

PN - ABA - 171  
15.10.85

AN IDENTIFICATION OF PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY  
ORGANIZATIONS (PVOs) IN BANGLADESH JUDGED SUITABLE  
FOR POSSIBLE FUTURE AID COLLABORATION

FINAL REPORT

John B. Urner and Shireen Pervin Huq

Consultants

Aid/Dhaka Purchase Order No. AID-67-85  
of August 22, 1985

OCTOBER, 1985

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The consultants are grateful for the kind cooperation of

- all those among the donor community in Dhaka who kindly consented to be interviewed, often taking an appreciable length of time. (A list of those donor organizations follows the Table of Contents.)
- the several AID staff members who made themselves available for inquiries about AID's experience with PVOs in this country, past and present, and who discussed AID's cooperation with PVOs, or lack thereof, in all current and upcoming projects (Mel Chatman, Bob Sears, Mike Calavan, Jan van der Veen, Sigrid Anderson)
- Directors of NGO coordinating organizations: Dr. Khawja Shamsul Huda of the Association of Development Agencies in Bangladesh - ADAB; and Mr. Md. Rezaul Islam of the Voluntary Health Services Society - VHSS, who gave generously of their advice and counsel
- All of the dozens of directors of PVOs, available in Dhaka, who made 1-2 hours available for the consultants' requested interview, and who also assisted by themselves completing or arranging for the completion of the 4-page questionnaire. Without such splendid cooperation on the part of these busy directors the survey would have come to naught.
- Yet another dozen or so executive heads of other PVOs who were telephoned by one of the consultants and who, in many cases, also completed a questionnaire, an interview not proving necessary

[A List of PVOs Contacted appears after the Table of Contents.]

- our messenger/questionnaire tabulator/general assistant: Mr. Nasimul "Chondon" Haque. His services were always rendered with much diligence and competence, in a spirit of very friendly cooperation.
- our two respective families, who put up with survey activities in our two houses with welcome tolerance
- and of course our AID Project Officer, Ms. Colette Chabbott, in charge of AID's PVO program (in the Program Office), who was always most willing to discuss and help clarify questions/issues inevitably arising in the course of our work

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgements .....	i
Table of Contents .....	ii
List of Tables .....	v
List of PVOs Contacted (by alphabetical order of their acronyms).....	vi
List of Donors (by acronym when commonly used) .....	viii
SECTION-I - <u>Sectoral Grouping of Survey Results</u> .....	1
A. Introduction to Section.....	1
Consultants' Methodology: 1	
Use of a 4-Page Questionnaire:	
Use of an Interview :	
Consultants' Evaluation of Question- naire and Interview Results:	
B. Sector-by-Sector Results of the Survey.....	5
Brief Profile of PVOs Fund suitable for possible future AID support.	
A Brief Explanation of the Following Five Tables: ...	15
SECTION-II - <u>FINDINGS/COMMENTS FROM THE PVO SURVEY AND     ITS ANALYSIS</u> .....	28
A. Lessons Learned from Aid and other Donor Experience.	
Suitable PVO Functions :	
Roles and Scope of PVO Activities:	
Suitable Donor-PVO Funding Arrangements: Program Costs :	
B. Recommendations from PVOs to Larger Donors Regarding Coordination.....	35

C. Identification of PVOs Well-Suited to Carry out Activities Appropriate to AID.....36

Summary of PVOs Listed in Tables 1-5 in Section I,B:

Comments on the Identified PVOs.

Presence of Four Third-Country-Based PVOs:

Ample Presence in Employment Expansion Work by PVOs in Table 1-5:

Other Findings on the Sectors:

Expansion Capabilities :

D. Consultant Recommendation/Insights Developed Regarding Aid's Planned PVO Program.....40

1. Continued Emphasis on Use of Intermediaries :
2. The Comparative Lack of Need for Aid Funding within the Next Few Years :
3. When Beginning Support to Indigenous PVOs:
4. Aid Would Do Well to Push Much More Effective Coordinating Among Donors:
5. Keep Well in Mind the Risks of Overfunding :
6. Inappropriateness in Present-day Bangladesh of Donor Pressures for PVOs to Become Gradually more Self-Sufficient with Less and Less Need for Foreign Funding:
7. PVO-Government of Bangladesh Relations:
8. Child Survival Via the World Food Program :
9. Slighting of the Urban Sector :
10. AID's Own PVO Collaboration:

ANNEX 1 - PART I - Master List of PVOs Categorized  
by Consultants' Determination of  
Possible Suitability for Future  
Aid Collaboration.....50

PART II- Category B PVOs: Synopsis of  
Reason for not Being in  
Category A.....54

ANNEX 2 - QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN SURVEY -  
4 pgs.

ANNEX 3 - INTERVIEW SCHEDULE -  
2 pgs.

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>NO:</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Agricultural Sector (on 2 fold-out sheets).....	16-17
2. Rural Infrastructure Sector (on 2 fold-out sheets).....	18-19
3. Small Scale Enterprise Sector (on 2 fold-out sheets).....	20-21
4. Health Sector (on 2 fold-out sheets).....	22-23
5. Family Planning Sector (on 2 fold-out sheets).....	24-25
Keys to Numbers Entered in Preceding Tables for Certain Data Items .....	26

## LIST OF AGENCIES CONTACTED

ADAB	Association of Development Agencies in Bangladesh
ADRA	Adventist Development and Relief Agency
ASA	Association for Social Advancement
BACD	Bangladesh Association for Community Development
CARE	Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere
CARITAS	
CCDB	Christian Commission for Development in Bangladesh
CDS	Center for Development Services
CHCP	Community Health Care Project
CONCERN	
CP	Comilla Proshika
CRWRC	Christian Reformed World Relief Committee
CTRDW	Centre for Training and Rehabilitation of Destitute Women
CUSO	Canadian University Services Overseas
FFHI	Food for the Hungry International
FLVDB	Friends in Village Development, Bangladesh
GTC	German Technical Center
GUP	Gono Unnayan Prochesta
HEED	Health, Education and Economic Development
IDE	International Development Enterprises
INTERPARES	
IUCW	International Union for Child Welfare
IVS	International Voluntary Services, Inc.
JC	Jagorani Chakra
JW	Jute Works

KARIKA	Bangladesh Hasta Shilpa Samabaya Federation Ltd.
MCC	Mennonite Central Committee
MIDAS	Micro Industries Development Assistance Society
MSS	Manabik Shahajya Sangstha
NK	Nijera Kori
NLC	New Life Center
PFB	Presbyterian Fellowship in Bangladesh
PLACT	Programme for the Introduction and Adaptation of Contraceptive Technology.
PROSHIKA-MUK	Proshika Monohik Unnayan Kendro
RDRS	Rangpur-Dinajpur Rehabilitation Service
SAP	South Asia Partnership
SC-USA	Save the Children, USA
SDUPW	Skills Development for Under-Privileged Women
SN	Shapla Neer
SNSP	Shaplagram Neri Swadivur Parishad
SOS-CVIB	SOS Children's Villages International in Bangladesh
TARD	Technical Assistance for Rural Development
USC	Unitarian Service Committee of Canada
UTO	United Towns Organization
VDS	Vegetable Dye Society
VERC	Village Education and Resource Center
VHSS	Voluntary Health Services Society
WI	Winrock International
WVB	World Vision of Bangladesh
YMCA	Young Men's Christian Association - National Council
YWCA	Young Women's Christian Association of Bangladesh

LIST OF DONOR AGENCIES INTERVIEWED

CIDA Canadian International Development Agency  
DANIDA Danish International Development Agency  
FF Ford Foundation  
NORAD Norwegian Aid & Development  
OXFAM Oxford Famine Relief Committee - United Kingdom  
TAF The Asia Foundation  
WFP UN World Food Program

## I - SECTORAL GROUPING OF SURVEY RESULTS, BY INDIVIDUAL PVO

### A. Introduction to Section

CONSULTANTS' METHODOLOGY --- The main question was how best to identify the appropriate PVOs, mostly in Dhaka, according to the sectoral interests of AID; namely, the following five :

1. Agricultural Sector, with special emphasis on
  - o research, and
  - o raising productivity
2. Rural Infrastructure Sector, whether
  - o for construction/maintenance of rural works such as earth roads, embankments, sinking potable water or irrigation tubewells, building clinics, and the like
  - o for building social institutions, such as cooperatives, savings societies, credit granting programs, or many different types of societies/unions not always formally recognized by government
3. Small Scale Enterprise Sector (i.e., enterprises created, encouraged, serviced by PVOs; not of course PVOs themselves who, by definition, are not profit-seeking businesses)
4. Health, with a special emphasis on existing or planned child survival programs
5. Family Planning

AID also requested that (a) at least five indigenous PVOs be identified in each sector suitable for possible future AID collaboration and (b) that at least 10 PVOs be identified whose activities feature (prominently include) employment expansion.

Not less than 10 suitable PVOs were requested per sector.

The following techniques were used in this identification process, during the first approximately two weeks of the contract period (total seven weeks) :

1. Several discussions with knowledgeable AID staff members, especially Mr. Mel Chatman, the former Mission PVO Coordinator, and Ms. Sigrid Anderson, In-Charge of PVO liaison for the Health and Population Division.

2. Interviews with Directors of the two principle NGO coordinating agencies :

- o ADAB (Dr. Khawja Shamsul Huda) - two held
- o VHSS (Mr. Md. Rezaul Islam)

During those helpful interviews the Directors were requested to suggest names of mostly Dhaka-based PVOs known to be active in one or more of the above five sectors.

3. Results of interviewing foundations and PVOs which are prominent intermediaries channeling funds from assorted governmental and private donors, as well as other forms of assistance, to smaller, scattered PVOs, often located upcountry. These most prominent intermediaries are, in addition to ADAB:

- o Asia Foundation (AID funds to family planning PVOs)
- o Ford Foundation (largely own funds, to a variety of mostly indigenous PVOs in several sectors)
- o South Asia Partnership (Canadian-source funds channeled to a considerable number of non-Dhaka-based PVOs around the country--none in family planning)
- o Oxfam-UK (assisting approximately 55 smaller PVOs in many parts of the country)

World Food Program aids about four prominent Dhaka-based PVOs plus about 500-550 local ones, big majority being orphanages, via food grants. In addition two more UN agencies channel project-specific funds to a few PVOs; UNICEF (5 PVOs) and UNDP (3 PVOs) -- recorded at a Local Consultative Group meeting in 4/85.

- 4. Review of PVO directories, especially the annotated VHSS 1985 directory.
- 5. Quick look through the AID PVO files (12 drawers, packed).
- 6. Results of initial set of interviews with the well-known larger PVOs in early September, mostly when pre-testing the survey questionnaire.
- 7. Discussions with the AID Program Officer handling the PVOs (Ms. Colette Chubbott), particularly on questions of PVO eligibility, such as the status of those (a) already being funded in large part by AID whether from Washington or from the Mission here, and (b) those based in a third country (of whom there are many active in Bangladesh, especially from Canada, the UK, Scandinavian countries, and to a lesser extent from Switzerland, Germany, Netherlands and Japan).

8. Lengthly discussions with other major donors to PVOs: NORAD, CIDA, DANIDA.

9. Personal knowledge of PVOs by consultants, especially that of Ms. Huq.

USE OF A 4-PAGE QUESTIONNAIRE -- Topics of inquiry were largely determined from the consultants' contract's scope of work, emphasizing data in six categories--please refer to Annex 2.

The first version of the questionnaire was pre-tested with several PVOs, and was reviewed by a few AID officers. A sizeable number of changes were then made for the final version used in all subsequent PVO inquiries, the total number of which was 37. Including the pre-test interviews, the grand total completed was 29. (NOTE: Not quite all interviewed organizations filled out a questionnaire. The total number being turned over to AID with this report is 29. The absent ones are all from organizations not eligible for inclusion in the 10 or more PVOs found available per sector in Part B below. The questionnaires not submitted were not really needed because of obviously inappropriate aspects of the organizations involved. Such interviews were never full-length.

In Annex 5, Part II are the names of all 25 organizations with the main reason(s) for not being included in the tables of Section 4. Those with an asterisk(\*) are the ones noted here which didn't complete questionnaires. (The Annex also notes in Part I the dozen other PVOs, some very prominent, which were not contacted because of advance information on non-possibilities of proving available: Those in group F.)

The intended procedure was for the questionnaires to be filled out by the PVO Director or his/her designated assistant prior to the interview scheduled for 1-2 days later; however, in many instances this was not done.

USE OF AN INTERVIEW -- The framework of each interview was the list of topics given in Annex 3. A few of the topics were dependent on noting the PVO's questionnaire response to particular items (e.g., if the PVO had been assisted by outside donors, was unwilling to work with the Government) and thus in some interviews not all 10 topics were brought up.

The first version of the set of interview issues was also pre-tested along with the questionnaire for several days prior to being finalized. AID's review of the draft interview schedule especially led to improvements.

Seldom could the interview be conducted in less than one hour; the average length was closer to 1.5 hours, naturally depending on such factors as the size/complexity of the PVO's operations, extent of experience with past AID or other donor funding and the like (not excluding the loquaciousness of the interviewee).

A total of 54 interviews were held, a few being quite attenuated because the consultant had become aware, usually from questionnaire responses, that the organization concerned would not be eligible for the sectoral lists of Part B. (The principal such reason involved the PVO Director's reason for not being interested in future AID collaboration/funding, if the "No" box of item V-3 in the questionnaire had been checked. If the PVO had a principled stand against such possible collaboration there was little point in carrying out the full interview. If, however, the Director simply meant that AID's funding participation appeared unnecessary within the next 1-5 years due to plenty of other funding already being committed or rather definitely likely, that was not deemed a reason for the PVO being ineligible for the sectoral lists of Part B following. In those instances the full interview went ahead.)

In a few cases questionnaire were completed but no interview held, largely for the reason just cited--the consultants having learned that the PVO had taken some policy position against working with AID. In the list of PVOs in Annex J, Part II those who kindly submitted a questionnaire but were not interviewed are marked with \*. (NOTE: other reasons also arose for not proceeding with an interview, a few times, such as no significant activity in a sector relevant to AID or because the PVO was entirely financed by the home-country government directly, making it solely an expression of that country's bilateral foreign aid program. The last reason was not deemed to apply to third-country based PVOs if less than 90-100% of their funding (for current budget) came directly from that country's government.)

**CONSULTANTS' EVALUATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW RESULTS**  
- Several criteria were specified by AID as determining whether or not serious consideration could be given later to the prospect of developing some kind of funding relationship, whether program support through co-financing or more contractual type collaboration through grants for specific projects/purposes. These five criteria are described in the Addendum to Tables 1-5 for Item 14. In order to be considered eligible a PVO had to score at least 3 out of a possible 5 points, as shown in Item 14. Those who scored only 0 - 2 points are merely listed in Annex I, with the reason of too low a score noted.

## B. Sector-by-Sector Results of the Survey

BRIEF PROFILE OF PVOs FOUND SUITABLE FOR POSSIBLE FUTURE AID SUPPORT (alphabetical overall five sectors)-

### ADRA - Adventist Development and Relief Agency

Checked relief and rehabilitation as their most important activity at 35% of current budget. No.2 is Health @ 30%. In latter sector operate dental and medical clinic, beneficiaries not restricted to the poor. Well-off patients pay for operation of clinics and permit below-cost services for low income (locals). Also concentrate on women and the poor in underprivileged villages (5). For destitute women they have developed income generating handicraft work marketed, in part, to foreigners living in Gulshan (Polywog), which pay 25% of budget. During '84 flood ADRA aided 10 villages in relief work. Based in Wash., D.C. Note: proposed a child survival project to AID here earlier in '85, not accepted. Adventist Church operates a separate operation: a considerable number of schools primary through junior college. Data for latter not included in Tables 3 and 4.

