

**AN EVALUATION OF
PEACE CORPS/A.I.D.
COOPERATION IN AFRICA**

Washington, D.C. December 29, 1989

Submitted to

**Peace Corps and
Agency for International Development
AID IQC # PDC-5371-I-00-8122-00-D.O. 17**

MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL

600 Water Street S.W., NBU 7-7
Washington, D.C. 20024

telephone: (202) 484-7170
telex: 4990821MANSY fax: (202) 488-0754

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	ES-1
Acronyms and Abbreviations	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background	1
B. Summary of Evaluation Scope of Work	1
C. Evaluation Methodology	2
II. COLLABORATION: ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS	5
A. Attitudes toward Collaboration	5
B. What is Collaboration?	7
C. Cooperation vs. Collaboration	10
III. COLLABORATION BENEFITS AND OPPORTUNITIES	11
A. Benefits of Collaboration	11
B. The Effect of Collaboration on Impact and Sustainability	17
C. Collaboration Opportunities	18
D. The Synergy of Peace Corps-A.I.D. Collaboration	21
IV. MODALITIES FOR A.I.D.-PEACE CORPS COLLABORATION	22
A. A.I.D. Projects which Employ PCVs	22
B. PCVs in PVO Projects	22
C. Projects Designed and Managed by Peace Corps	24
D. A.I.D. and Peace Corps Working in the Same Sector and Collaborating Informally	25
E. Summing Up	25
V. A.I.D. FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF PEACE CORPS	27
A. The Nature of the A.I.D. Financial Contribution to Peace Corps	27
B. The Use of PASA Funds	29
C. Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current Modalities	33
1. Small Project Assistance Fund	33
2. PASA Funds for Training and Project Development	34

VI. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED PLAN OF ACTION	36
A. General Attitudes and Perceptions	36
B. Operational Impediments to Collaboration	38
C. A.I.D. Financing of Peace Corps Activities	40

ANNEXES

A -- Summary of Scope of Work	43
B -- Peace Corps Statement of Objectives	47
C -- Action Plan for A.I.D. Development Fund for Africa (Executive Summary)	49
D -- Botswana Country Study	54
E -- Burundi Country Study	65
F -- Ghana Country Study	76
G -- Lesotho Country Study	82
H -- Mali Country Study	91
I -- Togo Country Study	102
J -- List of Persons Contacted in Washington	112
K -- List of Documents Reviewed in Washington	114

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAI	-	American Agriculture International (A.I.D. contractor, Lesotho)
ABS	-	Annual Budget Submission
ADRA	-	Adventist Development and Relief Agency (Ghana)
AED	-	Academy for Education and Development (A.I.D. contractor, Lesotho)
AF	-	Africa Regional office in Peace Corps
AFR	-	Africa Bureau (A.I.D.)
AFSI	-	African Food Systems Initiative (Peace Corps project)
AFVP	-	French Association of Volunteers for Peace
A.I.D.	-	Agency for International Development
A.I.D./W	-	Agency for International Development Washington
AIP	-	Accelerated Impact Program (former AFR regional project)
APCD	-	Associate Peace Corps Director
ARDN	-	Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition (A.I.D. appropriation category)
ASAP	-	Africa Small-Business Assistance Program (AFR-AF PASA)
ATIP	-	Agriculture Technology Improvement Project (Botswana)
BANFES	-	Basic & Non-Formal Systems (Education project, Lesotho)
BDC	-	Botswana Development Corporation
BOCCIM	-	Botswana Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Mining
CARE	-	Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere
CCCD	-	Combatting Childhood Communicable Diseases (A.I.D. regional project)
CCFI	-	Collaborative Community Forestry Initiative (Ghana)
CDC	-	Center for Disease Control, Atlanta, Georgia
CDSS	-	Country Development Strategy Statement (A.I.D.)
CDU	-	Country Desk Unit
CLUSA	-	The Cooperative League of the USA
CMPB	-	Country Management Plan and Budget (Peace Corps)
COP	-	Chief of Party (contractor)
CRS	-	Catholic Relief Service
DCM	-	Deputy Chief of Mission
DFA	-	Development Fund for Africa
FICAH	-	Food Industry Campaign Against Hunger (U.S. PVO)
FSR	-	Farming Systems Research
FUCEC	-	Togolese Federation of Credit Unions
FY	-	Fiscal Year
GDO	-	Government Development Officer
GOB	-	Government of Botswana; Government of Burundi

