22204

Prepared For:

Office of Private & Voluntary  
Cooperation  
Agency for International  
Development  
Washington, D.C.

May 14, 1984

## I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to summarize the experiences during 1982 and 1983 of the six cooperative development organizations (CDOs) and AID concerning evaluation of cooperative development projects. The project evaluation activities will be examined in particular for their relationship with the cooperative evaluation system prepared by Development Associates under contract to AID.<sup>1</sup> The report will also suggest possible approaches which might be used to strengthen the project evaluation process in the future.

The report consists of this introduction and three major sections.<sup>2</sup> In the section which follows, a summary will be provided of the project evaluation activities during 1982 and 1983 of the six CDOs and AID. The focus of this summary will be on the structure and content of evaluations rather than on the evaluation conclusions. In the next section, the conclusions of Development Associates concerning the status of project evaluation will be presented. The conclusions will concern the general status of cooperative development project evaluation, the extent to which the cooperative evaluation system has been used, and whether general conclusions about cooperative development can be drawn from recent evaluations. In the final section, Development Associates' recommendations for improving the evaluation of cooperative development projects will be presented.

---

<sup>1</sup> Young, M., Hopstock P., Romashko, T. and Jones, E. Evaluating Cooperative Development Projects: A System For Planners, Project Staff and Evaluators. Prepared by Development Associates, Inc. for the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation, Agency for International Development, May 14, 1982.

<sup>2</sup> An Appendix is also included which lists the persons who were interviewed and the papers which were reviewed.

## II. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

This section describes the evaluation activities of the six cooperative development organizations in the 1982-83 period, with special reference to the cooperative evaluation system. It also discusses those evaluations of cooperative development projects conducted during 1982-83 which are included on AID's Development Information and Utilization (DIU) system.

### A. Agricultural Cooperative Development International (ACDI)

ACDI has been active in evaluating its cooperative development projects in the 1982-83 period. ACDI has performed evaluations of projects in Bolivia, Honduras, Guyana, Tonga, and Egypt. In three of those evaluations (Bolivia, Honduras, and Guyana), the cooperative evaluation system was used to define and structure the content of the evaluations. In the other two evaluations, the evaluators were shown the system, but the system was not extensively used.

In addition to ACDI-sponsored evaluations, there also have been three AID-sponsored evaluations of ACDI projects: in Egypt, Tanzania, and Uganda. The evaluation system was not an input to any of these evaluations.

In the three cases in which the evaluation system was used by ACDI, the results appeared to be generally positive. Specific comments of evaluators concerning the system are presented in Section III (Conclusions) of this paper. In the Bolivia evaluation, the evaluators met with Development Associates to discuss the system, and included a separate section in their evaluation report to answer the evaluation system questions and discuss the system. For the Honduras project, the design of the evaluation was completed by ACDI central staff and Development Associates as part of the field test of the system. The field evaluators subsequently met with Development Associates prior to implementing the evaluation. The Honduras evaluators' major comment on the design was that additional questions needed to be added to completely describe the project. In the case of the Guyana evaluation,

the evaluator was already acquainted with the system through the Honduras evaluation, and required no additional briefing. ACDI thus has been a major force in the promotion of the cooperative evaluation system.

B. Cooperative Housing Foundation (CHF)

CHF conducted no evaluations of its overseas cooperative projects in the 1982-83 period. It has, however, been involved in two types of activities relating to evaluation: 1) the preparation of evaluation sections in project design documents; and 2) the completion of an evaluation manual.

In developing project design documents, CHF has had a role in drafting several evaluation plans. According to CHF, the cooperative evaluation system has been used occasionally as a source document in drafting those plans.

CHF has also recently completed a monitoring and evaluation manual. The document draws on the evaluation system as well as other materials prepared for use by voluntary agencies. Like the evaluation system handbook, the CHF manual sets forth questions, indicators and data sources, leaving it to the user to select those which fit their project. The CHF questions and indicators are specifically geared to housing projects, with some questions relating to cooperative management systems. The specificity of questions to housing concerns is especially evident in questions relevant to monitoring and process evaluation. The impact section in the CHF manual, on the other hand, includes more general questions, and draws heavily from the cooperative evaluation system. Many of the impact questions come directly from the system, and others are from a draft project evaluation design prepared in cooperation by Development Associates and CHF during the period when the evaluation system was being introduced.

C. Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA)

There have been a number of evaluations of CLUSA field projects which have been completed in the 1982-83 period. Two yearly evaluations have been completed on a member education project in the Gambia; mid-term evaluations have been done on projects in Egypt, Rwanda, and India; and an end-of-project evaluation was completed on a different project in India. In addition, an evaluation report on a project in Indonesia is presently in preparation. CLUSA's roles in these evaluations have varied from providing a contracted team leader for the evaluation to having no role (except as an information source) in the process.

None of these evaluations have made significant use of the cooperative evaluation system as a tool for defining or structuring evaluation content. In one or two cases, the evaluators were provided copies of the system by CLUSA as an input to the evaluation, but there was no explicit guidance about if or how the system was to be used. In almost all cases, the evaluations have assessed progress toward objectives as defined by Logical Framework documents, but otherwise there is little to compare across evaluations.

Evaluations are planned in 1984 for CLUSA projects in the Gambia, Rwanda, and Haiti. In addition, CLUSA is attempting to clarify if their project in India requires evaluation this year. Of these, the evaluations in Rwanda, Haiti, and India would be performed using CLUSA project funds, while the evaluation in the Gambia would be performed under AID funding. There are no present plans to use the cooperative evaluation system to structure any of these evaluations.

D. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA)

Evaluation of NRECA field projects is confounded by two major factors: (1) many of NRECA's projects do not involve cooperative components, and thus a general system for evaluating electrification projects cannot focus on cooperative management systems; and (2) NRECA's projects tend to be large, spread over a number of years, and tend to have limited impact in the early

years; thus, they are most suitable for large-scale evaluation years after project completion, a process rarely supported by AID or other donors.

In the period of interest (1982-83), NRECA conducted no new evaluations of cooperative field projects, but they were involved in a number of evaluation-related activities. NRECA took the data from their evaluation of their Philippines project (completed in 1981), and prepared an executive summary using the study questions from the cooperative evaluation system. They have also established systematic monitoring systems (including quarterly and annual reports) for their major cooperative development project in Bangladesh. NRECA provided significant input into a meta-evaluation of electrification projects in Asia conducted by the Asian Development Bank, and conducted evaluations of NRECA seminars given concerning the productive uses of electricity.

Because of the lack of NRECA - initiated project evaluations, it is somewhat difficult to judge the usefulness of the cooperative evaluation system to NRECA. It would appear that the data collected by NRECA concerning its cooperative development projects are consistent with the evaluation system elements. However, there has been little effort to summarize those data within the evaluation system model. NRECA also has no present plans to conduct broad-scale evaluations of past or ongoing cooperative projects.

E. Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance (VOCA)

VOCA routinely conducts mini-evaluations of all of its overseas projects. Approximately 40 such mini-evaluations have have been conducted in 1982-1983. VOCA's field representatives visit the cooperative which was assisted by a volunteer and ask about the extent to which the volunteer's recommendations have been implemented and the economic impact of the project on the cooperative and its members. Based on Development Associates input, in 1983 VOCA added specific items to its evaluation report form relating to extent of project implementation, use of volunteer's recommendations, economic impact on the cooperative, and economic impact on members. Although

This information was often included in previous evaluation reports, it was not reported in any standard and consistent fashion.

In 1983, VOCA conducted a meta-evaluation to summarize its previous evaluation results. This meta-evaluation showed that (1) almost all volunteers completed their agreed-upon tasks; (2) most or all of the volunteers' recommendations have been implemented; (3) for a large majority of projects there was moderate or substantial impact on the financial soundness of the cooperative; and (4) for many projects, little direct economic impact on members was expected, but in a majority of cases where some impact was expected, moderate or substantial impact was reported.