### CARE - Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere

By far the largest PVO in the country, CARE's current budget of over \$12 million is supported 78% from CBO programs aided by CUSA and AID. The former consists of the wheat from Canada for paying in kind the female road maintenance workers, and the latter is part of the commodities distributed through the Food-for-Work program (from 1975). The big majority of the wheat in the FFW program comes from AID--the value not included in CARE's budget figure. CARE receives directly from AID \$388.2M in 1985-86 for monitoring the FFW Project. Those two major, country wide programs temporarily employ over one-half million rural, landless men and women. In addition, the agency operates a deep tubewell program in 5 districts for the landless and small farmers, now irrigating about 9,000 acres; a Primary Health Service Training Program which seeks to upgrade 70 Family Welfare Centres each year, at the union level; a Women's Development Project in 150 villages; and an Agriculture Development Project for 3,000 marginal farmers assisted in raising vegetables as a cash crop (in Tangail). Four other foreign donors support CARE in this country.

## CCDB - Christian Commission for Development in Bangladesh

An indigenous rural development organization affiliated with the World Council of Churches in Geneva. CCDB is working in 2,000 villages spread across 15 districts. CCDB started out with a multi-sectoral integrated approach where the main inputs they provided were credit, health services and social education. This continues to be their main thrust. About 2 years ago they began in new areas a no-input approach where the main effort is on adult education and group formation. As a third approach, they have in recent years taken on a role of supporting small localized groups near to or adjacent to villages where CCDB is operating. The organization provides financial assistance and helps these small groups increase their capabilities in aspects of development.

Though in all 3 approaches the target remains socially and economically disadvantaged groups, some services are provided to the community as a whole, such as health care. Although they do emphasize women as a special target group, this is not being reflected in the implementation. CCDB has a major agricultural development project in Rajshahi and Pabna involving the promotion of different levels of irrigation technology. All projects include programs in literacy and numeracy, development education, skills training, health and family planning, and credit programs for income generation. Animal immunization, fisheries development programs and cultivation of pineapples, HYV paddy, and sugar cane also form an important part of the development programs.

**CONCERN-** An Irish voluntary organization which started its work here in the refugee camps in 1971. It's committed to relief and development assistance to the poorest sections of society with a special emphasis on mothers and children. They operate in 9 urban areas across 7 districts. They are one of the main agencies working with the Bihari community and in the destitute camps adjacent to Dhaka. Concern's main area of activity is in health care and they have programs in 6 locations. It emphasizes preventive health efforts where vaccination forms a major component. Concern also operates 6 nutrition units serving malnourished children. UNDP has funded out of its Women's Decade funds 5 Women's Training Centers in urban slum areas where women are helped to gain skills as well as given literacy and health education. There are 3 handicraft centers employing nearly 300 women. Concern has one agricultural project in Sylhet district where they provide extension services to farmers. It has also been involved in engineering works as part of a rural communications program and urban sanitation projects.

Concern is keen to shift more and more towards community development programs and is undergoing major readjustments in management at present.

CP - Comilla Proshika

An agro-based rural program emphasizing village-level institutional development (780 villages currently in 12 districts). Income generation by their groups featured, in agriculture, pisciculture, animal raising an important part of group formation/development. Now stressing more female involvement at the group/village level. CIDA funds 90% of current budget. After Phase III ends in '89 they intend to phase down to a service agency for the independent groups they've fostered.

CRWRC - Christian Reformed World Relief Committee

Presently their work concentrates in the Bogra area where they work primarily with marginal farmers, landless and rural poor women in agricultural production, health/nutrition, literacy and income-generation. CRWRC started its work in Bangladesh in 1972, having till 1975 worked jointly with MCC. Main thrust has been agriculture, and later adding work with women, and small scale income generation. Three years ago started working with landless. CRWRC plans to establish a local FVO out of its program--the Bogra Rural Development Project, to have its own administration and Board. This process of building up a program and handing over the administration to a newly formed institution is the model operandi that CRWRC would like to follow in all its projects.

The organization plans expansion into the Jamalpur District, and is presently in the research/development stage of what promises to become its largest effort within two years or so.

CTRDW - Centre for Training and Rehabilitation of Destitute Women

A Dhaka-based organization providing shelter and care for abandoned children and pregnant women, and through training and education making poor slum women self-supporting. The center was started in 1981 and now has plans for setting up a garments manufacturing unit for which a proposal has been submitted to AID/W. CTRDW works closely with the Dept. of Social Welfare and has been successful in initiating fostering of children/infants and has also played a very active role in the repatriation of Bangladeshi women from Pakistan.

#### FIVDB - Friends in Village Development/Bangladesh

An indigenous rural development organization working in 3 village clusters in Sylhet district. FIVDB evolved as an independent organization out of IVS in January, '81. They have been closely associated with the Rural Development Training Institute of the GRD, running the Village Development Training Programs. They have also provided the field base for FWTEI trainees. Although they target their development program to landless women and men and marginal farmers, their clinic facilities are open to all women and children in the community. One of their major programs is literacy, and the materials developed by them have received widespread appreciation. They are active in building organizational strength of the poor and are working with agricultural development, cottage industries, credit for income generation, livestock development, horticulture and a very successful duckling production and extension project. In addition, FIVDB produces a regular monthly newspaper, "Gram Bandhob" for neo-literates which provides a variety of information ranging from cultivation techniques, legal rights to health care, etc.

#### GUP - Gono Unnayan Procheshita

Another indigenous rural development agency having an integrated approach with special attention to the rural poor, sick children, small and marginal farmers and co-operative groups. Among the many different program activities: adult functional education, agriculture, batik and tie-dye production, community health care, cooperative formation of landless and destitute people, livestock development, and legal aid. GUP was initiated with Quaker efforts and continues to uphold Quaker and Gandhian principles. They have set up a Peace Centre which is a place for discussions, cultural programs and prayers. GUP is a localized organization working in two adjacent districts with its main office in Madaripur.

#### HEED - Health, Education and Economic Development

Largely a Christian-based program with 7 donors based in diverse countries, concentrating on rural institutional development (No.1 rank, with 17% of budget), agriculture (15%), health (26%) and six other activities. Five upazilas in three districts are served in this integrated approach, plus Mirpur where they work with the Biharis (income generation). Among target groups are lepers (Sylhet area). Small farmers and women are principal other targets. Health work underway for nine years emphasizing MCH/FP clinics; have built some hospitals and clinics; offer

health-worker training. Want to be a facilitator between GBD and people, but leary of any institution building with Govt. Help arrange loans for their participants from Govt. banks. Biggest projects are Kamalganj (Sylhet Dist.) and Dacope (Khulna Dist.)

**IDE - International Development Enterprises**

A fairly new effort to disseminate the recently developed Power hand powered water pump, which can bring an average Tk.2,000 net gain per season for each farmer purchasing/using. Each irrigation pump aids one family, on the average; each potable water pump benefits three families. Estimate a 10:1 cost-benefit ratio. Raising 60% of their C\$1.2 M 3-year budget from sales, remainder largely from CIDA. Designer of the pump now with IDE and helping further improve its quality; made by MAWTS. Also an intermediary, to 15 local organizations.

**INTERPARES-** A Canadian PVO aiming at the creation of developmental partnerships with third world organizations. It works both as an intermediary serving 4 Bangladeshi PVOs as well as directly with projects mainly in the field of technology transfer. Interpares has sponsored a lot of R&D and is now setting up technology transfer units in collaboration with MAWTS, Comilla Cooperative Karkhena and SEDS. With SEDS Inter Pares has plans for an improved rickshaw factory to employ women workers at Shaturia. Inter Pares is interested in collaboration with AID in furthering technology transfer units. It has in the past successfully worked with Bangladesh Jute Mills Corpn., a government concern, in the introduction of jute plastic. However, an attempt to get the Government interested in gas-fueled motorized rickshaws has not gotten anywhere in three years.

**IUCW - International Union for Child Welfare**

A Swiss PVO working closely with the Dept. of Social Welfare, GBD, finding the collaboration most satisfactory. Their socio-economic programs include giving small loans to economically deprived families for income generating schemes. In addition, they work in population planning, MCH and nutrition/ health. Family development centers are built in villages which act both as a neutral community space and as a service center.

JC - Jagoroni Chakra

Also indigenous, based in Jessore. Besides working in 57 villages, JC tackles Jessore slums and 8 sweeper community colonies. Their main thrust is to build organization of their target groups: landless, marginal farmers, destitute women and sweeper community (Harijans). Program activities include skills training for women, fisheries development; population planning and adult education.

KARIKA - Bangladesh Hastashilpa Samabaya Federation Ltd.

The central office buys from scattered producer groups (in over 12,000 villages) in 12 districts a variety of jute products which Karika endeavors to sell internally (few stores) and abroad (main outlets are in 5 or 6 countries). Producers are in 124 units of which 64 constitute registered co-operatives, 50 are families and individuals and 12 founders/members. Units often take short-term loans from Karika, such as 2 weeks, 1 month-- interest free. No international donors last 5 years (were 4 principal ones). Have 2 expansion projects in mind, proposals written, ERD approved. Report doing some conscientization work with groups, and some training for specific handicraft skills. Central organization occasionally seeks out new, promising products or designs. Claim to be entirely self-supporting (questionnaire conflicts somewhat).

MIDAS - Micro Industries Development Assistance Society

While originally aimed largely at PVOs, has evolved with AID encouragement, not to mention funding, into a new, unique channel of credit to promising private sector small business. Its loans are for 3-5 years at 18% per year. In addition, a technical staff specializes in feasibility studies @ Tk. 5-10 each, which a few PVOs have also hired. While PVOs shy away from the borrowing approach, preferring donor grants for funding, there are a few examples of successful PVO enterprises started via MIDAS. AID's loans so far \$2.5 M. The executive head cites MIDAS' advantages over commercial banks: more open to innovation by borrowers, offers shorter time from application to loan disbursement (4-5 months average), and borrowers needn't make "side" payments, too. Prefers to emphasize rural, off-farm employment gains via these small scale and cottage industries. As of mid-84 had itself lent for 12 projects, had referred a number of others to other funding agencies--29 total projects developed. The 12 approved by AID involved capital of Tk.77.7 lacs.

**MSS - Manabik Shahajya Sangstha**

One of few urban-only PVOs found suitable. Seeks to aid poor in its areas of Dhaka (between Green Road and Old Airport Road, N. Badda) through an integrated approach emphasizing employment/income generation (rank 1, absorbing 30% of the budget), health (No.2 @20%), commodity distribution (10%) and three other activities. One of smaller organizations with current budget of only Tk. 20 lacs, but that's rapidly growing (in significant part due to successful foreign fund raising by foreign women handling its affiliated Badda Women's Self-Help Center). Earns 20% of budget from the Women's Center and the printing operation (boys training). Family planning efforts funded by AID via Asia Foundation. Women's program includes training in housekeeping, cooking, baby care skills. Seek to expand work with women and also aid women working in garments factories by starting a day care center--funding sought. Board has 42 "big shots". In small scale enterprise sector, too, because of its small loans program which by 7/75 had fostered 127 little businesses with aggregate borrowings of Tk.1.4 lacs (a 5% service charge is assessed).

**PFB - Presbyterian Fellowship in Bangladesh**

Based in Atlanta, Georgia; the Church hqs. there being the sole source of funds. Quite missionary oriented. Two principal projects: in Tangi with the poor, the ex-squatters resettled from Dhaka some years ago (mostly health work); and in Rajbari, the "Christian Health and Agricultural Project". The latter's agricultural part features a demonstration farm plus extension services to surrounding area. Not targeting Christians in project areas. After the health and agriculture, third ranked activity is training, both in agriculture and adult literacy. Marginal farmers comprise agricultural beneficiaries--1-2 acres per family. Graduation from assistance program sought, based on farmers providing own food needs for at least 12-13 months running, taking a 4-year period to produce. Would like to replicate the Rajbari project elsewhere. Bangladesh Baptist Fellowship involved in the Rajbari effort.

SC-USA - Save the Children, USA

Operate a strictly rural integrated development approach in four districts (17 villages), mostly using funds from hqs.' child-sponsorship program (rapidly growing in size, amount). Six activities noted from agency's statement of objectives, which include improvements in agricultural productivity, health, nutrition, family planning plus some public works and income-generation. AID currently contributing 13% of budget--\$91K for child survival work. AID/W considering a matching grant, not necessarily affecting BD. Have plan to expand into other areas, aiming at another 3 by end of 1990. Classify their villages on poverty scale, find 60-65% in the lowest half of the A-D scale. Provided funds to VERC for 4-1/2 years, only intermediary experience. Not eager to do any more.

Some specifics from '84 report: 5 sets of materials researched and partially produced on the priority area of MCH; agriculture continued winter vegetables demonstration, fish cultivation, grain storage and distributed seeds in flood-affected areas; public works sector saw a bridge built, paid 50% by GBD; small loan program begun, and with MIDAS started a weaving project.

SNSP - Shaptagram Nari Swanirvar Parishad

One of larger rural, village-level programs featuring women-only those whose families are absolutely landless or whose family holdings are insufficient for subsistence. Over 9 districts have groups in 700 villages, have established 9 main centers outside Dhaka. Institutional development ranked first, with credit-savings groups, conscientization work and legal aid; training second in importance, with specialized

**TARD - Technical Assistance for Rural Development (Savar)**

Aimed at the landless and marginal farmers, this PVO has especially become known for its well-organized training programs offered to other PVOs and even international agencies: 60 such trainings held so far. Offer also evaluations and consultations for PVOs. In addition, has a Field Operation Programme affecting, according to the '83 report, 70 villages in 3 upazilas. Major components of this field-work are training of target groups (cadres become village change agents), group awareness/participation, formation of action groups who undertake development projects using their savings, TARD funds and various government inputs. As of 1983 around 1,000 small projects had been started. Social activities also are pushed, which the report mentions as including 900 poultry vaccination cases plus 9 marriages without dowry and 6 instances of resisting polygamy by group pressure. TARD was formed by ex-VERC staff.

**VERC - Village Education and Resource Center (Savar)**

Provides direct services to target groups and support services to both GED and PVOs involving people in 293 villages over 20 districts. Like TARD, training is featured (ranked 3), but unlike TARD there's stress on building/improving rural infrastructure in terms of physical artifacts (ap-tech, No.2). Technology development/dissemination is prominent. VERC has established several new approaches to development communication: facilitating the sharing of experiences among project designers and client groups, exchanging data/experience among development agencies (e.g., joint project planning, sharing materials), an action research program, introduction into trainings of new elements such as an "affective" goal; the spread of publications and aids to field workers including operation of a library and issuing periodicals. Learning materials for the Children's Education Centre and other literacy centres are produced. In 1/84 a Univ. of Dhaka group evaluated and made numerous recommendations.

VERC also stimulates the formation of co-operatives with some services provided for their further development. There is little in the whole field of rural uplift not also being tackled by VERC: a truly comprehensive approach with many innovative components.

WI - Winrock International

Its Human Resources Development Division (formerly Agricultural Development Council of New York) provides scholarships, fellowships for postgraduate study by Bangladeshis outside the country, to increase their abilities upon later return to contribute in the agricultural sector. In addition, WI provides research grants. The fellowships are 6 MS and 2 Ph.Ds sent per year; the grants numbered 14 in '84. WI provides some travel awards, publications to local individuals/organizations; sponsors seminars and workshops.