GOG - Government of Ghana
 GOL - Government of Lesotho
 GOT - Government of Togo
 GRM - Government of the Republic of Mali
 HC - Host Country

 HCG - Host Country Government
 HCN - Host Country National
 HGP - The Home Gardens/Nutrition Project (Lesotho)
 HRDO - Human Resources Development Officer
 IDM - Institute for Development Management, Botswana

 IEES - Improving Efficiency of the Education System (Botswana project)
 IESC - International Executive Service Corps
 IMF - International Monetary Fund
 INECN - Institute for the Environment and the Conservation of Nature
 (Burundi)
 IST - In-Service Training

 JSEIP - Junior Secondary Education Improvement Program (Botswana
 project)
 KCS - Kalihari Conservation Society (Botswana)
 LAPIS - Lesotho Agricultural Production & Institutional Support (A.I.D.
 project)
 LCDSS - Limited Country Development Strategy Statement (A.I.D.)
 MEDP - Ministry of Economic Development and Planning, Lesotho

 MFDP - Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, Botswana
 MOA - Ministry of Agriculture
 MOE - Ministry of Education
 MOH - Ministry of Health
 MOU - Memorandum of Understanding

 MSI - Management Systems International
 NA - Nutrition Agent
 NGO - Non-government Organization
 NTTC - National Technical Training Center (Botswana)
 OAR - Office of the A.I.D. Representative

 ODA - Overseas Development Assistance (UK)
 OHV - Operation Haute Valle (Mali)
 OPEX - Operational Expatriate
 OPIC - Overseas Private Investment Corporation (U.S.)
 OTAPS - Office of Training and Program Support (Peace Corps)

 PASA - Participating Agency Services Agreement
 PCD - Peace Corps Director
 PCT - Peace Corps Trainee
 PCV - Peace Corps Volunteer
 PC/W - Peace Corps/Washington

PDO - Project Development Officer (A.I.D.)
 PEIP - Primary Education Improvement Project (Botswana)
 PIC - Production Initiative Component (Lesotho)
 PID - Project Identification Document (A.I.D.)
 PIR - Project Implementation Review (A.I.D.)

PP - Project Paper (A.I.D.)
 PROPTA - Projet pour la Promotion de la Traction Animale (Togo)
 PST - Pre-Service Training
 PTO - Program and Training Officer (Peace Corps)
 P&T - Program and Training

PVC - Private and Voluntary Cooperation (A.I.D./W office)
 PVO - Private Voluntary Organization(s)
 RDO - Rural Development Office(r)
 REDSO - Regional Economic Development Support Office (A.I.D.)
 REDSO/WA - Regional Economic Development Support Office/West Africa

RPCV - Returned Peace Corps Volunteer
 SDA - Special Development Assistance
 SED - Small Enterprise Development
 SME - Small and Medium Enterprise
 SOW - Statement of Work, or Scope of Work

SPA - Small Project Assistance
 SPAF - Small Project Assistance Fund
 TDY - Temporary Duty
 TRIPS - Togo Rural Institutions and Private Sector (A.I.D. project)
 TTC - Teacher Training College

UNDP - United Nations Development Program
 USAID - U.S. Agency for International Development mission
 Volags - Voluntary Agencies
 WOCCU - World Council of Credit Unions
 WFP - World Food Program
 WID - Women in Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Cooperation in development efforts has existed since the early days of the Peace Corps and the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.). Since 1981, the agencies have made a sustained effort to increase the extent of joint programming as well as overall cooperation. Specific actions taken include (1) creating mechanisms to promote cooperation, such as the Joint A.I.D.-Peace Corps Coordinating Committee in Washington, (2) developing cooperating policies in more detail and communicating these policies to the field, (3) designing programs and jointly funding initiatives aimed at fostering effective cooperative efforts at the village level, and (4) developing agreements in key development sectors such as water supply and sanitation, energy, child survival, natural resources conservation, nutrition, and micro-enterprise development.