The VOCA evaluation system is consistent with but clearly more limited than the cooperative evaluation system. The items which were added to the VOCA evaluation report form in 1983 served to increase the similarity. Given the size of VOCA projects, the limited focus would appear to be appropriate. In each of the next two years, VOCA plans to conduct an evaluation with a somewhat broader focus (presumably consistent with the evaluation system), but the nature of those evaluations has not yet been determined.

F. World Council of Credit Unions (WOCCU)

WOCCU has had involvement in a number of evaluations of its overseas projects in the past two years, but most of those evaluations have been sponsored and directed by non-WOCCU sources. Among such evaluations have been mid-term assessments of projects involving the African Cooperative Savings and Credit Association and the Malawi Union of Savings and Credit Cooperatives, an end-of project assessment of a project involving the Lesotho Cooperative Credit Union League, and a baseline study of a project involving the Cameroon Cooperative Credit Union League. These and other evaluations have been sponsored by AID and led by non-WOCCU personnel, although WOCCU main office and field staff have provided key inputs and have in some cases served on the evaluation team.

WOCCU had primary responsibility for a 1980-82 major assessment of the impact of the Latin American Confederation of Credit Unions. The data collection of this assessment was largely completed prior to the period of interest in this report (1892 - 83), but most of the assessment reports were completed in 1982. This assessment was completed concurrently with the development of the cooperative evaluation system, so although there were common elements between it and the system, the overall structures were very different.

In general, evaluations of WOCCU projects have made little use of the cooperative evaluation system as a way of defining and structuring evaluation content. In most cases, this has been true because those sponsoring the evaluations (Missions, etc.) have not suggested or required its use, and those performing the evaluations (contractors, consultants) have not been well acquainted with its contents. While there have been numerous evaluations of WOCCU projects, the lack of a consistent structure has limited the ability to make cross-project comparisons.

Perhaps the most interesting of the evaluations concerning WOCCU projects concerns the Credit Union Development Project in Cameroon. As discussed earlier, a baseline study has already been performed, and this study involved the collection of beneficiary level and control group data. A mid-project evaluation is planned in the near future, and if the baseline design and data collection procedures are continued in subsequent evaluation efforts, this should provide important information about beneficiary impacts of credit union projects.

#### G. AID - Sponsored Evaluation

The evaluation officers at each of AID's Regional Bureaus were contacted and asked to list recent evaluations of cooperative projects and to comment on the cooperative evaluation system. Almost all of the evaluations mentioned had been identified previously by the cooperative development organizations. None of the evaluation officers were acquainted with the cooperative evaluation system. It should be noted in this regard, however, that none of the officers were in their present positions when the evaluation system was being developed.

A review of cooperative project evaluation reports maintained by AID's Office of Development Information and Utilization (DIU) yielded 25 documents from the 1982-83 period. These reports fell into the following categories:

- o audit reports (3);
- o Project Evaluation Summaries (10);
- o interim or mid-term evaluations (3);
- o final or end-of-project reports (3);
- o special evaluation reports (6);

These reports were reviewed to identify the evaluation methodology and report format, and to determine if the cooperative evaluation system had been employed.

The results of this review showed that only two of the reports (both special evaluations) made mention and use of the cooperative evaluation system. Both of these reports involved ACDI projects (in Bolivia and Honduras), and these have been previously discussed in the review of ACDI activities. The format and content of the remaining reports are briefly discussed below.

Audit reports. Audit reports are prepared for the Office of the Inspector General, and they involve reviews of the financial aspects of projects. As such, they include only a limited amount of information relevant to project evaluation.

Project Evaluation Summaries. These reports are prepared at the end of projects to summarize project achievements. They are structured within the Logical Framework system, and they report project achievement relative to proposed inputs, outputs, purposes, and goals.

Interim/midterm reports. There is no systematic format or methodology for midterm reports. Of the three reviewed, two followed the Logical Framework format, and outlined progress made toward attaining stated objectives. The third report focused on the strengths and weaknesses of the various project components, based on the perceptions of key personnel.