WVB - World Vision Bangladesh

Primarily a Christian relief organization. Started work in this country primarily offering relief aid to the Garo community. It has now grown into a development program with an emphasis on schools. WVB's a development aid stresses increased self-sufficiency of families in need. Their main program deals with the sponsorship of children.

YWCA - Young Women's Christian Association

Has programs in six major cities and one rural area; with employment/income generation top priority, health second, training 3rd. Also stimulates formation of credit groups among women. Raises 79% of its annual budget from own sources, such as schools, income-generating projects, non-formal education classes, bake sales, bazar tables, and the like. Back about '76-77 had AID funding for 1-1/2 years of a jute handicrafts training consultant which went well though handling AID's financial reporting requirements was difficult. Get into family planning motivation, family life education. Over 600 girls/women trained in some skills, many oriented to export production of jute goods. In Dhaka food products are also emphasized (biscuits, cakes, pastries), sold in 12 local shops. Do a number of other programs: functional literacy, hygiene education, provide in each branch a health worker who assists in the Y schools, too (capacity of about 1,000 students), undertake vaccination campaigns. Some gradual expansion sought, but experiencing financial straits in last year or so. Report quite a positive relationship with the Ministry of Social and Women's Affairs.

The Mirpur training features carpentry for boys, weaving for girls (12-13 years).

A BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE TABLES - Each of the five sectors noted above has a two-page table in which selected items from the questionnaires and interviews are tabulated per PVO.

The left-most wide column lists the 15 topics for which entries may be found in the columns to the right.

In each sector the PVOs are arrayed beginning with US based, then indigenous, and finally any third-country-based. The last category of PVOs are missing from Sectors 1 and 2: Agriculture and Rural Infrastructure.

Items in the tabulation are those found straightforward, usually without any need to enter words or phrases. Elaborating details for some of the data items may be found in the questionnaires.

The principle purpose of the following tables are two-fold: (a) To identify the PVOs found suitable per sector and (b) to furnish quite a lot of data which can be readily compared among the 10 or more PVOs per sector, enabling some assessment of suitability from various standpoints.

The order of listing PVOs within each of the three categories noted--US-based, indigenous, third country based--should not be interpreted as any order of preference by the consultants.

TABLE-1  
10 SUITABLE PVO'S IN THE AGRICULTURE SECTOR

DATA SELECTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES & INTERVIEWS	CRWRC	IDE	PFB SCF (USA)		WINROCK		CARE	NEED	CCOB	GUP	FIVD-B
	US Based *SR=1*	US Based Sec. Rank+1	US Based E.R.=2	US Based SR=4H	US Based SR=1	US Based SR=1	US Based SR=2	Indig SR=2	Indig SR=4	Indig SR=1	Indig SR=4
1 Present also in OTHER SECTORS: No. indicates sector Table No. in this set. ....	2,4		4	2,4			2,4	5,4	2	2,4	2,3,4
2 EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION: ✓ means it's a featured aspect of PVO's work in this sector. ....	✓						✓	✓		✓	✓
3 RURAL/URBAN: ✓ indicates primarily urban (questionnaire lists names)			✓								
4 a AN INTERMEDIARY? If so, the No. indicates how many PVOs aided in current year. ....		15		1					20		
b ✓ = aid by channeling funds. ....		0		0					0		
# = aid by training programs. ....				0					0		
B = aid by advice, helping register. ....				0					0		
+ = aid in some other way (see quest.) ....				+					+		
5 NOT intermediary: a ✓ means keen to take on that role and apparently have capacity. ....	✓										
6 a TARGET GROUP, if any: No. identifies from list on Addendum to this Table. ....	2,3,8	10	3,5,8	N.R.	P.S.S.	2,3,7,10	3,9,10		2,8	1,2,3,8,9	2,8
b Other group not on list (written in). ....											
7 GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD: a) No. sites. ....	24	NR	2	4	N.R.	5000	NR	18	NR		3
b) No. villages: c) No. upazilas. ....	606;8	NR;30	2;2	17;4	NR	NR;366	NR;5	2000;45	500;5		60;1
d) No. districts: e) No. divisions (questionnaire lists names)	1;1	10;NR	2;2	4;2	NR	50;4	3;NR	15;4	2;NR		1;1
8 a BENEFICIARIES: Estimated No. during current budget year (K=1000's). ....	61k	30k	26.4k	45k	NR	650k	51.5k	35k	25k		15k
b ✓ means their description differs from target groups of Item 6 above. ....							✓				
9 a STAFF: Total No. ....	161	42	137	57	2	1157	372	1106	135		60
b % expatriates, if any. ....	1.8% <sup>2</sup>	4.7% <sup>1</sup>	6.5% <sup>2</sup>	5.2% <sup>1</sup>	50%	1.3% <sup>2</sup>	3.7% <sup>1</sup>	0.2% <sup>2</sup>			
c % specified as "management". ....	3.7% <sup>2</sup>	14.2% <sup>1</sup>	12.4% <sup>2</sup>	61.4% <sup>1</sup>	50%	4.7% <sup>2</sup>	3.4% <sup>1</sup>	1.8% <sup>2</sup>	3.7% <sup>1</sup>		25%
d % female. ....	5.5% <sup>2</sup>		31.3% <sup>2</sup>	22.8% <sup>1</sup>		19.0% <sup>2</sup>	21.7% <sup>1</sup>	30.2% <sup>2</sup>	14.9% <sup>1</sup>		25%
10 a BUDGET: Total current in taka (K=1000's; K = millions). ....	9.57M	13.9M	9.924M	19.19M	13.25M	247.02M	1.35M	37.50M	5.0M		7.15M
b % change over 3 yrs. ago (if newer, since year entered in brackets). ....	191%	302%	150%	266%	368%	50%	142%	72%	125%		-69.8%
c % from GENERATED FUNDS inside BD (may include donations (rare); normally receipts from sales of products, training charges, etc.). ....	12.80%	60%	5%	NR	NR	NR	26%	15%	22%		1%
d SPECIFIC SOURCES (up to 3) of income generated in 10,c (written entries). ....							H' CRAFT TEC. FUND	LOAN REF. PART.	AGRI PIS REV. ECK		SEED, CREDIT INT.
e WANT TO INCREASE 2 OF GENERATED INCOME? # = have definite plans to do so. ....	YES	YES					YES		EE		YES
f % of current budget estimated for ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD. ....	6.55%	20%	7%	17%	23%	10%	11%	19%	6.5%		10%

TABLE-1 (Contd.)  
10 SUITABLE PVO'S IN THE AGRICULTURE SECTOR

DATA SELECTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES & INTERVIEWS	CPWRC	IOE	PFB	SCF (USA)	WINROCK	CARE	HEED	CCDB	GUP	FIVD-B
	US Based *SR=1*	US Based Sec.Rank=1	US Based S.P.=2	US Based SR=NR	US Based SR=1	US Based SR=2	Indig SR=2	Indig SR=4	Indig SR=1	Indig SR=4
11 a EXPANSION: If rep'ted so seeking, \$ amt = self-claimed ability to effectively absorb in one year's time. ....	\$110K	\$346K	\$200K	\$30K	NR	\$1.5M	\$50K	NR	\$174K	\$2.48K
b Any entry in 11,a as % of total current budget	33%	75%	66%	5%		12%	100%	NR	100%	100%
c ✓ = an actual plan reported (an added # = projects identified with cost estimates)..	✓*	✓*	✓*	✓*		✓*	✓*		✓	✓
12 a DCMGFS: 1st digit(s) = No. reported since work began in 80, or at least since about 1980; 2nd digit(s) in ( ) is No. apparently contributing to current budget (the quest. names donors, usually acronyms). ....	(11)	2(2)	0	3(3)	2(2)	11(11)	7(7)	7(7)	5(5)	3(3)
b # = some of foreign funds from AID directly (% of current budget). ....				#(39%)	#(60%)	#(9%)				
c ## = some of foreign funds from AID via an intermediary. ....										
d # = majority of foreign funds from another govt. (% of current budget from that govt., if any). ....										
e ## = minority of foreign funds from another govt.'s foreign aid program. ....	##	#36								
13 COLLABORATION W/GBO:										
a ✓ = reported Govt. personnel in programs/projects/trainings. ....										
b ✓✓ = Govt. supplies equipment/contraceptives/food. ....										
c ✓✓✓ = Govt. funds some of PVO's work. ....							✓✓			
d # = other collaboration. ....							✓✓✓			
e # = no collaboration reported. ....										
14 SCORE (3 - 5) on 5 crucial criteria of "most promising" (5 = top); those with only 0,1 or 2 not included in this table. ....	12345	123 5	12 5	12345	23 5	12345	12345	123 5	12345	12345
(definitions of the 5 criteria are given in the Addendum to this Table)	5	3	3	5	3	5	5	4	5	5

N.A.\* in columns to right = "not reported"

\*S.R.# in the bottom row of each PVO's column heading means "sector rank" as assigned by the PVO itself on the questionnaire from among the total of 13 possible activities. Directors were asked to rank all the checked activities in item IV,2 on pgs.2-3

TABLE-2  
12 SUITABLE PVD'S IN THE RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE SECTOR

DATA SELECTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES & INTERVIEWS		SCF-USA US Based SR=NR	CRWC US Based SR = 2	CARE U.S. SR = 1	SAPTAGRAM Indig. SR = 1	TARD Indig. SR = 1	CCDB Indig. SR = 1	KARIYA Indig. SR = 1	BUP Indig. SR = 2	VERC Indig. SR = 1	YWCA Indig. SR = NR	JAGOROWI Indig. SR = 1	FIVD-B Indig. SR = 1
1	Prominent also in OTHER SECTORS: No. indicates sector Table No. in this set. ....	1,4	1,4	1,4	4,5	5	1	3	1,4		3,4	4,5	1,3,4
2	EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION: ✓ means it's a featured aspect of PVD's work in this sector. ....		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		
3	RURAL/URBAN: ✓ indicates primarily urban (questionnaire lists names) .....												
4	a AN INTERMEDIARY? If so, the No. indicates how many PVDs aided in current year. ....	1											
	b ✓ = aid by channeling funds. ....	✓					20			60			
	# = aid by training programs. ....	#								#			
	+ = aid by advice, helping register. ....	+								+			
	+ = aid in some other way (see quest.) .....												
5	NOT intermediary: a ✓ means keen to take on that role and apparently have capacity. ....		✓										
6	a TARGET GROUP, if any: No. identifies from list on Addendum to this Table. ....	NR	2,3,8	2,3,7,10	2,3	2,8	2,8	7	1,2,3,8,9		3,4,5	2,3,8	2,8
	b Other group not on list (written in). ....												
7	GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD: a) No. sites. ....	4	24	5000	23	NR	38	500					3
	b) No. villages; c) No. upazilas. ....	17;4	606;8	NR;366	700;13	NR;4	2000;45	12750;120	NR	NR	NR	14	3
	d) No. districts; e) No. divisions. ....	4;2	1;1	50;4	9;NR	4;NR	15;4	12;4	500;5	293;36	1;NR	57;3	60;1
	#Questionnaire lists names								2;	20;4	4;NR	2;1	1;1
8	a BENEFICIARIES: Estimated No. during current budget year (K=000's). ....	45K	13K	850K	31.5K	75K	35K	20K	25K	60K	NR	NR	15K
	b ✓ means their description differs from target groups of Item 6 above. ....												
9	a STAFF: Total No. ....	57	161	1157	82	34	1106	60	135	229	135	31	60
	b I expatriates, if any. ....	5,261	1,861	1,381			0,271						
	c I specified as "management". ....	61,401	3,732	4,751	8,541	44,121	1,811	151	3,701	4,371	11,111	12,91	251
	d I female. ....	22,811	5,591	19,011	60,981	23,531	30,201	33,341	14,811	63,321	NR	54,841	251
10	a BUDGET: Total current in taka (K=000's; M = millions). ....	19.19M	9.57M	349.02M	NR	7M	37.5M	21.39M	5M	7.34M	8.45M	6.0M	7.15M
	b I change over 3 yrs. ago (if newer, since year entered in brackets). ....	2661	1911	5031			8751	721	2791	1251	1751	2641	NR
	c I from GENERATED FUNDS inside BD (may include donations (rare); normally receipts from sales of products, training charges, etc.). ....		12,801	NR	NR								-701
	d SPECIFIC SOURCES (up to 3) of income generated in 10,c (written entries). ....		TUBWELL SEED H'CRAFT			21	151	101	221	141	791	NR	11
						TRN. PRG CONSULT. REPAYMENT	LOAN	H'CRAFT SALE	AGR F (SC REVOLVING	TRN PRG TECH.	SCHOOL INCOME GEN. SOURCE		SEED; DUCK; CREDIT
	e WANT TO INCREASE I OF GENERATED INCOME? ...	NR	YES	NR	YES	YES	NR	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	# = have definite plans to do so. ....		#		#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#
	f I of current budget estimated for ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD. ....	171	6,551	101	NR	151	101	201	6,51	151	131	71	101

- 18 -

TABLE-2 (Contd.)  
SUITABLE PVD'S IN THE RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE SECTOR

DATA SELECTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES & INTERVIEWS	SCF-USA US Based SR=NR	CRWRC US Based SR = 2	CARE U.S. SR = 1	SAPTAGRAM Indig. SR = 1	TARD Indig. SR = 1	CCDB Indig. SR = 1	KARIKA Indig. SR = 1	GUP Indig. SR = 2	VERC Indig. SR = 1	YMCA JAGOROMI Indig. SR = NR	FIVD-B Indig. SR = 1	
11 a EXPANSION: If rep'ted so seeking, & an't = self-claimed ability to effectively absorb in one year's time. ....	\$ 30K	NR	\$ 1.5m	NR	\$ 174K	NR	\$ 350K	\$ 174K	\$ 255K	\$ 300K	\$ 52K	\$ 248K
b Any entry in 11,2 as % of total current budget	5%		12%		71%		47%	100%	100%	100%	75%	100%
c ✓ = an actual plan reported (an added ✓ = projects identified with cost estimates)...	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
12 a DONORS: 1st digit(s) = No. reported since work began in BD, or at least since about 1980; 2nd digit(s) in ( ) is No. apparently contributing to current budget (the quest. names donors, usually acronyms). ....	5(5)	1(1)	11(11)	7(7)	5(5)	7(7)	6(6)	5(5)	9(6)	3(3)	6(6)	3(3)
b # = some of foreign funds from AID directly (% of current budget). ....	*(38%)		*(9%)									
c ** = some of foreign funds from AID via an intermediary. ....												
d # = majority of foreign funds from another govt. (% of current budget from that govt., if any). ....									** 30%	**		
e ## = minority of foreign funds from another govt.'s foreign aid program. ....							853%				8100%	
13 COLLABORATION W/GOV: a ✓ = reported Govt. personnel in programs/projects/trainings. ....												
b ✓✓ = Govt. supplies equipment/contraceptives/food. ....												
c ✓✓✓ = Govt. funds some of PVD's work. ....				✓✓			✓✓		✓✓		✓✓	
d # = other collaboration. ....												
e # = no collaboration reported. ....												
14 SCORE (3 - 5) on 5 crucial criteria of "most promising" (5 = top); those with only 0,1 or 2 not included in this Table. .... (definitions of the 5 criteria are given in the Addendum to this Table)	12345 5	12345 5	12345 5	1 34 3	0 123 5 4	123 5 4	123 5 4	12345 5	123 5 4	23 5 3	123 5 4	12345 5

Physical vs. socio-economic infrastructure: The majority of PVDs above primarily stress institution building in rural areas. The questionnaires note if any physical structures are also or mainly being built—which is the case with CARE and SCF-USA.