Joint A.I.D.-Peace Corps programming has been carried out in Africa for a number of years. There are currently about 900 Peace Corps volunteers (PCVs) assigned to 63 A.I.D.-supported projects carried out by host country agencies and/or private voluntary organizations (PVOs) in 24 African countries.

This large volume of interaction in Africa involves significant levels of financial resources and volunteers; yet, the potential for enhancing U.S. Government development objectives in Africa through these cooperative efforts has not been systematically assessed. Thus, the Africa bureaus of A.I.D. and Peace Corps, with the support of the Joint A.I.D./Peace Corps Coordinating Committee, decided it was time to determine in what ways this collaboration enhances the development process and seek ideas for improving joint inter-agency programming and implementation in the field.

This led to a contract with Management Systems International (MSI) to carry out an evaluation of the collaborative efforts of the two agencies. Two teams of two people each conducted interviews in A.I.D. and Peace Corps in Washington. Subsequently, one team visited three anglophone countries in Africa (Ghana, Lesotho, and Botswana) and the other team went to the three francophone countries of Mali, Togo, and Burundi. The teams visited joint projects, interviewed many people, had brainstorming sessions with USAID and Peace Corps personnel, and offered suggestions for strengthening collaboration. The results of their visits are reflected in this report.

GENERAL ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS

Major Findings

- (1) The principal focus of field cooperation is on resource sharing: A.I.D. financial support of PCV activities and PCV participation in A.I.D.-supported projects. There is some information sharing, little true partnership (the indicator of effective collaboration).
- (2) There is a great deal of ambivalence in both agencies about the desirability and feasibility of increasing A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration, and hence some confusion why Washington is emphasizing it.

- (3) There are untapped opportunities for collaboration -- see Chapter III and country studies (Annexes D - I).

Conclusions

- (1) A higher level of joint A.I.D.-Peace Corps program planning in the field would result in better programs for both agencies and probably more integrated A.I.D.-Peace Corps projects.
- (2) Joint participation in project development would ensure better designed projects, projects that would be more easily implementable, likely to have greater impact, and with a better chance of being sustained.
- (3) The two agencies need to do a better job of sensitizing their personnel to the value of and potential for collaboration. It is collaboration, not cooperation, that should be emphasized.
- (4) Procedures and manuals in both agencies should give more emphasis to the value of A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration and provide better instructions and guides to the missions of the two agencies about undertaking collaborative activity.

Recommended Actions

- (1) USAID and Peace Corps mission directors jointly review their programs and program plans, drawing on Chapters III and IV herein, to look for untapped opportunities for mutually supportive development-enhancing activities.
- (2) USAID and Peace Corps mission directors use the matrix in Table II-1 to review collaboration in individual projects and activities, giving special attention to impact and sustainability.
- (3) The new Director of the Peace Corps and the new Administrator of A.I.D. issue a joint statement affirming their support for a high level of collaboration (not cooperation) between the two agencies and announce actions that have been or will be taken to emphasize the importance of and/ or facilitate A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration. They should also invite field comments on this report.
- (4) The Peace Corps Director and A.I.D. Administrator should put collaboration on the agenda for the next regional meetings with their mission directors; if possible, the conferences should be co-located so that joint A.I.D.-Peace Corps meetings could be held to discuss collaboration.
- (5) The A.I.D. Administrator should instruct the group working on a revision of Handbook III to include a number of specifics that would strengthen collaboration. (These are spelled out in Chapter VI.)