Final/end-of-project reports. There was also no systematic format for final reports. Two of those reviewed discussed project activities in terms of

inputs, outputs, purposes, goals, and accomplishments. The third report contained a limited amount of evaluation information, but did contain recommendations for subsequent action.

Special evaluation reports. There was broad diversity in the nature of special evaluation reports. As stated previously, two of these reports used the cooperative evaluation system as an organizing system, although there were differences even between those reports. The Bolivia evaluation used the system on a post-hoc basis, devoting a separate section to answering the system questions. The Honduras evaluation structured almost its entire report within the evaluation system. The remaining four reports followed dissimilar formats. One described strengths, accomplishments, deficiencies, and suggestions for overcoming them. The second focused on expected results, and presented a short-term plan for achieving results. The third presented findings and analysis in terms of both explicit and implicit objectives. The fourth was devoted entirely to a discussion of how to redesign a project given a series of project deficiencies.

In summary, a review of evaluations collected by AID/DIU indicated that there was no unifying structure for such evaluations, though the Logical Framework methodology was frequently used. The cooperative evaluation system has thus far not been used in any systematic way.

### III. CONCLUSIONS

As a result of our analysis of cooperative project evaluations conducted in 1982-83, we at Development Associates have drawn four major conclusions:

- 1) There continues to be a lack of systematic evaluation of overseas cooperative projects, although there has been some increased activity in this area;
- 2) The system for evaluating cooperative projects which was prepared for AID is being used only sporadically;
- 3) It is difficult to assess the utility of the system given its sporadic use; and
- 4) No major meta-analytic (i.e., cross-project) conclusions concerning the results of cooperative projects can be drawn from evaluations conducted in 1982-83.

Each of these conclusions is discussed in detail below.

#### Lack of Systematic Evaluation

After reviewing a large number of previous AID evaluations of cooperative projects, Development Associates concluded in 1980 that:

"The evaluation literature dealing with AID's cooperative activities contains valuable information relating to cooperative programs, but there is no system for selecting projects for evaluation nor a systematic framework for assessing the outcomes of these activities and disseminating them within the Agency. Thus, AID has no coherent set of lessons learned from its nearly two decades of cooperative development activities nor a system for building a body of knowledge for the future. In addition, there is no commonly

accepted definitional framework as a basis for gathering such information in a consistent manner from throughout the Agency or its grantees."<sup>1</sup>

In the past four years, there has been some progress relating to the evaluation of cooperative projects. The cooperative evaluation system has been developed for use as a framework in conducting evaluations. The cooperative development organizations have strengthened their capacities in the area of evaluation, in particular improving their methods for collecting beneficiary information. As indicated in Section B above, a limited number of evaluations have been performed using the evaluation system.

Despite these advances, however, there is still a lack of systematic evaluation of cooperative development projects. Decisions concerning which projects to evaluate and how they should be evaluated are still being made on a case-by-case basis by project planners, staff, and monitors, with little knowledge of the system or results of previous evaluations. The amount of "institutional knowledge" is also still quite limited because there are no effective procedures (i.e., systems and personnel) for summarizing and disseminating evaluation results.

Although some type of evaluation is written into almost all AID projects, there are a number of weaknesses with present efforts. Baseline studies of potential or actual beneficiaries are relatively rare, as are post-project evaluations examining long-term impacts. The usefulness of evaluation results is often limited by the absence or inappropriateness of comparison groups. Sophisticated evaluations are difficult to perform and obviously do not need to be done on all cooperative projects. A limited number of more detailed evaluations, however, would probably be preferable to the present unfocused efforts.

---

<sup>1</sup>Development Associates, Inc. Evaluation of Cooperative Development Projects: Summary Analysis of Selected AID Evaluations. Submitted to the Agency for International Development under Contract AID/SOD/PDC-C-00158, October, 1980.

There is presently no systematic evaluation of cooperative projects being sponsored by AID/W. Although the institutional grants to cooperative development organizations include provisions for evaluation, a considerable amount of those resources is being committed to evaluations initiated and controlled by AID Missions. It would therefore appear that additional AID/W focus (through FVA/PVC or PPC/E) on the evaluation of cooperative development projects would be called for.