NOTES: The consultants consider that two more foreign-based PVDs are promising in this sector: 1) IUCM and 2) Concern. Shapla Neer is a possibility. Data on both can be found in the columns of other tables herein (IUCM in Table 3 & 5; Concern in Table 4).

"S.R." denotes "sector rank", as assigned by the PVD in the questionnaire (item IV<sub>2</sub>) based on the number of activities checked (13 max.).

"N.R." in columns to right = "not reported".

TABLE-3  
10 SUITABLE PVD'S IN THE SMALL SCALE ENTERPRISE SECTOR

DATA SELECTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES & INTERVIEWS	WORLD									
	ADVENTISTS USA SR=4	VISION USA SR=1	NSS INDIG SR=1	KARIKA INDIG SR=NR	MIDAS INDIG SR=1	LONILLA YVCA PROSHIKA INDIG. INDIG. INDIG. SR=NR SR=NR SR=NR			FIVD-9 INDIG SR=5	LUCW SWITZ SR=1
1 Prominent also in OTHER SECTORS: No. indicates sector Table No. in this set. ....	4		4	2		2,1		1,2,4	5	
2 EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION: ✓ means it's a featured aspect of PVD's work in this sector. ....		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
3 RURAL/URBAN: ✓ indicates primarily urban (questionnaire lists names)			✓							
4 a AN INTERMEDIARY? If so, the No. indicates how many PVDs aided in current year. ....		25								4
b ✓ = aid by channeling funds. ....										
" = aid by training programs. ....										
" = aid by advice, helping register. ....										
" = aid in some other way (see quest.) ....										
5 NDI intermediary: a ✓ means keen to take on that role and apparently have capacity. ....										
6 a TARGET GROUP, if any: No. identifies from list on Addendum to this Table. ....	3,5,1,6	1,2,3,5	1,3,5,7	7	7	3,4,5	2,8,10	2,8	1,4,5	2,3,7,8
b Other group not on list (written in). ....										
7 a GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD: a) No. sites. ....	5	116	NR	500	23	NR	NR	3	NR	NR
b) No. villages; c) No. upazilas	5;NR	150;30	NR;NR	12750;120	NR;NR	1;NR	760;20	60;1	916;86	NR;NR
d) No. districts; e) No. divisions	5;NR	18;4	2;NR	12;4	10;NR	6;NR	12;4	1;1	19;4	4;NR
*Questionnaire lists names										
8 a BENEFICIARIES: Estimated No. during current budget year (K=000's). ....	35K	60K	10K	20K	NR	NR	NR	15K	290K	2K
b ✓ means their description differs from target groups of item 6 above. ....										
9 a STAFF: Total No. ....	177	238	62	60	30	135	149	60	93	13
b % expatriates, if any. ....	3.75%	1.12%							.93%	23.08%
c % specified as "management". ....	2.82%	4.85%	14.52%	15%	3.33%	11.11%	12.08%	25%	11.83%	23.08%
d % female. ....	61.02%	17.16%	62.90%	33.34%	10%	NR	21.48%	25%	8.60%	15.38%
10 a BUDGET: Total current in taka (K=000's; M = millions). ....	8.5M	57.6M	2.0M	21.39M	41.4M	8.45M	23M	7.15M	63.15M	50M
b % change over 3 yrs. ago (if newer, since year entered in brackets). ....	31.5%	123%	133%	279%	995%	264%	NR	-70%	73%	167%
c % from GENERATED FUNDS inside BD (may include donations (rare); normally receipts of products, training charges, etc.). ...	30%	NR		10%	8.5%	79%	36%	1.0%	NR	5.0%
d SPECIFIC SOURCES (up to 3) of income ge in 19,c (written entries). ....	NTAL VICES; *06;			H' CRAFT SALES	CONSUL- TANCY	SCHOOL TRAINING; INCOME INTEREST	SEED; CREDIT FROM INTEREST; DUCK			TECHNOLOGY TO PVD'S
e WANT TO INCREASE % OF GENERATED INCOME? " = have definite plans to do so. ....			YES	YES		YES		YES	NR	
f % of current budget estimated for ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD. ....	14%	15%	11%	20%	3.66%	12%	8%	10%	17%	10%

TABLE-3 (Contd.)  
10 SUITABLE PVO'S IN THE SMALL SCALE ENTERPRISE SECTOR

DATA SELECTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES & INTERVIEWS	WORLD									
	ADVENTISTS	VISON	NSS	KARIKA	MIDAS	COMILLA		FIVD-B	IUCN	INTERPARES
	USA SR=4	USA SR=1	INDIG SR=1	INDIG SR=NR	INDIG SR=1	INDIG SR=NR	INDIG. SR=NR	INDIG SR=5	SWITZ SR=1	CANADA SR=1
11 a EXPANSION: If rep'd so seeking, 8 an't = self-claimed ability to effectively absorb in one year's time. ....	\$295K	NR	\$52K	\$350K	NR	\$300K	NR	\$248K	NR	NR
b Any entry in 11.a as % of total current budget. ....	100%		3.0%	4%	10%	100%		100%		
c ✓ = an actual plan reported (an added * = projects identified with cost estimates)..	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓		✓
12 a DONORS: 1st digit(s) = No. reported since work began in 80, or at least since about 1980; 2nd digit(s) in ( ) is No. apparently contributing to current budget (the quest. names donors, usually acronyms)..	4(4)	9	5(3)	6(0)	4(2)	3(3)	2(2)	3(3)	4(2)	2(2)
b * = some of foreign funds from AID directly (% of current budget). ....					*				*(NR)	
c ** = some of foreign funds from AID via an intermediary. ....					**	**				
d # = majority of foreign funds from another govt. (% of current budget from that govt., if any). ....				#53%			#90%		#84%	#60%
e @ = minority of foreign funds from another govt.'s foreign aid program. ....	@		@		@	@	@			@
13 COLLABORATION W/GOV: a ✓ = reported Govt. personnel in programs/ projects/trainings. ....										✓
b ✓✓ = Govt. supplies equipment/contraceptives/ food. ....			✓✓							
c ✓✓✓ = Govt. funds some of PVO's work. ....				✓✓✓						
d * = other collaboration. ....								*		
e @ = no collaboration reported. ....		@			@					
14 SCORE (3 - 5) on 5 crucial criteria of "most promising" (5 = top); those with only 0,1 or 2 not included in this Table. ....	123 5 4	12 5 3	123 5 4	123 5 4	23 5 3	23 5 3	1234 4	12345 5	1 345 4	123 5 4

\*The meaning of "S.R." is "sector rank" as assigned by the PVO in the questionnaire (item IV.2), based on the activities reported (13 max.)

\*"N.R." in columns to right = "not reported".

\*NOTE: In the questionnaires some of the above PVOs did not check the "small scale enterprise" activity option but instead reported on their employment/income expansion work. When the latter was found by the consultants -- after interviewing and reading any documents--to feature the stimulation of small-scale enterprises, such as by the recipients of loans from the PVO itself or arranged by the PVO, then the PVO was assigned to this sector anyway. Virtually always the documents listed the small businesses being engaged in by the PVO-aided beneficiaries, judged a sufficient indication that enterprises really were being promoted.

TABLE-4  
14 SUITABLE PVD's IN THE HEALTH SECTOR

DATA SELECTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES & INTERVIEWS	SCF-USA USA SR=NR	PF-B USA SR=1	ADRA USA CA=2	CRMC USA SR=3	CARE USA SR=3	HSS INDIG SR=2	GUP INDIG SR=3	FIVD-B INDIG SR=3	SAPTABRAH INDIG SR=4	JAGORCWI INDIG SR=2*	YNCA INDIG SR=2	NEED USA SR=1	CONCERN IRELAND SR=1	CTRWI SWISS SR=1
<p> <b>Prominent also in OTHER SECTORS:</b> No. indicates sector Table No. (omit sev.) .....  <b>EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION:</b> ✓ means it's a featured aspect of PVD's work in this sector. ....  <b>RURAL/URBAN:</b> ✓ indicates primarily urban ..... (questionnaire lists names)  <b>AN INTERMEDIARY?</b> If so, the No. indicates how many PVDs aided in current year. ....                      ✓ = aid by channelling funds. ....                      # = aid by training programs. ....                      Δ = aid by advice, helping register. ....                      * = aid in some other way (see quest.) .....  <b>NOT intermediary:</b> a ✓ means keen to take on that role and apparently have capacity. ....  <b>TARGET GROUP,</b> if any: No. identifies from list on Addendum to this table. ....                      Other group set on list (written in). ....  <b>GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD:</b> a) No. sites. ....                      b) No. villages; c) No. upazillas .....                      d) No. districts; e) No. divisions .....                      (Questionnaire lists names)  <b>BENEFICIARIES:</b> Estimated No. during current budget year (K=1000's). ....                      ✓ means their description differs from target groups of Item 6 above. ....  <b>STAFF:</b> Total No. ....                      % expatriates, if any. ....                      % specified as "management". ....                      % female. ....  <b>BUDGET:</b> Total current in take (K=1000's; M = millions). ....                      % change over 3 yrs. ago (if newer, since year entered in brackets). ....                      % from GENERATED FUNDS inside BD (may include donations (rare); normally receipts from sales of products, training charges, etc.). ....                      SPECIFIC SOURCES (up to 3) of income generated in 10, (written entries). ....                      PATIENT FEE; MED                      DENTAL SERVICE                      TUBEWELL SEED H' CRAFT                      PRINTING INCOME/REVOLVING GENERATE                      AGRI INCOME/REVOLVING FUND                      SEED                      SCHOOL INCOME GEN. SOURCE                      H' CRAFT TEACHING EX. PAT. FUND                 </p>	1,2	1	3	1,2	1,2	3	1,2	1,2,3	2,3	2,5	2,3	1,5		
		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	1													
	✓													
	NR	3,5,8	3,5,1,6	2,3,8	2,3,7,10	1,3,5,7,1,2,3,8,9		2,8	2,3	2,3,8	3,4,5	3,9,10	1,2,3,4	1,3
	4	2	5	24	5000	NR	NR	3	23	14	NR	NR	NR	5
	17;4	2;2	5;NR	606;6	NR;366	NR;28	500;5	60;1	700;13	57;3	1;NR	NR;5	NR;NR	NR;NR
	4;2	2;2	5;NR	1;1	50;4	2;28	2;NR	1;1	9;NR	2;1	5;NR	3;NR	7;NR	1;NR
	45K	26.4K	35K	13K	650K	10K	25K	15K	31.5K	NR	NR	51.5K	25K	NR
	57	137	177	161	1157	62	135	60	82	31	135	372	490	36
	5.26%	6.57%	3.95%	1.86%	1.38%							3.76%	6.33%	5.95%
	61.40%	12.41%	2.82%	3.73%	4.75%	14.52%	3.70%	25%	8.54%	12.91%	11.11%	3.47%	3.06%	27.78%
	22.81%	31.39%	61.02%	5.59%	19.01%	62.90%	14.81%	75%	60.98%	54.84%	NR	21.77%	55.51%	72.22%
	19.19M	9.02M	8.5M	9.57M	349.02M	2.0M	5.0M	7.15M	NR	6.0M	8.45M	13.50M	22.81M	1.95M
	26%	150%	315%	191%	503%	133%	125%	-70%		NR	26%	142%	58%	183%
	N.A	5%	30%	12.80%	NR	20%	22%	1%	NR	NR	79%	26%	NR	NR
	17%	9%	12%	6.55%	10%	11%	6.5%	10%	NR	7%	13%	11%	4.4%	8%

TABLE-4 (Contd.)  
14 SUITABLE PVO's IN THE HEALTH SECTOR

DATA SELECTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES & INTERVIEWS	SCF-USA USA SR=NR	PF-B USA SR=1	ADRA USA SR=2	CRWRC USA SR=3	CARE USA SR=3	MSS INDIG SR=2	GUP INDIG SR=3	FIVD-B INDIG SR=3	SAPTAGRAM INDIB SR=4	JAGORONI INDIG SR=2*	YMCA INDIG SR=2	HEED USA SR=1	CONCERN IRELAND SR=1	CTRWI SWISS SR=1
EXPANSON: If rep'ted so seeking, \$ amt = self-claimed ability to effectively absorb in one year's time. ....	\$30K	\$200K	\$295K	\$110K	\$1.5M	\$52K	\$174K	\$248K						
Any entry in 11, a as % of total current budget	51	661	1001	331	121	31	1001	1001	NR	751	1001	1001	YES, CAPABLE NR	\$56K B21
✓ = an actual plan reported (an added \$ = projects identified with cost estimates)...	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		
DOMONS: 1st digit(s) = No. reported since work began in 80's, or at least since about 1980; 2nd digit(s) in ( ) = No. apparently contributing to current budget (the quest. names donors, usually acronyms). ....	5(5)	0	4(4)	1(1)	11(11)	5(3)	5(5)	3(3)	7(7)	6(6)	3(3)	7(7)	4(4)	9(4)
* = some of foreign funds from AID directly (% of current budget). ....	*138%				*192%									
** = some of foreign funds from AID via an intermediary. ....														
† = majority of foreign funds from another govt. (% of current budget from that govt., if any). ....														
‡ = minority of foreign funds from another govt.'s foreign aid program. ....			‡			‡				‡100%			‡63%	‡50%
COLLABORATION W/GRD:														
✓ = reported Govt. personnel in programs/projects/trainings. ....														
✓✓ = Govt. supplies equipment/contraceptives/food. ....														
✓✓✓ = Govt. funds some of PVO's work. ....					✓✓	✓✓								
§ = other collaboration. ....					✓✓✓					✓✓✓				
¶ = no collaboration reported. ....														
SCORE (3 - 5) on 5 crucial criteria of "most promising" (5 = top); those with only 0, 1 or 2 not included in this table. ....	12345 5	12 5 3	123 5 4	12345 5	12345 5	123 5 4	12345 5	12345 5	1 34 3	123 5 4	23 5 3	12345 5	12345 5	123 5 4

The meaning of "S.R." is "sector rank" as assigned by the PVO in the questionnaire (item IV,2), based on the activities reported (13 max.)

NOTE: Two more US-based PVOs are already being, or about to be, given AID/W grants for work in this country in this sector (child survival): a) Helen Keller International and b) The Salvation Army. Due to such funding already being in the pipeline, local representatives, if any, were not interviewed nor questionnaires completed. SCF-USA is also scheduled to receive an AID/W grant (\$91,000) for child survival work in Bangladesh.

NOTE 2: Due to AID's emphasis on child survival activities, PVOs were not allocated to this sector unless a ready doing pertinent work connected to children, usually MCH (maternal child health) though such MCH activity would not necessarily be expandable into full-fledged child survival work in all cases. Due investigation, mostly into personnel, present approaches, will be required.