- (6) Peace Corps's Office of Training and Program Programming and Training System Manual (October to the field to include more references to the importance of with USAIDs and ways to collaborate more effectively.
- (7) Pending completion of the revisions in manuals and handbooks as recommended immediately above, the Director of the Peace Corps and the Administrator of A.I.D. should advise their field directors to invite participation of the other agency in the preparation of country programs and in the design of new projects.
- (8) The Joint Committee on A.I.D.-Peace Corps Collaboration should develop, or have developed, publications to promote collaboration and recommend steps to provide incentives to individual A.I.D. and Peace Corps officers to practice collaboration -- see Chapter VI for details and related recommendations.
- (9) The Joint Committee should review staff training programs in both Peace Corps and A.I.D. with a view to incorporating in such programs a component on A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration which would deal with the various types of collaboration discussed in this report, including the associated problem areas and remedies for them. Trainers and trainees from each agency should be involved in such training programs.

OPERATIONAL IMPEDIMENTS TO COLLABORATION

Major Findings

- (1) Peace Corps staff generally do not have significant experience or training in project design, monitoring, and evaluation; even officers who do are usually so burdened with the training and operational support of PCVs that they have little time for such activities. Hence, Peace Corps staff (and PCVs) are seldom involved in the planning of USAID-funded projects.
- (2) Most PVO representatives interviewed were not enthusiastic about incorporating PCVs in their projects except in special circumstances and on a limited basis.
- (3) Some USAID personnel feel that PCVs are not sufficiently trained to be incorporated in A.I.D. projects; others feel that there is a dwindling role for volunteers because of the increase in trained local nationals.
- (4) Many A.I.D. programs are focussing on policy reform and reducing the number of projects targeted at local communities; this is cited by some USAID personnel as a reason why there is no longer a basis for A.I.D.-Peace Corps joint activities.
- (5) A.I.D. personnel generally are not aware of the potential value to A.I.D. of Peace Corps activities that may serve as precursors or successors to SAID projects or that may be complementary to USAID sector policy reform efforts.

... evidence of interest by either USAIDs or Peace Corps
of... planning and collaborative implementation of projects;
, the project which appeared most likely to be successful of any the
ams reviewed was collaboratively planned and is being implemented in a
ery collaborative fashion involving not only A.I.D. and Peace Corps but
also a U.S. PVO, a local NGO, villagers, and governmental service
organizations.

- (7) Some Peace Corps directors passively wait for host governments to come to them with proposals for use of volunteers rather than look for the best opportunities for PCV use. A variation is to seek to work only with a ministry with which there has been a good experience, thereby limiting opportunities.

Conclusions

- (1) Collaborative planning needs to be fostered; it would result in better programs for both agencies and better project implementation results.
- (2) Steps need to be taken to increase the likelihood of collaborative planning:
 - (a) Improvements should be made in the capabilities of Peace Corps staff in program development and project design and evaluation.
 - (b) USAID personnel, USAID contractors, and PVOs need to be sensitized more to the value of collaboration with Peace Corps.

Recommended Actions

- (1) Peace Corps increase the training of its staff in program planning and project design and evaluation.
- (2) Peace Corps reconsider its rule that staff assignments cannot exceed five years; longer tours would make staff training more cost effective.
- (3) Peace Corps encourage more PCVs to extend their tours to three and four years and consider initiating, on a trial basis, the recruitment of volunteers committed to three or four-year tours.
- (4) A.I.D. and Peace Corps promote more collaborative workshops of the type that led to the design of the CCFI project in Ghana.
- (5) USAIDs set up workshops at the beginning of project implementation for all of the anticipated participants (e.g., Peace Corps staff and PCVs, USAID contractors, PVOs, local participating organizations, appropriate government personnel) to establish roles and responsibilities and implementation schedules.
- (6) A.I.D. instruct its field missions to look more closely for opportunities to integrate PCVs in their projects and for possibilities for Peace Corps interventions that might: (a) lead to eventual joint A.I.D.-Peace Corps projects; (b) facilitate, or ease the potential negative feelings about, the termination of AID funding -- especially in grass-roots

activities; or (c) be supportive or test the results of USAID policy reform activities.