#### Lack of Use of the Cooperative Evaluation System

As the discussions in Section B illustrated, there has been a relatively limited use of the cooperative evaluation system as a tool for defining and structuring the content of project evaluations. Of the cooperative development organizations, ACDI has been most active in this regard, having structured a number of its recent evaluations within the system. CHF has been considerably less active in evaluation, and though its present evaluation systems have been strongly influenced by the cooperative evaluation system, the two are not directly parallel. The evaluation efforts of CLUSA, NRECA, VOCA, and WOCCU have only been mildly influenced by the system, so none of their recent evaluations can be said to be tests of the system. Also, among the evaluations which we examined which were generated and controlled by USAID Missions, none used the evaluation system to structure the evaluation process.

The lack of use of the evaluation system can be largely attributed to the fact that there have been only limited efforts to promote it within the AID bureaucracy since its original development. Copies of the system were sent to all Missions and Missions were requested to use it, but there has been no follow-up to the original distribution, and to date no feedback has been received. Active attention should have been focused on countries and regions with active cooperative projects, but no such efforts were made. Similarly, there have been limited efforts to encourage cooperative development organizations to perform project evaluations using the system. The result has been that those performing evaluations often either have been unaware of the system or have seen the system as irrelevant to their efforts.

It would appear that the one of the primary reasons for the development of a cooperative project evaluation system (i.e., to produce results which can be easily summarized across projects) has not been well communicated. Cooperative development organizations, USAID Missions, and individual evaluators all legitimately believe that there are project-specific and organization-specific questions which need to be included in evaluations. What is less frequently agreed upon is that there are certain common questions which should be asked about all (or almost all) cooperative development projects, and that there should be a common framework within which information from evaluations of cooperative projects should be collected, analyzed, and presented. We at Development Associates continue to believe that there are very strong reasons for the use of a common evaluation framework, though the specific framework may need to be adjusted based on the experiences of evaluators.

#### The Utility of the Cooperative Evaluation System

Because it has been used very seldom, it is extremely difficult to judge the utility of the evaluation system. The system should be tested in a number of broad-scale evaluations involving different content areas before summative judgments are made.

Those employing the system thus far, however, (primarily on ACDI projects) have offered the following positive comments:

- 1) The system is general enough to fit a broad spectrum of cooperative projects, yet specific enough to guide the formulation of very detailed questions about project design or performance;
- 2) The system is integrated with the Logical Framework methodology, which allows it to fit easily into ongoing AID planning/evaluation activities;
- 3) The system correctly places a strong emphasis on planning as well as evaluation; and
- 4) The study questions are generally applicable and important to cooperative projects.

They have also offered the following critiques of the system:

- 1) The questions are not prioritized; thus, key questions are not identified, and the chances of getting a common set of questions answered across projects is considerably reduced;
- 2) The indicators which are provided are really just variables, and do not include norms or criteria to judge the effectiveness of projects;
- 3) The lists of data sources which are attached to the questions are so general as to be not very useful to evaluators; and
- 4) The system does not detail the specific steps of translating evaluation questions into study procedures; it thus requires the special research skills of an experienced evaluator, and cannot be completed by local staff.

In response to the negative comments, Development Associates would like to note the following:

- 1) We believe that common questions should be asked in evaluations only if common project elements are being evaluated; therefore the system did not specify items as being required for all cooperative project evaluations, although it was expected that a number of common questions (concerning inputs, intervention strategies, institutional purposes, and beneficiary purposes) would be asked in most evaluations; and
- 2) The system was designed for use by individuals with some experience in evaluation; we feel that a cookbook (i.e., programmed) approach to cooperative project evaluation would not do justice to the complexity of cooperative projects or the special insights of particular evaluators.