TABLE-5  
10 SUITABLE PVO'S IN THE FAMILY PLANNING SECTOR

DATA SELECTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES & INTERVIEWS		HEED USA SR=8	TARD INDIG SR=3	SAPTAGRAM INDIG SR=4	JAGORANI INDIG SR=2	IUCW SWISS SR=3
1	Prominent also in OTHER SECTORS: No. indicates sector Table No. in this set. ....	1,4	2	2,4	2,4	3
2	EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION: ✓ means it's a featured aspect of PVO's work in this sector. ....	✓		✓		
3	RURAL/URBAN: ✓ indicates primarily urban ..... (questionnaire lists names)					
4	a AN INTERMEDIARY? If so, the No. indicates how many PVOs aided in current year. ....					
	b ✓ = aid by channeling funds. ....					
	# = aid by training programs. ....					
	a = aid by advice, helping register. ....					
	+ = aid in some other way (see quest.) ....					
5	NOT intermediary: a ✓ means keen to take on that role and apparently have capacity. ....					
6	a TARGET GROUP, if any; No. identifies from list on Addendum to this Table. ....	3;9;10	2;8	2;3	2;3;8	1;4;5
	b Other group not on list (written in). ....					
7	GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD: a) No. sites.			23	14	
	b) No. villages; c) No. upazilas	NR;5	NR;4	700;13	57;3	916;86
	d) No. districts; e) No. divisions	3;NR	4;NR	9;NR	2;1	19;4
	*Questionnaire lists names					
8	a BENEFICIARIES: Estimated No. during current budget year (K=000's). ....	51.5K	75K	31.5K	NR	290K
	b ✓ means their description differs from target groups of Item 6 above. ....	✓				
9	a STAFF: Total No. ....	372	34	82	31	93
	b % expatriates, if any. ....	3.76%	44.12%			0.93%
	c % specified as "management". ....	3.49%	23.53%	8.5%	12.9%	11.8%
	d % female. ....	21.77%		61%	54.8%	8.6%
10	a BUDGET: Total current in taka (K=000's; M = millions). ....	1.35M	7M	NR	6M	63.15M
	b % change over 3 yrs. ago (if newer, since year entered in brackets). ....	142%	875%	NR	NR	74%
	c % from GENERATED FUNDS inside BD (may include donations (rare); normally receipts from sales of products, training charges, etc.). ....	26%	2%	NR	NR	NR
	d SPECIFIC SOURCES (up to 3) of income generated in 10,c (written entries). ....	H' CRAFT TEACHING EXPAT. FUND	TRAINING PROGRAM DEV. CONSULT.			
e	WANT TO INCREASE % OF GENERATED INCOME? # = have definite plans to do so. ....	#		YES #	YES #	NR
f	% of current budget estimated for ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD. ....	11%	15%	NR	7%	17%

TABLE-5 (Contd.)  
 10 SUITABLE PVO'S IN THE FAMILY PLANNING SECTOR

DATA SELECTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES & INTERVIEWS	HEED	TARD	SAPTAGRAM	JAGORANI	IUCW
	USA SR=8	INDIG SR=3	INDIG SR=4	INDIG SR=2	SWISS SR=3
11 a EXPANSION: If rep'ted so seeking, \$ amt = self-claimed ability to effectively absorb in one year's time. ....	\$50K	\$174K	NR	\$52K	NR
b Any entry in 11, a as % of total current budget	100%	71%		75%	
c ✓ = an actual plan reported (an added + = projects identified with cost estimates)..	✓	✓		✓	
12 a DONORS: 1st digit(s) = No. reported since work began in 80, or at least since about 1980; 2nd digit(s) in ( ) is No. apparently contributing to current budget (the quest. names donors, usually acronyms). ....	7(7)	5(4)	7(7)	6(2)	4(2)
b * = some of foreign funds from AID directly (% of current budget). ....					NR
c ** = some of foreign funds from AID via an intermediary. ....					
d † = majority of foreign funds from another govt. (% of current budget from that govt., if any). ....			NR		†(84%)
e ‡ = minority of foreign funds from another govt.'s foreign aid program. ....			NR		
13 COLLABORATION W/GSD:					
a ✓ = reported Govt. personnel in programs/ projects/trainings. ....					✓
b ✓✓ = Govt. supplies equipment/contraceptives/ food. ....				✓✓	
c ✓✓✓ = Govt. funds some of PVO's work. ....					
d † = other collaboration. ....				†	
e ‡ = no collaboration reported. ....			‡		
14 SCORE (3 - 5) on 5 crucial criteria of "most promising" (5 = top); those with only 0, 1 or 2 not included in this Table. ....	12345 5	123 5 4	1 34 3	123 5 4	1 345 4
(definitions of the 5 criteria are given in the Addendum to this Table)					

The total of 10 should be understood as including 5 table to right. PVOs already being funded by AID for family planning work in this country 1) The Pathfinder Fund, 2) The Association for Voluntary Sterilization (AVS) together with its subgrantee, Bangladesh Association for Voluntary Sterilization (BAVS), 3) Bangladesh Family Planning Association (BFFA), 4) Family Planning International Assistance (FPIA) and 5) Family Planning Services Training Center (FPSTC), which is an indigenous group. In addition, if the Asia Foundation would qualify as a PVO (which it doesn't), it would be a sixth addition to this sector as it is currently funding 25 small, mostly upcountry PVOs just in this sector.

\*N.R.\* in columns to right = "not reported".

IUCW: Although the IUCW currently receives the majority of its funding from the Swiss Govt. (via the Swiss Development Corp.), the consultants have not considered it ineligible because a) it also receives bi-lateral aid funds from Canada and the Netherlands, b) it has in the past received substantial amounts from AID/W, lately via the FPIA, even when the Swiss Dev. Corp. is funding most of the IUCW budget; and c) the local IUCW director expressed definite interest in approaching AID in 1986.

KEYS TO NUMBERS ENTERED IN PRECEDING  
TABLES FOR CERTAIN DATA ITEMS

Item 6 - TARGET GROUPS

- 1 = poorest of the poor; very poor; very low income
- 2 = landless (in rural context)
- 3 = poor/destitute women, generally
- 4 = mothers and children (health programs)
- 5 = children mainly
- 6 = women/couples of child-bearing age
- 7 = unemployed (if PVO has employment expansion thrust)  
7A = especially or only unemployed youth
- 8 = marginal farmers (usually defined by small amount  
of acreage owned and cultivable)
- 9 = afflicted or threatened by some particular disease/  
handicap
- 10 = mostly small farmers requiring first-time or  
improved irrigation equipment (sometimes also  
potable water)

em 14 - SCORE ON 5 CRUCIAL CRITERIA OF "MOST PROMISING" PVOs

Score = sum of No. of following criteria fulfilled:

1. success in reaching the poor, especially women and the "assetless" (1 point if interview replies indicated firm basis for knowing who beneficiaries are, such as by various field actions including interviews with candidate members/participants, household visits etc., and if stated target groups in Item 6 included such types. In a few cases where PVO reported not targeting particular population elements, a point can be given if the interview discussion revealed its programs do in fact feature one or more of these elements mentioned at beginning of this para.
2. expansion capability (elaborated in Item 11 in Sec.I,B) (1 point if keen to expand; if report capability to effectively make use of a sizeable additional sum per year (in\$)--"sizeable" being judged by % increase over current budget and by absolute amount (not less than \$30,000/year); and if size of staff and presence of a qualified accountant (usually checked) suggests such expansion manageable)
3. experience to date with contracting and or co-financing (1point if have had at least one donor relationship within last five years which was "significant" in terms of % of budget covered (not less than 15%). "Donor" excludes funds from PVOs own foreign hqa).
4. assessment by donors/PVO community of outreach potential and effectiveness (1 point if negative assessment(s) not heard)
5. compatibility/willingness to work with AID (1 point if at least openness to collaboration was indicated; not necessarily any stated wish to seek AID funds. In addition, if have been positive about abilities to cope with AID reporting + financial accounting/auditing requirements)

## II - FINDINGS/COMMENTS FROM THE PVO SURVEY AND ITS ANALYSIS

### A. Lessons Learned from AID and Other Donor Experience

SUITABLE PVO FUNCTIONS-- Donors in Dhaka appear in general agreement that PVOs are valuable in handling some of their socio-economic assistance funds for the following reasons:

- o Ability to penetrate the grass roots, which more-often-than-not means the rural areas.

This ability derives from several well-known characteristics, most often an ideological or principled stand on behalf of the rural poor.

- o Ability to pilot new socio-economic approaches, experiment with new forms of small-scale development institutions, sometimes even to try out new physical tools/devices.

However, our strictly limited amount of information on PVO activities does not suggest that more than half do much experimentation.

While foreign-based PVOs are typically the ones piloting appropriate technology in the physical sense, indigenous PVOs much more frequently get into socio-economic experiments...usually introducing new ideas among their rural participants.

PVOs can usually arrange financing for a sufficient number of years, often as many as five, to push the project through to the point where judgements can be made on success/failure, needed modifications. The PVO and supporting donor(s) can normally supply the depth of resources necessary, per participant, to reach a modicum of success. Even if the level of spending per beneficiary is much greater than would seem manageable by Government, if it were to take the same approach, that finding would not be judged unimportant by donors.

- o Dissemination of promising new approaches in the countryside, such as for example, ORT, can be rather quickly done by PVOs -- donors presume more quickly than by most Government-sponsored campaigns.
- o An important additional function of PVOs, obviously appealing to donors, is their tendency to stress well-defined target groups.

Our discussions seemed to confirm (though not proving) that PVOs can normally succeed in focussing their

uplift on such groups (destitute women, malnourished children/mothers, illiterates, landless and the like) ... can hit the target. Very few government programs other than some specialized medical ones, and not even integrated/intensive rural development programs, are able to pick out such particular elements from the population and confine development efforts there.

- o Similar to the preceding function, PVOs can hit particular geographic areas deemed especially neglected/wider more readily than can official government programs which, at least theoretically, must be spread out over entire upazilas or even wider areas.

AID's OWN USE OF PVOs CURRENTLY AND IN PROSPECT, -- About 10 projects are underway within the Mission, some of which have been found suitable for using PVO collaboration (direct support almost entirely to a few US-based ones; indigenous ones in family planning aided only through a U.S.-based intermediary):

#### Agriculture, Rural Development & Nutrition

Technical Resources - the GRD (via the Bangladesh Agricultural Research Council of the Ministry of Agriculture) requested AID to co-finance Winrock International (in Table 1 of Section 1,B and preceding narrative descriptions); no other PVOs known in this project though the GRD is free to propose more ... possibilities exist, depending on what the Govt. wants.

Rural Finance - ending next year, this project had no provision for a PVO. AID and the GRD preferred a reputable, sizeable international firm of specialists in rural banking plus some use of Ohio State University.

Rural Industries - the major component of stimulating mostly rural-based small scale industries/businesses proceeds on the basis of grants to a fairly new indigenous PVO: MIDAS (in Section 1 above). MIDAS loans must be approved by AID; it is extremely closely tied to the Agency. The other component of this project is Women's Entrepreneurship Development Program, handled solely by the GRD agency. Bangladesh Small and Cottage Industries Corp; no role for any PVO has been identified, though the potentiality is certainly there if the project gets extended beyond 11/85 (began '83). Many rural-oriented PVOs would be suitable to work with BSCIC in a supplementary way, bringing in some cases a wealth of past experience with small loan and other programs aimed exclusively at low income/destitute women. A few of them could, for example, pilot new approaches, or just introduce into the project some of their own successful previous approaches. The consultants strongly recommend that this project, if continued, carve out a role for at least 2-3 PVOs.

PVO Co-financing element - two significant US organizations involved:

- a) The Asia Foundation funds an experimental engine to operated a rice mill burning rice husks (note, however, that this Foundation is, technically speaking, not a PVO as normally understood in this country).

b) CARE is the channel used for a deep tubewell project.

Agricultural Research - no PVOs involved; AID uses a US non-profit consulting organization under contract.

Food for Work II and III - Sizeable grants to CARE have been used to achieve a high level of monitoring of this large US program in which food wages pays for much rural earth road construction (see Tables 1, 2 and 4 for CARE data, identical in each, and the proceeding narrative paragraph), including CARE's supplementary work in collaboration with the GBD on overseeing the spending done on short culverts and bridges.

Rural Electrification - As in agricultural research, only a US non-profit consultant and a US firm are working with the Rural Electrification Board under contract. Highly specialized expertise is obviously required, including much introduction of new technology and power retailing/servicing systems--not a subject for PVO assistance.

Enterprise Policy Report - No scope is foreseen in this new project for a PVO. It features year-long research by specialized institutions or firms plus a sizeable grant to the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (with a U.S. Govt. agency assisting) for a nation-wide census of enterprises.

#### Family Planning

The Family Planning Services project is where the Mission has made extensive use of PVOs -- five US -based and the FPETC and about 25 small indigenous PVOs via the Asia Foundation as intermediary. The staff of AID are convinced --the consultants certainly agreeing--that the campaign to increase contraceptive usage rates among eligible couple receives an important impetus through the private-sector voluntary organizations.

#### Child Survival Fund

Actually a part of the Family Planning Service Project, this new thrust of the Agency is definitely going to involve PVOs. AID/W has already made grants, or is about to, to Save the Children, USA; Helen Keller International; and the Salvation Army; and the international PVO, International Centre for Diarrheal Disease Research (Bangladesh) may come into the program. Much additional room exists for adding more PVOs, Mission staff realize, and active efforts are proceeding to identify other PVOs with promise in this particular part of the health sector. Several suitable PVOs exist (Table 4), both foreign-based and indigenous, who have been already working in aspects of child survival mostly through MCH programs (please also see note at bottom of 2nd page of Table 4).

## ROLES AND SCOPE OF PVO ACTIVITIES -

- o The intermediary role : Several prominent PVOs, all based in Dhaka, distribute donor funding to local PVOs (in some cases even to national ones). Item 4,a in the 5 tables of Section 1,B indicate that 5 PVOs play this role for 5 or more other PVOs. Other PVOs not in those tables are also active: Oxfam-UK, ADAB, SAP, Shapla Neer and IYS.

Very often these intermediaries ferret out to strictly small, local groups in rural areas whom they find heading in the right direction, then aid them to become registered with the Ministry of Social Welfare and to commence implementing particular programs financed entirely through the intermediary. Donors to that intermediary, if in country, are apt to be involved in selection and even monitoring of the work of the upcountry small recipient PVOs. Donors back in the first world usually do not become involved, though the hqs. of a foreign based PVO may.

A few interviewed PVOs are keen to take on an intermediary role though not yet so authorized or at least able. One example is the US based IYS. Two more are the indigenous PVOs - TARD and VERC.

Donor use of intermediaries is fairly wide spread. Prominent examples are CIDA's use of SAP, CUSO, IDE; and AID's use of TAF. The practice clearly allows a much wider donor outreach. Donors themselves could never develop so many links to upcountry indigenous PVOs.

- o Introduction of Bangladeshi Viewpoint : A specially important capability of the indigenous PVOs is the vantage point offered by a local Board. Crucial policy decisions on which types of activities to undertake, how to do so and with whom to collaborate can be based on

but such publications never wrote of evangelising or winning converts. By and large the principal church-related PVOs, such as the Presbyterians (USA), Caritas, Heed and CRWRC appear to operate their foreign-funded programs, of many types, in a way to justify donor confidence that religion is not thereby being advanced.

SUITABLE DONOR-PVO FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS --- The main donors used the usual two approaches of project-related grant and broader program support along the lines of co-financing.

Donors usually fund for three years at a time; just one year is not common. Up to five years was mentioned.