- (7) A.I.D. and Peace Corps increase staff exchanges, particularly in positions which will impact on field guidance on program development and project identification and design.

A.I.D. FINANCING OF PEACE CORPS ACTIVITIES

Major Findings

- (1) A.I.D. provides funding to Peace Corps for three major purposes:
 - o Funding of small projects, e.g., through the Small Project Assistance funds;
 - o Program development and project design; and
 - o Training for Peace Corps staff, PCVs, and host national counterparts.
- (2) The amount of money A.I.D. transfers to Peace Corps is small compared to its own budget and to Peace Corps's budget, but it is of strategic importance to Peace Corps. It provides the bulk of project funding available to Peace Corps and it helps strengthen the capabilities of PCVs and their host country counterparts.
- (3) Most of the PASAs are between AID/S&T and PC/OTAPS; only two are specifically for Africa, one of which is funded by AID's Africa Bureau.
- (4) There are PASA agreements for most, but not all, A.I.D. appropriation functional accounts. Each agreement is different in terms of what can be financed and in terms of reporting and accounting requirements.
- (5) Most Peace Corps missions visited were not well informed about the technical PASAs; USAIDs' knowledge of the PASAs was even less.
- (6) Small Project Assistance funds were widely used and appreciated, although there were some PCVs and Peace Corps and USAID staff that were not pleased with PCVs being seen by villagers as a source of funding.
- (7) Although the Peace Corps mission must sign an agreement with USAID to obtain Small Project Assistance funds, USAIDs generally have minimal involvement in the administration of the program; they are generally not consulted at all on the use of the other PASAs.

Conclusions

- (1) There is no valid reason for limiting the technical PASAs and the Small Project Assistance program to a limited number of technical fields.

- (2) The PASA provisions should be standardized to facilitate their use. The Africa Bureau of A.I.D., because it has a single appropriation in lieu of the functional accounts, could have a single PASA with Peace Corps to cover all fields of activity.
- (3) Field missions should be better informed about the uses of the PASAs.
- (4) USAIDs should be more involved in decisions on the use of the PASAs; this could promote collaboration and quite possibly would result in better utilization of funds.

Recommended Actions

- (1) The technical PASAs be expanded to include the fields of agriculture and rural development and education, either from AID/S&T or from the Africa Bureau, and the Small Project Assistance funds become available for education and special development activities, particularly natural resource conservation and management.
- (2) The technical PASAs be modified to permit funds to be used for project/activity design and evaluation and for setting up data management systems for monitoring and impact data collection.
- (3) The Africa Bureau of A.I.D. consider enlarging its support to Peace Corps activities in Africa and do so through a single PASA with Peace Corps to cover all fields of activity, even if backstop responsibility were divided between offices for different functional programs, in order to reduce PASA administrative hassles.
- (4) The Joint Committee on A.I.D.-Peace Corps Collaboration appoint a committee to standardize the accounting and reporting provisions of the various technical PASAs and to consider also standardizing the types of activities that can be funded under the PASAs.
- (5) The Joint Committee prepare a message for the field: (a) re-informing all Peace Corps and A.I.D. missions of the AID resources available through the PASAs and the ways they are to be used; and (b) requiring USAID clearance of Peace Corps mission requests for use of the funds.
- (6) A.I.D. and Peace Corps urge their missions to use the technical PASA funds to develop collaborative projects in Primary Education, Micro-enterprise Development, Child Survival, and Natural Resources Management and Conservation, areas of particular interest to Congress which appear ripe for expanded collaboration.
- (7) A.I.D. and Peace Corps develop and deliver a series of joint planning and programming workshops in the field and in Washington.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

There are untapped opportunities for collaboration that would be in the interest of both agencies and would be supportive of host countries' development efforts.

The synergistic effect of improved and expanded collaboration would be greater than the sum of benefits to each agency. This would be reflected in the overall impact of the U.S. government development effort in the host country and in a more rational use of taxpayers' dollars.