We do believe, however, that the cooperative evaluation system can be improved to make it more useful to those designing evaluations. The document can speak more to the issue of how to select study questions (and which questions may be key to

a particular evaluation), and it can include more practical guidance about how to conduct an evaluation. After the system has been used somewhat more broadly, it may be appropriate to revise and/or add certain sections to the document.

Revisions should only be made, though, if there is a strong intention to promote the system within and without the AID bureaucracy.

#### The Difficulty of Drawing Cross-Project Conclusions

We have examined a number of the evaluations of cooperative projects which were completed in 1982-83, but we have found it extremely difficult to draw cross-project conclusions. Much of the problem is due to the non-comparability of the evaluations. Included among the group are baseline studies, mid-project evaluations, end-of-project evaluations, and post-project impact studies. The cooperative units of interest have ranged from regional confederations to local service cooperatives, and the types of cooperatives have included credit unions, rural electric cooperatives, housing cooperatives, and farmer cooperatives. Given this diversity, it is not surprising that the questions dealt with in the evaluations have also been broadly diverse.

In addition to the diversity in evaluation content, the ability to generalize across evaluations is also limited by the lack of clearly stated study objectives and study questions in evaluation reports. Although evaluations may contain common elements, it can be difficult to see such commonalities because the study questions are not clearly specified or because different terminology is used to explain similar findings. The lack of common evaluation frameworks makes the task of combining evaluation results both cumbersome and imprecise.

Despite these limitations, however, we offer the following comments based on the evaluations we have read:

- 1) Cooperative development appears to be most effective when it is done in a measured and orderly fashion. It takes time for local people to see the benefits of cooperative membership. Attempts to establish a large cooperative system in a relatively limited time period have often failed for this reason. Cooperative projects should thus take a long-term development perspective.

- 2) The relationships between cooperatives and governments are a key factor in the success of cooperative development. It is clear that cooperatives need the support of government structures, but they also need to retain their independence from those structures to retain their grassroots identity. This is one of the key issues that cooperatives face, so project papers on cooperative development should pay particular attention to political issues.
  
- 3) It is extremely important that members of cooperatives understand cooperative principles. The problems of some cooperative projects have been caused by unrealistic expectations or inappropriate attitudes of cooperative members. An emphasis on the education of prospective and active cooperative members (rather than simple recruitment) would thus be indicated.
  
- 4) The concept of cooperative self-sufficiency is a key issue. An over-emphasis on self-sufficiency can exclude lower income individuals from cooperative membership. An under-emphasis on self-sufficiency can undermine the business purpose of the organization, and turn a cooperative simply into a mechanism for income redistribution. Cooperative development projects should pay particular attention to the issue of self-sufficiency, and should include objectives concerning self-sufficiency and measures to be taken if objectives are not reached.

#### IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of our analysis, Development Associates makes the following recommendations concerning the evaluation of cooperative projects:

- 1) The cooperative development organizations should be encouraged to continue and in some cases expand their own project evaluation activities under the terms of their institutional grants. The organizations should be given guidance concerning issues of interest to FVA/PVC and PPC/E, and they should be encouraged to structure their evaluation activities within the cooperative evaluation system.
- 2) There should be a renewed emphasis on promoting the use of the cooperative evaluation system within AID in order to judge its usefulness. This should be done by contacting Missions or Bureaus in countries or regions where cooperative projects are ongoing or have recently been completed, and by suggesting the use of the system. Regional Bureau evaluation officers should also be contacted and urged to promote the system during their reviews of project evaluation proposals.
- 3) After some additional evaluations have been completed using the cooperative evaluation system, the utility of the system for cooperative project evaluation should be assessed. This assessment might include a panel session of those who have used the system. Based on that assessment, the system should be modified (if necessary), and a new version should be distributed to relevant parties.
- 4) The FVA/PVC Cooperative Office should collect and efficiently file all recently completed and future evaluations of cooperative projects. This activity would greatly facilitate future reviews of cooperative evaluations. Many of the evaluation reports are already on file at FVA/PVC, but the receipt and filing systems could be more systematic.