Donors naturally vary in the extent of reporting and financial accounting requirements imposed on aided PVOs. A few donors' requirements were thought lax by others. In the other direction, a few are known to ask a lot of grantees. AID's financial reporting requirements were noted by several as demanding, beyond the usual bookkeeping/accounting methods they otherwise used. AID seeks to know exactly what its dollars accomplish, which precludes co-mingling AID grants with those of other donors.

Periodic reporting requirements, such as quarterly (used by AID), were rarely thought objectionable. Some donors expect bi-monthly reports. A year-end audit is standard. However, the DANIDA spokesman thought the audits not worth much, though an audit once tipped off Oxfam UK about a serious problem with one of their up-country PVO recipients.

Several donors will only visit funded projects/programs occasionally, perhaps infrequently, in one case only when the home country PVO responsible for the grant to a local PVO here would specifically so request. CARE thought the amount of AID field visits/inspections surprising, exceeding AID's practice in a few other countries where the same PVO is supported.

Little uniformity occurs among donors concerning frequency of or type of evaluation required for aided projects, whether midstream or at the end. DANIDA requires an evaluation at completion of the project only if a following phase is being proposed for a new grant. Information was not obtained, as a rule, on whether evaluations were normally done by the donor or a contracted outside organization (a majority probably by the donor's own staff).

o Practices of donors in channeling funds to indigenous PVOs  
---The two usual paths are bi-lateral grants either to the headquarters of the PVO based in the home country, which in turn either transfers the funds to its branch in Bangladesh, if any, which then acts as an intermediary to the indigenous PVO, or the home-country PVO routes the funds to an affiliated indigenous PVO here. Alternatively,

a government's mission in Bangladesh may grant funds to the indigenous PVO directly.

Mission (field) grants tend to be smaller than those arranged from the government's central office in the capital to a home-country-based PVO. A ceiling to field grants is often encountered: NORAD's is Nkr250,000 (about \$30,000), CIDA's is C\$25,000. Whether there are also upper limits on the number of mission-level awards, within such maximum, was not always clear from the discussions . . . NORAD wasn't itself sure on that point.

A much less common avenue of donor funding is through some GBD agency. CIDA was nearly alone in reporting that its funding of the two Proshikas (Comilla and Proshika-MUK) had been arranged through the Ministry of Agriculture, for five years in each case, requiring eight months to set up.

- o Practices of donors in channeling funds to foreign-based PVOs. -- In the case of governments the funding of home-based PVOs often is arranged in the central office with the Bangladesh field office of the PVO being only one of several ultimate recipients. The second channel of course is the field mission's grant, with size limitations arising for some governments as brought out in the preceding paragraph.

All government foreign aid agencies contacted here pass appreciable parts of their PVO funding through organizations headquartered in their own countries, though not necessarily a large majority goes to Bangladesh by that route.

PROGRAM COSTS -- How much various donors are granting, on the average, to PVOs for work in Bangladesh was not systematically researched for this study. A few numbers were revealed :

- o Ford Foundation's smallest PVO grants are \$40K - 50K; others to established, larger PVOs run up to \$500K with several grants in the \$150K - \$300K range (interview with Mr.K.Marshall, Sept.11, '85). Portions of all those larger grants are to be repayed without interest, termed "recoverable grants". Ford has employed that special type of grant in Bangladesh since 1978 (Proshika).
- o NORAD: Nkr100K is average amount of grant (about \$12K). (Ms. U. Kramer, 9/3).
- o CIDA: Its mission-administered fund makes grants, usually no more than one, up to C\$25K. A number of Canadian PVOs are centrally funded, up to C\$1M for three years--in the case of program support. (Ms. N. Banerjee, 9/12).

- o DANIDA: Since '72 \$6.5M -- 7.0 M has been allocated to 13 PVOs in this country, with typical amounts running \$400K for 5 years, \$200K for 3 years, or \$300K for 4 years. (Mr. J. Strange-Hansen, 9/9).
- o OXFAM-UK: Equivalent of \$2,800 limit of field office authority. UK approval can mean considerably larger grants. (Ms. T. Parker, 9/1).

B. Recommendations from PVOs to Larger Donors Regarding Improved Coordination

The PVO interviews produced a few recommendations. The chief ones are :

- o Longer term grants, such as three years, are preferable to one-year. The latter mean a distinct threat of a major funding source ending prior to consummated arrangements for a renewal or a new replacement grant from another source.
- o Program support, normally meaning for a whole program area, such as co-financing, is generally recommended by the PVOs instead of project-specific grants akin to a contract for them to perform some service. The former type of grant usually permits some types of management/administrative overhead to be included, though not always; the latter never does. If a PVO is going to be financed largely through project grants it will encounter severe difficulties paying for the increasing number of management staff needed. Several times PVOs complained about their being unable to expand unless the next batch of funding could include augmentation of central management positions.
- o Donors should allow for more field staff positions, too, even when project funding. Moreover, these PVOs tended also to want newly established field positions not to be just temporary for the life of some two or three-year project; recruitment is hampered without greater prospects of job security.
- o Another plea/recommendation is that donors' reporting and financial record-keeping requirements should be kept "reasonable", not unduly burdening management with complicated financial reporting tasks every month. (Periodic narrative reports and the year-end audit were never particularly criticized in the interviews.)
- o An important request from several PVOs: donors need also to finance recurring costs. Plenty of money seems available for capital expenditures and training courses. PVOs ask for support of the program as a whole. This means support through a minimum cycle of development of a program (at least 3 years), including support of welfare activities if that is a component, taking into account recurring

expenditures and the flexibility needed by PVOs to best respond to their implementation situation and target group or community needs.

- o A number of organizations expressed apprehensions regarding USAID funds. Most of these were with regard to complicated & detailed accountability requirements, some times perceived as an expression of lack of trust and partnership on the part of USAID. PVOs seek a sense of partnership with their donors based on mutual trust and non- interference. Visits by donors and personal interaction is seen as positively contributing to a greater understanding of the work.

C. Identification of PVOs Well-suited to Carry Out Activities Appropriate to AID

SUMMARY OF PVOs LISTED IN TABLE 1-5 IN SECTION 1,B.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>No. of PVOs</u>		<u>3rd Coun-</u>
		<u>US-</u>	<u>Indige-</u>	<u>try Based</u>
		<u>based</u>	<u>nous</u>	
1. Agriculture	10	6	4	0
2. Rural Infrastructure	12	3	9	0
3. Small Scale Enterprise	10	2	6	2
4. Health	14	5	7	2
5. Family Planning #	5	0	4	1
Total (after allowing for the several listed in more than one sector)	25	8	13	4

# This sector is also to include the 5 others (4 US-based, 1 indigenous) listed on the bottom of Table 5, 2nd sheet, which are already funded by AID and who were not requested to completed questionnaires and were not interviewed. Thus, the 5th sector actually has 10 suitable PVOs.

COMMENTS ON THE IDENTIFIED PVOs. -- Agriculture is the only sector in which the consultants were unable to find the requisite five indigenous PVOs judged suitable for possible future AID collaboration according to the criteria described above in the Addendum to Tables 1-5. Agriculture appears to be a sector which indigenous PVOs hesitate to enter in any significant way--directly, excluding their back-door entry through building rural socio-economic institutions--because they are so well aware of the widespread and fairly well funded GBD programs, internationally aided. PVOs may perceive few unfilled niches. The niche of trying out/promoting new and appropriate technologies is dominated by the foreign-based PVOs, who're into technology transfer.

Beyond the fact of agriculture being a sector already crowded with Government agencies, at work in virtually all upazilas, plus some foreign-based PVOs, there remains the further consideration of the development approach or stance of so many indigenous PVOs. They voice very strongly the belief that this sector requires fundamental socio-economic restructuring before the sector can furnish a decent, above-subsistence, above-the-verty line level of living to the groups of most concern to the PVOs: small/marginal farmers, landless, women from poor families (and their children). Accordingly, indigenous PVOs are relatively content to let Government and foreign PVOs handle the usual research and productivity increasing efforts, judged by them not apt to redound to the benefit of the rural poor under present rural conditions, while they concentrate on building the social and economic institutions rooted in small groups of these target elements. Often PVO directors spoke to the consultants with utmost conviction when avering that this country's rural sector will not aid their target groups unless and until the latter have been worked with for a few years via an integrated approach of consciousness raising, formation of savings and credit societies, introduction of literacy, nutrition and various other trainings and sometimes sponsorship of producer co ops. (Many also add health work, most often MCH.) Feeling that way, indigenous PVOs understandably concentrate their efforts on rural socio-economic infrastructure rather than agriculture per se, as shown by nine of them turning up on Sector 2.

PRESENCE OF FOUR THIRD-COUNTRY BASED PVOs.-- Resort was had to this category only when a sector was not already well filled with US-based or indigenous PVOs. A few of them offer well developed (and already rather well financed) programs in Sectors 3-5, such as, for example, Concern's large amount of health sector effort in both urban and rural areas. Consultants understand AID could likely find a way to support such PVOs. (Actually, there is a Concern-USA, which could be the vehicle for AID/Washington grants.) Other major donors in Bangladesh sometimes fund particular projects of US-based PVOs (e.g., CIDA funds

CRWRC, which is basically US based, though there is a Canadian base as well; and DANIDA is funding a CARE project, though CARE is admittedly not based solely in the US). As a precedent, AID/W has made grants to the IUCW, a majority of whose budget comes from the Swiss Govt. (later AID has funded through FPFA).

AMPLE PRESENCE OF EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION WORK BY PVOs in TABLES 1-5.-- The questionnaire asked about six additional activities besides those attributed to the five sectors given in Table 1-5 of Section 1 above. The first of those is the further concern of AID, as noted in the consultants' assignment, to identify employment expansion efforts. Below are the tallies from all questionnaires completed, 14 not included in the tables, of the No. reporting activities in each of the additional six activities :

- employment/income generation (noted by 28 PVOs out of the total 39 which completed the questionnaire--the most commonly adopted activity).
- relief and rehabilitation (checked by 12 PVOs).
- distribution of commodities (marked by 6).
- institutional development (also popular, stressed by 22 PVOs, not infrequently as first in importance. Usually it means intensive work with a limited number of rural target groups in forming co ops, credit groups etc. as listed at the top of page 3 of the questionnaire. Sometimes those PVOs did not indicate they were doing any activity in agriculture, rural infrastructure, health or any other of the five sectors used in the table of Section 1,B. However, the consultants considered this work with institution building, if in rural areas, amounted to doing work in the rural infrastructure sector--a sector not confined to construction of rural works. The foregoing interpretation explains why there are more PVOs given in Table 2 of Section 1,B--rural infrastructure--than are found in the questionnaires as having ticked this category).
- training (carried on by 23 of the PVOs questioned).
- technology, either development or dissemination, or both (noted by 12).

#### OTHER FINDINGS ON THE SECTORS

- o Agricultural research proved a rare interest or specialty of PVOs, not that the survey team talked to many in this field (Winrock International being an exception) since other non-governmental research groups, what few there are, were understood to be already recipients of AID support and well known to AID. But it should be noted that the technology

development activity if involving devices for use in agriculture could qualify the PVO as active in the agricultural sector and therefore tabulated in Table 1 of Sec. I,B. (An example is the Rower pump being further developed, and disseminated, by IDE.)

- o Some highly specialized activities were often reported, not readily discernable without a close reading of the questionnaires. E.g., several PVOs, notably Karika and the YWCA, concentrate on developing ties to groups of women making jute handicrafts (plus recently a very few other types of handicrafts), buying their products at fairly uniform prices and then widely marketing, especially abroad. The consultants considered this kind of activity to qualify for the employment expansion criterion of AID. (NOTE: The organization, CORR-The Jute Works, has a very similar activity to Karika, though only for export, but is not registered with the Ministry of Social Welfare as a NGO and thus, strictly speaking, is not eligible for consideration as a possible future AID recipient).

#### EXPANSION CAPABILITIES

- o AID's especially interested in their reported capabilities to expand. The 5 tables of Sec. I,B examine that in Item 11, a - c. The responses of PVOs in those tables who made any estimate of the amount of additional taka per year they could effectively absorb are reflected below, per sector. Expansion can also be judged by the percentage increase in their total budget since 1982, likewise averaged by sector :

		Reported Ability to Absorb Additional Funding (Annual)		
Sector (No. reporting)	Avg. in Dollars	Avg. in Current Budget	Avg. percent Increase in Total Budget Since '82 (No.)	
	(7)	165K*		
1. Agriculture (8)	332K	16%	205%	(10)
2. Rural Infrastructure (9)	198K*	343K	68%	268% (10)
3. Small Scale Enterprise (5)	249K	70%	253%	(9)
	(11)	142K*		
4. Health (12)	256K	65%	188%	(12)
5. Family Planning (3)	92K	82%	364%	(3)

\* Calculated without CARE's figure.

o Additional expansion capabilities were discussed during the interviews; chiefly, the PVO's ability to cope with a donor government's requirements for detailed financial reporting (requiring having an accountant on the management staff). PVOs with any prior experience of AID funding were generally found able to handle such tasks; those without past experience (the big majority of indigenous PVOs) normally were judged able to handle if they had coped with the requirements of two or more other foreign donors, had an accountant, and seemed big enough in terms of staff/budget. All those factors were taken into account in the scoring, reported in Item 14 of Tables 1-5 in Sec.1, where expansion capability was one of the five criteria weighed.

D. Consultant Recommendations/Insights Developed  
Regarding AID's Planned PVO Program :

1. CONTINUED EMPHASIS ON USE OF INTERMEDIARIES -- The already-proven utility of this approach in the family planning sector via the Asia Foundation (channels Mission funds to 25 small, mostly uncountrty PVOs) suggests AID will want to use it also in the other four sectors. Promising intermediaries are available in most of the other sectors, agriculture being the question mark. However, IDE already is serving as an intermediary and could expand that activity, though admittedly their scope is very narrow: just refining and marketing the Rower hand pump. CRWRC has also had experience with being an intermediary (Bogra District), to a limited extent, and would be suitable for doing more of that; however, it might not be interested in doing so in any districts where its own programs are not yet established. If ADAB's intermediary role--now confined to just 24 PVOs being supported by German EZE funds--was expanded, then it could probably work with smaller PVOs in agriculture and other sectors.

The situation is quite different in rural infrastructure where several indigenous PVOs have expressed great interest in expanding their work by serving as intermediaries, such as TARD and VERC. Again, CRWRC comes to mind, if they are interested in such a role (that PVO impressed the consultants with their extremely thorough, step-by-step approach to developing the capabilities of their rural groups. It appears that many Dhaka-dictated procedures/controls are applied without much laxity). CCDB may be yet another possible intermediary. It reports widespread rural-oriented activities (19 out of a total 12 possible activities ticked in part IV of the questionnaire) and also reports serving as an intermediary, though failing to report how many local groups are supported (possibly because they are seldom if ever full-fledged NGOs).

The small-scale enterprise sector contains MIDAS, of course, which would be a suitable intermediary if such an added function would be agreeable to their Board and to AID. Seems an issue worthy of exploration. As an adjunct to MIDAS' regular operations, which concern mostly small businesses/industries, such a new thrust would bring MIDAS back into the NGO fold where it originally intended to concentrate. Its present Director is most familiar with the NGO scene. For just handicraft enterprises, operated by co-ops and PVOs largely in the rural areas, Karika has an established network which it's capable of expanding, or Karika might be capable as well to handle donor funds intended for aiding handicraft production quite apart from its own network. In fact, there is precedent for Karika working with outside groups in this way. Intermediaries in the health sector are available, too, pre-eminently VHSS if it would agree to serve as such a channel, requiring considerable enlargement of its own staff/budget. The possibility is promising, in the consultants' view. MSS could fulfill an intermediary role, too, in the urban area, as it's to do already, but it's on the small side. Management/budget/procedures would all need considerable expansion.