The possibility of Peace Corps seeking to change its legislation and secure its own funding to replace that of AID's PASAs and SPAs was briefly considered and then rejected as being counter to the purposes of collaboration and probably not cost-effective to the U.S. government.

When designing new projects, both agencies need to focus more on impact and sustainability and on how each agency's contribution can enhance project impact and sustainability and the measurement thereof.

I. INTRODUCTION

Between September 15 and December 1, 1989, Management Systems International (MSI) carried out an evaluation of collaborative efforts between the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) and the Peace Corps (PC) in sub-Saharan Africa. The evaluation was contracted by the A.I.D. Africa Bureau and managed jointly by it and the Africa Region of Peace Corps. Summarized below are the background of the evaluation, its scope of work, and the methodology used to carry out the evaluation.

A. BACKGROUND

Cooperation in development efforts has existed since the early days of the Peace Corps and A.I.D. Since 1981, the agencies have made a sustained effort to increase the extent of joint programming as well as overall cooperation. Specific actions taken include (1) creating mechanisms to promote cooperation, such as the Joint A.I.D./Peace Corps Coordinating Committee in Washington, (2) developing cooperating policies in more detail and communicating these policies to the field, (3) designing programs and jointly funding initiatives aimed at fostering effective cooperative efforts at the village level, and (4) developing agreements in key development sectors such as water supply and sanitation, energy, child survival, natural resources conservation, nutrition, and micro-enterprise development.

Joint A.I.D.-Peace Corps programming has been carried out in Africa for a number of years. There are currently about 900 Peace Corps volunteers (PCVs) assigned to 63 A.I.D.-supported projects carried out by host country agencies and/or private voluntary organizations (PVOs) in 27 African countries.

This large volume of interaction in Africa involves significant levels of financial resources and volunteers; yet, the potential for achieving U.S. Government development objectives in Africa through these cooperative efforts has not been systematically assessed. Thus, the Africa bureaus of A.I.D. and Peace Corps, with the support of the Joint A.I.D./Peace Corps Coordinating Committee, decided it was time to determine in what ways this collaboration enhances the development process. In a time of reduced budgets, it was considered critical to identify ways to apply human and financial resources more effectively. This evaluation was arranged to assist A.I.D. and Peace Corps to improve and develop collaborative strategies that further enhance and support joint inter-agency programming and implementation in the field.

B. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

The highlights of the objectives of, and scope of work for the evaluation are set forth below. See Annex A for a more detailed presentation of the scope of work.

1. Objectives

The objective of this evaluation is to determine under what circumstances, around what problems, and through what means collaboration has produced development benefits which would not otherwise have been realized. The focus

is not to evaluate individual projects, but to measure the overall effect of collaboration on the program.

The evaluation is to examine existing program management arrangements in Washington and the field that promote and support joint A.I.D./Peace Corps collaboration. The following is expected from the evaluation:

- Information regarding past and current A.I.D./Peace Corps cooperation will be enhanced;
- Strengths and weaknesses in the collaboration process that affect program success will be identified;
- The appropriate circumstances and means for joint collaboration will be identified;
- Lessons learned will be recognized and implications for future programming delineated; and
- Recommendations for strengthening and improving joint Peace Corps/A.I.D. planning, programming, and implementation.

2. Scope of Work

Two teams of two people each will conduct interviews in A.I.D. and Peace Corps in Washington. Subsequently, one team will visit three anglophone countries in Africa (Ghana, Lesotho, and Botswana) and the other will visit three francophone countries (Mali, Togo, and Burundi). During the visits, each team will evaluate the following:

- a) Effectiveness of current collaborative programming modalities;
- b) Program impact;
- c) Fulfillment of Peace Corps's mandate (see Annex B);
- d) Achievement of A.I.D. Africa Bureau's program objectives (see Annex C);
- e) Effectiveness of joint programming;
- f) Operational and organizational arrangements for collaboration;
- g) Efficiencies of collaboration; and
- h) Sustainability.