## APPENDIX

### Data Sources Reviewed and Individuals Interviewed During the Preparation of This Report

A. Reports in AID's DIU library which were reviewed included the following:

ACDI. Final Report - Cooperative Marketing Project-Manila. 1982. Rural Development Services. Special Evaluation Report - NCDC/CLUSA

ACDI. Small Farmer Production Project - Egypt - Mid-Project Internal Evaluation

Carter, T.R. NCDC Cooperative Oilseed Processing Management; End of Project Evaluation. April 1982, 62 p.

CLUSA. Final Report - Cooperative Marketing Project - Manila. 1982.

Finnell, L. and Merschrod, K. Evaluation Report: Cooperative Development Services - Agriculture Sector II Program in Honduras. ACDI/AID. February 1983, 37 p.

Hatch, J.K.; Flores, A.L.; Morales, J.V. Evaluation of the Small Farmer Credit Program of the Cooperative Multiactiva "La Merced" Ltd. Rural Development Services. December 1982, 81 p.

McDonald, A.W.; Sorock, M., et. al. Impact Evaluation of Housing Guaranty Programs in Panama. AID. March 1983, 31 p.

Miller, G.D.; Waldstein, A. Egypt: Cooperative Marketing Project, Mid-Term Evaluation. AID. May 1982, 84 p.

Obregon, H.G., CECOMERCA: Informe y analisis del Resultado Operacional para el Tercer Trimestre y los Primeros Nueve Meses del Ano 1982, Terminando el 30 de Septiembre (CECOMERCA: Report and Analysis of the Operational Results for the Third Quarter and the First Nine Months of 1982, ending on September 30). ACDI. November 1982, 17 pp.

Rifkin, N.; Grant, S.H.; and Pigozzi, M.J. Interim Evaluation of CLUSA/The Gambia-Cooperative Education. AID. February 1982. 50 p.

Steele, H.L. and Obregon, H.G. Project Reprogramming Considerations: Guatemala Small Farmer Marketing Project. AID. 1982, 36 p. (English and Spanish Editions).

B. Documents Received and Reviewed From the CDO's Included the Following:

Action Programs International. Evaluation of Support to Regional Organizations - ACQSCA. Prepared for AID. March 1983. 46 p.

- Blane, D.; Garvey, W.; Boyle, P.; Alrutz, J.; Waldstein, A.; and Bennett, M.B. Rwanda Local Crop Storage: Formative Evaluation. July, 1983.
- DeLancey, V. Report on the Base-line Data Survey for the CamCCUL/WOCCU/USAID Credit Union Development Project in Cameroon. July 1983, 78 p.
- Donald, G. Credit Unions and Production Lending: A Study of the Impact of Production Credit Programs in Latin America- Regional Summary, Volume III. World Council of Credit Unions. February 1983, 115 p.
- Dublin, J.; Harmon, D.P., and Tsegaye, M. Mid-Term Evaluation of the Malawi Union of Savings and Credit Co-operatives Project. Prepared for USAID/Malawi. October 1983. 84 p.
- Mason, J.P. Monitoring and Evaluation Manual for Low-Income Housing and Community Upgrading Projects. (DRAFT) Cooperative Housing Foundation. December 1983. 44 p.
- Mindock, K.A. Assessment of Agricultural Credit in Lesotho: With a Focus on the Lesotho Cooperative Credit Union League. AID. September 1983. 30 p.
- Olson, R.; Finfrock, D.; Mitchell, T.; Landis, M.; Charadavoyne, J.; and Hendrix, C. Report on the Evaluation of the Oilseed Growers' Cooperative Project (India). June, 1983.

C. The following AID Bureau evaluation staff were contacted:

- o LAC Bureau - Jack Francis
- o Africa Bureau - Hank Miles
- o Near East Bureau - Robert Zimmerman
- o Asia Bureau - Sharon Piner

D. Individuals Contacted at the CDOs included:

- o ACDI - George Regan
- o CHF - John Mason
- o CLUSA - Susie Jones
- o NRECA - Philip Costas
- o VOCA - Charles Cox
- o WOCCU - Tony Schumacher

06798