2. THE COMPARATIVE LACK OF NEED FOR AID FUNDING WITHIN THE NEXT FEW YEARS. The interviews more often than not brought out that the PVOs, whether indigenous or third country based (US-based ones already often having AID support, though not quite all), especially the third country ones, are relatively well funded over the next 1-5 years. In Bangladesh there is no shortage of donor interest, donor funding. Established PVOs, most especially larger ones with years of experience, have only to develop promising projects in order to secure funds, or if some existing donor is dropping out they apparently have no trouble in finding some new donor to take up activities already underway.

In view of the foregoing, the consultants recommend that AID look several years ahead, in the case of all but the handful of PVOs who report a serious interest in the possibility of AID funds within the next 1-3 years. During that coming period AID might concentrate on developing future programs of mutual concern, the funding of which would commence later, perhaps in 3-5 years.

3. WHEN BEGINNING SUPPORT TO INDIGENOUS PVOs. The Consultants recommendation adopting a registration procedure that will not unduly deter these types of PVOs, hopefully less detailed and complex than for US based PVOs. Also, financial reporting requirements will be a deterrent if quite complicated, calling for quite new forms of record-keeping.

4. AID WOULD DO WELL TO PUSH MUCH MORE EFFECTIVE COORDINATING AMONG DONORS -- The need for enhanced coordinating is already felt by most if not all donors, and in the last year local Consultative Groups have formed, sectorally structured, which occasionally meet--with good effect. ADAB logically could sponsor and assist as a secretariat to such LCGs. The late June, '85 meeting of the Rural Development Sub-Committee proposed that ADAB assess the capabilities of the PVOs, monitor their activities and assist with improving the quality of their work(minutes). Whether ADAB is prepared to so venture has yet to be announced.

The Rural Development Sub-committee, incidentally, looks like a model of what the donors can do if actually getting together and frankly sharing news and views. The 4/85 meeting produced an especially worthwhile exchange of information, in the consultants' opinion, including an interesting enumeration of both negative & positive PVO characteristics.

ADAB is also suitable for undertaking yet other forms of coordination. In fact, the Director, Dr. Ruda, has certain specific types in mind, which sounded worthy and deserving of prompt donor support if ADAB's present staff/budget would need some expansion to accommodate. (E.g., ADAB sees that it must begin trying to obtain from donors much more regular information on which PVOs are proposing which new projects, then circulating the results for review/comment by other donors. Such a procedure should go a long ways to help prevent duplicate proposals reaching two or more donors at the same time, leading to much donor expenditure of staff time the majority of which is bound to be wasted, and even posing a threat of different donors deciding to fund the very same proposal (as has in fact occurred in one instance not so long ago.)

In the health sector it's recommended that AID similarly support more coordination by VHSS, probably along the very same lines as noted for ADAB above.

Improved coordination is also needed, in the consultants' judgement, in the following specific ways :

- o identifying neglected sectors/activities (referring to projects also upcoming).
- o identifying neglected geographic areas (such as among the 64 new districts; ADAB having a useful map of PVO sites, villages, upazilas as would aid this determination of overlooked locations).
- o when/if donor funding of particular PVOs or particular PVO projects will end, raising the question if such work should be continued and, if so, if another donor is interested to pick it up.

o identify large requirements, capable of being handled by a PVO, which are deserving of funding by two or more donors. In that way more of the bigger PVOs may be enabled to reach out into yet other parts of the country, using approaches proven successful in their established districts/upazilas.

5. KEEP WELL IN MIND THE RISKS OF OVERFUNDING -- Time and again some of the PVOs commented on their knowledge of or experience with donor tendencies to make too much funding available for a particular PVO, leading to dire consequences. The latter included (a) overly rapid growth beyond the ability of the PVO's central management to track, control, with resulting unsatisfactory accomplishments; (b) staff increases that led to internal wrangling and later to splits, the latter making both the original and new spin off PVOs weak for a certain period; (c) the recruitment of less capable staff, the training of whom imposed a large demand on PVO management/trainers; (d) often forcing PVO's to diversify into areas not of priority concern but for which large amounts are earmarked. The consultants recommend AID continue its stress on determining a prospective grantee's capabilities to absorb a sizeable increase in available resources. Such a determination, however, will not readily be made ... subjective estimates will bulk large.
6. INAPPROPRIATENESS IN PRESENT DAY BANGLADESH OF DONOR PRESSURES FOR PVOs TO BECOME GRADUALLY MORE SELF SUFFICIENT WITH LESS AND LESS NEED FOR FOREIGN FUNDING -- The notion of self-sufficiency or ability to generate income in the context of PVO's in development poses certain problems and dilemmas. What may constitute success in generating a greater income for the agency may in fact amount to the exploitation of one group of working people in order to support the development of another.

Here a distinction needs to be made between types of income generating schemes. Schemes that are at the same time an outcome of target group development activities, such as the need for employment generation or increase in agricultural productivity or development of livestock and fisheries etc., are faced with the problem, in all fairness, of leaving all or the bulk of any profit for the producers. It is unlikely that any significant net PVO income can be derived from a scheme having the objective of increasing target group income.

Secondly, as reported by a number of PVO's, a regular commercial venture could give rise to conflicts within the organization with one part of the organization attempting socio-economic uplift of the poor on the basis of considerable commitment and voluntarism and another part managing a commercial operation trying to achieve maximum possible profit.

Thirdly, rarely do such organizations have the management skills or capabilities to successfully run a commercial venture.

- o A major function of PVOs is their unique ability to link voluntary donors in the first world (referring also to private foundations) to the very needy in the third world both for relief/rehabilitation and for long-term development.

Donors in developed countries clearly prefer to contribute to national or international PVOs whom they perceive to be well established in vital third world activities. Links between the two worlds provided by hundreds of PVOs brings sizeable sums to the developing countries such as Bangladesh which wouldn't be available through public agencies, bi-lateral or multi-lateral.

Thus, present availability of abundant foreign funds, coming from donations from a great variety of public and private sources, and the unlikely event that such funds will become less available, puts the entire question of PVO net income generation in a different perspective.

Donors' association of such efforts to generate income with increasing 'self-reliance' appears to us quite misplaced. The bulk of foreign assistance reaching this country is in the form of bilateral funds. What is reaching the PVO sector is no more than a minor portion of the total. In this context, to stress "self-reliance" in the PVO sector while state policy shows no trend towards decreasing dependence on foreign aid and donors show no trend in decreasing bilateral assistance, is not only obscure in scale but grossly inconsistent with the overall policies of both the state and the donors.

Accordingly, under current Bangladesh conditions we feel that to continue to make PVO net income generation an indicator of developing self reliance or to make it a factor in assessing PVO capabilities would merely reflect a lack of understanding of the context within which PVOs operate and the conditions of life of the people PVOs are usually trying to reach.

- o There is yet another problem about PVOs being encouraged to raise the percentage of their annual budget from self generated income: that just focuses concern on the net receipts from those activities. The use of that modest net takes on such undue importance.

Donors appear to be arguing that placement of the net gains in PVO treasuries (where it might have investment possibilities) is inherently better than merely raising the incomes of the extremely poor producers with whom the PVOs are working (where it's very apt to be consumed rather than saved and invested productively). Two points are offered in support of our contention that such great concern about the placement of net income is unwarranted:

1. What happens to gross earnings of PVO producer groups is at least as important--no doubt much more so. If PVOs can succeed in recouping their expenses on behalf of income generation .... breaking even while the total income grows, then they will have achieved real economic and social benefits for their participants even through not reducing their need for foreign donated currency by one taka. The commitment of indigenous PVOs to this growth in income, for those who offer any income or employment expansion activities (and not all do), looks to us to be generally quite strong and healthy--in no way vitiated by their knowing foreign support exists for expenses of their work outside of the income producing types (here assumed to pay their way).

Beginning some years ago donors in Bangladesh commenced encouraging PVOs to sponsor employment/ income generation programs which would, at the least, raise the incomes of rural poor. We suppose just continuing that emphasis is enough; it's unnecessary to go on from that, in the context of this country's extreme poverty, to push PVOs into raising the net incomes from these activities and plunking that into their own bank accounts.

2. The economic impact of net gains from these PVO-sponsored income producing activities will not necessarily be less if put into the hands of the extremely poor producers, or purchasers -- in rural areas -- of goods/services those enterprises offer, rather than into PVO kitties. The modest amounts of additional wages these producers would gain can be expected to be almost all consumed, yes, but in ways that have vital economic impacts: Such consumption not infrequently makes the difference between a healthy worker in the family and a malnourished, weak one who's forced to lose income by illness, if not forever by dying. Or such additions to family income may permit more of the children to attend school, with eventual long-term economic benefits to the family and nation which escapes the usual view of consumption vs. investment. Furthermore, the spending of PVO beneficiaries will

normally be in the countryside where some multiplier effects will benefit surrounding businesses and institutions, in contrast to its flowing into the PVO's hands where it might well leave the rural areas and get spent in Dhaka or some other sizeable city.

## 7. PVO- GOVERNMENT OF BANGLADESH RELATIONS

More than a few surveyed PVOs regularly working with the Government of Bangladesh expressed positive feelings about it. Their collaboration is generally not of a joint venture type. Usually it involves referring program participants to Government facilities/services and distributing some Government owned supplies/equipment/food. A number use Government personnel in their trainings, where such persons furnish badly needed expertise (lecturing/demonstrating about agricultural techniques, principles of nutrition, fertility reducing measures and so forth). Helping small local groups get registered is a further type of collaboration, leading to the groups becoming eligible for various types of Government assistance including sometimes loans from Government banks. Item 13, and in the tables of Sec. I, B tabulates aspects of GRD cooperation. Note that only four PVOs, in those tables, reported any Government funding.

PVO opinions regarding collaboration with the government of Bangladesh varies from CTRDW, hoping to build up its program and maybe even turning it over to the Department of Social Welfare, to some that are willing to have cooperative relationships with government agencies but will not consider joint projects under any circumstances.

CARE is a unique example of a PVO handling bilateral assistance and implementing a major program of the Government: Food for Work. CARE handles 120,000 tons of wheat per annum and has nearly 400 employees implementing this program.

Most PVO's are of the opinion that for the most part Government is not able to nor effective in reaching the target groups that PVO's wish to work with, nor are they sensitive or able to respond to the problems and needs at a micro-level.

Secondly, corruption and bureaucratic problems in the Government are important factors deterring PVO's from wanting any close relationships. In particular, the delay in obtaining Ministry approvals of proposed projects, via the External Resources Division of the Ministry of Finance, was remarked a number of times. Those lengthy delays can prove financially embarrassing when the PVO has made extensive preparation for beginning the work. Speeding up project processing for PVOs, which affects such a modest proportion of the work of line ministries, could engender a desirable

increase in the spirit of cooperation between the Government and these voluntary groups scattered around the country.

Effectiveness in co-operation with Government depends on particular personalities as well. However, Government officials are frequently transferred around, thus there is no continuity in commitment.

So even though most PVO's are not opposed to collaboration with the Government, they fear that they may be forced to do things and in a way that they think are not right. Although PVO's wish to be associated with Government programs particularly in the hope of influencing program directions, their experience is that often the Government takes unilateral decisions.

On the question of scale, however, most PVO's agree that collaboration with the Government if effective could ensure much greater outreach and more sustained growth. Replicability could be ensured through working through Government and demonstrating the usefulness of certain programs.

So at the same time that PVO's would like an increasingly better and more effective cooperation and coordination with the Government, they would like to retain complete autonomy in administration and implementation of their programs.

The recommendation is simply that AID remain very sensitive to divergent PVO attitudes towards GBD collaboration, only gently pushing in the direction of more such links ... allowing for the possibility of some PVOs remaining wholly apart from the GBD if still able to accomplish these objectives being supported by AID.

## 8. CHILD SURVIVAL VIA THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAM

At first glance this UN-based activity offers an entree to low income women and children throughout the country via its Vulnerable Group Feeding Program. Poor women who are heads of household come to the distribution depots usually once a month for the 31 kg. ration. At that time an effort can be made to interest them in aspects of nutrition and other health programs as would contribute to child survival. So far, however, only a tiny percentage of unions have been able to introduce any such developmental emphasis to this ration distribution effort. Only a trail stage is underway. Chances of success in a much larger number of unions would be increased, the WFP spokesman, Mr. M. Sackett, thought, if rural PVOs who have experience working with women could be induced to team up with upazila and union officials to route the food-ration-receiving women into an organized program, probably requiring them to return to the union-level family welfare or other center more than once per month. The Government would, of course, have to be supportive of any

such introduction of a PVO role. Further social experimentation soon in pilot unions/upazilas is most strongly recommended, with the PVO role to promote child survival but not necessarily be confined to that. Considerable new funding for a few PVOs would be required if this novel approach proves successful and spreads.

#### 9. SLIGHTING OF THE URBAN SECTOR -

Little of AID's assistance program bears on urban area (bits of family planning aid, parts of upcoming small enterprise policy planning); however, the sector looks to have increasing importance as the burgeoning cities swell in the face of grossly insufficient public-sector resources to provide enough jobs to the net in-migrants and the net growth of populations already in the cities. Public budgets available for physical and social infrastructure also fall far short of today's requirements and will likely fall increasingly further behind. The relatively few urban-based PVOs, with appropriate support, could lend a hand to pockets of the poor in various urban areas, though a variety of programs including income generation and enterprise development, which could --in the aggregate-- help hold the lid on discontent, social chaos. Slum and squatter area inhabitants desperately need the sort of assistance dedicated PVOs can provide, as has been furnished, for example, to Tongi relocated squatters since 1975 by PFB. While feeding efforts are necessary in places, a handout approach is not here being advocated; rather, the most promising approach is undoubtedly some combination of preventive/curative clinic-based medical help plus functional literacy and income generation either through skills training or enterprise development (or both). Pursuing many more of these urban programs by the donors could pay big dividends eventually, in our opinion.

## 10. AID'S OWN PVO COLLABORATION -

The consultants' brief review of AID's project-related use of PVOs, earlier in this section, points to distinct possibilities in the other four sectors besides family planning. Health may be the leading contender for more PVO support since there are a good many very experienced PVOs long active in the sector. Small scale enterprise would rank second among the four sectors, but not far ahead of rural infrastructure even if the latter would just be the "hard" aspects of physical works and productivity-increasing agricultural tools. If AID wished to proceed gingerly into softer aspects of rural infrastructure, such as fostering the building of more institutions based on organized groups of the rural poor, then that sector could attain much more prominence. A good many PVOs, as this survey should make clear, are already dedicated to just such an effort, and some of them (in the table) would welcome AID's partnership support to further spread their grass-roots approaches to this task. The agriculture sector holds considerable hope for enhanced PVO use, in the authors' view, if an intermediary would be selected and if the scattered rural PVOs, who have interest in the sector, would be enrolled into the development part of R&D--disseminating proven new seeds, farming techniques, irrigation practices etc. via their groups; or piloting some new ideas not yet sufficiently tested to attract the attention and support of professional research institutions.



<u>PVO Acronym*</u>	<u>Suitability Category</u>	<u>No. of Criterion Not Satisfying (B &amp; E only)</u>	<u>Sector(s) in which Active(when known)</u>
BACD	B	Too new & too small	AG
Banchte Shekha	F	No response	RI
BANG. DEV. SERVICE CENTER(BDSC)	F	4	RI
BANG. KENDRIO MAHILA PUNARBASHAN SANGSTHA	F	App't impossible	
BANG. RURAL ADVANCE- MENT COMMITTEE(BRAC)	F	3	AG, RI, SSE, H
BANG. WOMEN'S HEALTH COALITION(BWHC)	F	3	H, FP
BOTHERS TO ALL MEN (BAM)	F	3	H, FP
CARE	A		AG, RI, H
CARITAS	B	3	AG, RI, SSE, H
CCDB	A		AG, RI
CDS	B	Too new & too small; scored only 2 points	FP
CHCP	B	3	H, FP
CONCERN	A		H
CP	A		SSE
CRWRC	A		AG, RI, H
CTRDW	A		H
CUSO	B	Intermediary only	
FFHI	B	No strong relevant sector	
FIVDB	A		AG, RI, SSE, H
GONO SHASTHYA KENDRO(GK)	F	3	H, FP
GTC	B	3rd country Govt. agency	

<u>PVO Acronym*</u>	<u>Suitability Category</u>	<u>No. of Criterion Not Satisfying (B &amp; E only)</u>	<u>Sector(s) in which Active (when known)</u>
GUP	A		AG, RI, H
HEED	A		AG, H, FP
IDE	A		AG
INTERPARES	A		SSE
IUCW	A		SSE, FP
IVS	B	Intermediary only	
JC	A		RI, H, FP
JW	B	Not legally a PVO	SSE
KARIKA	A		RI, SSE
MIRPUR AGRICULTURAL WORKSHOP TRAINING SCHOOL	F	3, mainly other sector	AG, (education)
MCC	B	3	AG, SSE, H
MIDAS	A		SSE
MSS	A		SSE, H, FP
NK	B	3	AG, RI
NLC	B	3	H
PFB	A		AG, H
PIACT	B	No relevant sector	
PROSHIKA-MUK	B	Do not need funds till 1989	AG, RI, H
RESOURCE INTEGRATION CTR.	F	No response	
RDRS	F	3	AG, RI, H, FP
SAP	B	Intermediary only	
SC-USA	A		AG, RI, H
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OTR.	F	No reachable	

<u>PVO Acronym*</u>	<u>Suitability Category</u>	<u>No. of Criterion Not Satisfying (B &amp; E only)</u>	<u>Sector(s) in which Active(when known)</u>
SDUPW	B	No interest in donors	
SN	B	3rd country PVOs not always listed if other 2 types sufficient in sector.	AG, RI
SNSP	A		RI, H, FP
SCC-CVIB	B	Welfare sector only	
TARD	A		RI, FP
TDH(France)	F	3	
TDH(Swiss)	B	Third country PVO which could not be considered because of delayed response.	RI, H
<b>UNDERPRIVILEGED</b>			
CHILDREN'S EDUCATIO- NAL PROJECT(UCEP)	F	No relevant sector	(education)
USC	B	3	RI
UTO	B	No relevant sector	
VDS	B	No strong relevant sector	
VERC	A		RI
VHSS	B	Coordinating only	H
WI	A		AG
WVR	A		SSE
YMCA	B	3	
YWCA	A		RI, SSE, H

\* If spelled out in list of PVOs contacted at beginning of report; category F names not given there and are thus here spelled out.

PART II - CATEGORY B PVOs: SYNOPSIS OF REASON FOR  
NOT BEING IN CATEGORY A (TABLES 1-5.)

1. ASA is opposed to work with USAID funds. ASA feels that USAID programs do not help solve problems at their roots.
- \*2. BACD is a very new organization without enough experience yet of foreign donors, as would enable it to collaborate with AID.
- \*3. CARITAS is opposed to involvement with USAID funds because of negative experience and since then they made it a policy not to accept any Government money from anywhere. During 1974 floods USAID had assured \$300,000 worth of wheat seeds through Catholic Relief Services. However, at the time of payment USAID asked the Government of Bangladesh to divert bilateral money to make this payment. This put CARITAS into a seriously embarrassing situation. Moreover, in 1972 during the Housing Rehabilitation program CARITAS found USAID bureaucracy and accountability demands very heavy.
4. CDS did not score enough points in the grading exercise. They are a very new organization (started January 1985) and are not yet developed to a level workable for AID. However, CDS is one of the PVO's receiving USAID money through The Asia Foundation, and appears best linked to USAID through such an intermediary.
- \*5. CHCP is opposed to use of USAID funds; too burdensome and not worth the bureaucratic hassles.
6. CUSO is a Canadian PVO which has been an active intermediary in Bangladesh of both Canadian and non-Canadian funds and a prospective channel for USAID funds.
7. FFH'S programs in Bangladesh are not very strong. Moreover, they received all their funds through their headquarters.
- \*8. GTC is a purely German Govt. concern and thus involvement with USAID was out of the question.
9. IYS places volunteers into the field programs of other PVOs; just an intermediary (like VHS); however, the BD branch has new thrusts well in mind ... further consideration indicated.
- \*10. Jute Works is a marketing organization; not a registered NGO.
11. MCC has taken a firm policy against using AID funds. It finds, on the basis of U.S./Canadian hqs. thinking that AID has become too politicized.

- \*12. New Life Center represents Swedish funds and attaches great importance to the "neutrality" of Swedish funds; therefore would not funds from USAID which clearly represents a particular political bloc.
- \*13. Nijera Kori is politically opposed to use of USAID funds.
- \*14. PIACT is a purely research organization in family planning.
- \*15. Proshika-MUK has enough funds till 1989 and therefore doesn't even wish to address the issue of AID funds now.
- \*16. HRHS funds are all channeled through their headquarters in Geneva. Moreover, they do not accept government funds. They do not want to be responsible to any government in anyway.
- 17. SAP besides being just an intermediary is funded 80% from the Canadian Govt. (CIDA) - amounting to 100% of its foreign funds
- 18. SN (only Japan-based foreign PVO), because it's a third-country-based organization, just wasn't needed in any sector to reach the required minimum of 10 PVOs; didn't offer extraordinarily special advantages (works primarily as an intermediary)
- \*19. SOS Children's Village is basically an orphanage and thus not eligible under any of the sectors of USAID's interest.
- \*20. SDUPW is a very successful women's enterprise. They are totally self-sufficient and do not intend to receive funds from any agency.
- 21. Terre Des Hommes Switzerland is keen to collaborate with USAID but due to reporting error they were dropped and the interview was held after report was already completed.
- \*22. Unitarian Service Committee (Canada) receives all its funds through its headquarters in Ottawa
- \*23. UTO has no development programs currently.
- 24. Vegetable Dye Society does not at this stage of its development fall very strongly in any of the desired sectors.
- \*25. YMCA National Council mentioned being on principle opposed to USAID funds; however it should be noted that the International YMCA receives AID GRANTS (\$2.3 M in 1982-83).

-----  
 \*Questionnaire not completed

\*Questionnaire submitted but interview not held

## USAID PVO SURVEY (9/85) - Selected Information

Date completed \_\_\_\_\_  
 By whom? (Name) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Designation \_\_\_\_\_

CHECK ALL APPROPRIATE BOXES (more than one per question may be appropriate. Please write in details where "specify" applies)

I. Name of organization \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address \_\_\_\_\_  
 Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

## II. MAIN FEATURES of your NGO

1. Is your organization . . .

- Bangladeshi?  
 Foreign-based? (specify which country; if more than one, list, circling the name of the principal country)  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Affiliated with a foreign NGO? (If so, please list name[s]. If more than one affiliation, list in order of importance):  
 \_\_\_\_\_

2. Is your organization registered with ERD?

- Yes  No

3. Do you stress an integrated, multi-sectoral approach in your operations?  Yes  No

4. Area of operation (primarily):

- Rural  Urban (if checked, please list names of areas):  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

5. If you target particular groups/elements in your operations please specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

6. Geographic spread of your field programs/projects:

_____ No. of sites	_____ No. of districts
_____ No. of villages	(please list districts)
_____ No. of upazilas	_____
_____ No. of divisions	_____

7. Any recent evaluations performed?

- No  Yes (if checked, was it):  
 In-house  
 External

About how often do evaluations occur? \_\_\_\_\_

III. STRUCTURE & COMPOSITION

1. Does your organization work directly with projects OR as an intermediary with other NGOs?
  - Directly with projects
  - As an intermediary (if checked: How many NGOs do you serve? \_\_\_\_\_)
2. Have you received any funds through an intermediary funding organization?
  - Yes
  - No
3. Management of your organization:
  - Name of Executive Head of org. \_\_\_\_\_
  - Post held since \_\_\_\_\_
4. Staff:

	Management		Implementation	
	Expatriate	National	Expatriate	National
Males	_____	_____	_____	_____
Females	_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTALS	_____	_____	_____	_____

IV. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND % OF BUDGET ALLOCATED TO MAIN ONES

1. Please state your organization's goal \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

2. Activities: For each of the following in which you regularly engage, please assign a number indicating order-of-importance during the current fiscal year, with No. 1 as most important. In addition, for the first four (Nos. 1 - 4) please estimate, however roughly, the percentage of your current total budget (from both domestic and foreign, if any, sources) being absorbed by each of those activities.

RANK	% IF AMONG TOP FOUR	ACTIVITY
_____	_____%	Agricultural Research
_____	_____%	Agriculture and Food Production
_____	_____%	Agro-forestry extension (social forestry)
_____	_____%	Health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Check if emphasis on MCH</li> </ul>
_____	_____%	Population Planning
_____	_____%	Small Scale Enterprise
_____	_____%	Rural Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Physical structures only .</li> </ul>
_____	_____%	Employment/Income Generation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Farm</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Non-farm</li> </ul>
_____	_____%	Relief and Rehabilitation
_____	_____%	Distribution of Commodities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specify, <input type="checkbox"/> Food items</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Contraceptives</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Other, specify _____</li> </ul>

RANK	% IF AMONG TOP FOUR	ACTIVITY
_____	_____ %	Institutional Development <input type="checkbox"/> Co-operatives <input type="checkbox"/> Credit groups <input type="checkbox"/> Savings groups <input type="checkbox"/> Shamities/Unions <input type="checkbox"/> Conscientization work
_____	_____ %	Training, specifying types _____
_____	_____ %	Technology (such as appropriate, new, high) <input type="checkbox"/> Primarily <u>development</u> , major items being: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Primarily <u>dissemination</u> , of these items: _____

V. FUNDS

1. Experience with donors (grants, contracts, co-financing etc.):

Name of Donor	Year	Amount (in taka)	For How Many Yrs.?	For What Activities?
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. Do you receive any funds from Bangladesh Government?

- Yes  
 No (if checked, why not?) \_\_\_\_\_

3. Would you be interested in funds from USAID?

- Yes  
 No (if checked, could you please explain why?) \_\_\_\_\_

VI. BUDGET

1. Sources:

What is largest source of your funds? \_\_\_\_\_; \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 What is second largest source? \_\_\_\_\_; \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 What is third largest? \_\_\_\_\_; \_\_\_\_\_ %

2. Total budget in recent years (ALL funds, whether foreign or local):

What was total amount of budget 3 years ago? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Total two years ago? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Total last year? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Current budget (ALL expected funds, whether from abroad or local):

Total amount? \_\_\_\_\_

Of that total, what are the percentages from foreign source(s)?

• From government(s): \_\_\_\_\_%

• From private sources: \_\_\_\_\_%

What percentages are from Banqladeshi sources?

• From the Government: \_\_\_\_\_%

• From domestic private sources: \_\_\_\_\_%

Still referring to the above total, what percentage is expected to result from self-generated funds? \_\_\_\_\_%

Please list major sources for these generated funds:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. What percentage of the TOTAL current budget noted in item VI, 3 preceding is allocated to administrative overhead? \_\_\_\_\_%

THANK YOU MOST KINDLY FOR HAVING COMPLETED THIS QUESTIONNAIRE PRIOR TO THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULED WITH ONE OF THE USAID CONSULTANTS. AT THAT TIME ANY PARTS OF THE ABOVE WHICH WERE UNCLEAR OR GAVE PROBLEMS CAN BE DISCUSSED.

AT THE TIME OF THE INTERVIEW A NUMBER OF OTHER QUESTIONS WILL BE RAISED IN ORDER FOR THE CONSULTANTS TO GAIN A MUCH MORE COMPLETE UNDERSTANDING OF SEVERAL ASPECTS OF YOUR WORK, AND OF SOME OF YOUR VIEWS/FINDINGS.

LIST OF QUESTIONS TO RAISE, DISCUSS & SOMETIMES FOLLOW-UP IN THE INTERVIEW OF THE PVO

- I. Explore organization goals and how and at what level and with whom they are interested in working. (Can refer to what's been seen in printed documents from the org.)
- II. Their Board of Directors/Governing Body: Who're the members? How actively involved?
- III. Project development: How long a time usually occurs between project identification/proposing and beginning of implementation (if accepted)?
- IV. Follow-up to questionnaire's item on co-financing/contracting (grants) with one or more donors (item V,1): If reported such experience, then--
  - A. Did the org. find their experience with donors to be, on the whole, a positive or negative experience?
  - B. Referring to those collaborations with donors, what kind of problems are faced? What are one-to-three main ones, most serious ones (if any)?
  - C. Any preferences among donors? If so, why?
  - D. Any preferences among types of financial collaboration (co-financing, simple grants for specific projects/purposes, other)?
  - E. If have reported both government and private support (whether foreign or domestic), which type of source preferred? Why?
- V. Does org. have any interest in generating income to offset donor contributions? If affirmative, then:
  - A. What plans exist?
  - B. What % of budget can be financed this way?
  - C. Anticipated No. of years to reach target?
- VI. Expansion capability/absorption capacity:
  - A. Interested in expanding operations?
  - B. If so, what plans to do so?
  - C. If so, what constraints are faced?
  - D. Would org. have capacity to handle a sizeable increase in financial resources, in their opinion? If think so, about how much, in \$ terms, could be coped with?
- VII. Beneficiaries:
  - A. What are characteristics of beneficiaries? How know that?
  - B. Total No. of beneficiaries estimated currently?
- VIII. Work with the GBD: Is org. willing to work with the Govt.? (NOTE: Check response to funding sources question in questionnaire [No. V,1] to see if report having received any GBD support. If so, any expression of unwillingness now merits follow-up.) Other past experience? Plans to begin? What are thoughts

LIST OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (continued)

on institution building with GRD support? What are preferred modes of any Govt. collaboration?

IX. If an intermediary PVO as reported in the questionnaire (in III, 1), how are the PVOs being assisted?

A. By sub-grants?

B. Or/and by other forms of assistance? If so, state types, order-of-importance.

X. Compatibility with AID:

A. If have had experience with AID support, in any form, summarize how went, what is feeling about it?

B. If any significant problems reported with past AID collaboration . . . list, and follow-up with question about any suggestions for better ways of relating or of removing particular difficulties.

C. If questionnaire in part V, 3 revealed disinterest in AID support/collaboration but in such a way that this interview was nevertheless held, explore the "why" of that view. What would be required, on AID's side, on PVO side, or on both in order to overcome reason(s) for disinterest?

D. If that questionnaire item (V, 3) indicated willingness to enter future relationship with AID (if none heretofore), briefly explore state of knowledge re AID's requirements (if not knowledgeable and wish information, can hand over copy of booklet if available, or a copy of certain parts). Note if org. apparently could handle requirements (based on experience, if any, with other government support, on size/composition of staff, size of budget, etc.).

61-