Subsequently, the two teams will collaboratively prepare a consolidated report setting forth their findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

C. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

In Washington, the teams met with personnel of the two Africa bureaus: their leadership, the country desk officers for the countries to be visited, and with technical staff. In addition, the teams met with personnel in A.I.D.'s Bureau for Science and Technology and Peace Corps's Office of Training and Program Support, the offices involved in most of the Participating Agency Service Agreements (PASAs) that the two agencies have signed. See Annex J for a list of persons contacted in Washington.

The Washington orientation period also involved reading a number of documents provided by the two agencies (see Annex K for a list of the more significant). The teams also met to develop a common understanding of the scope of work and to prepare for the country field trips. After this team-building exercise, the teams met once again with the representatives of the two Africa bureaus to present their understanding of their mission and their implementation plans for carrying it out.

To attempt further to ensure compatibility and consistency between the findings in the different countries, the two teams met again in Africa after each team had completed the visit to the first country. Plans of work for the subsequent visits were revised somewhat.

In the country visits, interviews were carried out with: U.S. Ambassadors, USAID and Peace Corps directors and staff; host government officials; PCVs; representatives of PVOs; project beneficiaries; A.I.D.-funded contractor personnel; other donors; and other individuals interested in and familiar with A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration. The teams also had the opportunity to obtain information on collaboration in other countries and circumstances through talks with visiting PCVs and by interviewing USAID and PC staff about prior assignments in other African countries. Lists of the persons contacted and the documents reviewed in each country is attached to each country study (Annexes D through I).

In addition to collecting basic information about collaborative activities, the interviews were used to encourage brainstorming on the obstacles to A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration and the means by which they could be overcome. The teams sought new ideas for improving collaboration and asked for reactions to the ideas they had picked up during the trip. As part of the wrap-up session with the two missions, the teams also offered ideas for strengthening collaboration in the specific country.

The teams spent one-third to one-half of their time on field trips visiting collaborative projects. This provided useful insights into the various modalities of collaboration and their relative effectiveness. It also increased the teams' understanding of what the individual PCV has to offer to USAID and what the USAID's support of the volunteer can do for his/her effectiveness.

In addition to writing up the general state of collaboration in each country, the teams prepared some case histories illustrating the different kinds of collaboration encountered and the ways in which it was implemented. A major focus of the case histories is on:

- 1) the major tasks carried out during a collaboration effort (project initiation, planning, review and approval, management, monitoring, and evaluation); and
- 2) the actors who carried out the tasks.

An effort was also made, with interviewees' help, to make educated estimates on the developmental impact and the likelihood of achieving sustainability of the collaborative projects.

In their initial team-building meetings in Washington, team members had been concerned about extrapolating their findings from visits to only six countries. As the visits progressed, however, the teams felt more confident. The countries selected provided a good mix of attitudes toward collaboration, varied examples of mission capabilities, and an excellent variety of funding mechanisms and collaborative modalities. It was a good mix of countries and programs.

Upon return to Washington, the teams met again to exchange information and to integrate their findings as a prelude to arriving at the general conclusions and recommendations that are presented in this report. A first draft report was prepared and presented on December 1, 1989 for review by representatives of the two Africa bureaus. Following receipt of the latter's comments, this final report was prepared.

II. COLLABORATION: ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS

As the evaluation teams left for Africa, the president of MSI said to them, "Try to distinguish between mere exchange of resources and information and true partnership."

The team discovered a surprisingly large variety of ways that resources are exchanged and employed and quite a lot of information sharing; little true partnership was found. There was also confusion about what constituted collaboration and why Washington was so concerned about fostering it.

Set forth below are attitudes towards collaboration which the teams encountered, both in Washington and in the field, followed by a discussion of the various facets of collaboration.

A. ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLABORATION

The teams found very mixed attitudes toward collaboration, both in Washington and in the field. In Washington, the technical people were generally more enthusiastic about collaboration than the project development and country desk officers. In only two countries out of the six visited by the teams was there a high level of enthusiasm about current collaboration; even in these countries, the potential for collaboration had not been realized. In three countries, there were isolated examples of collaboration, but neither PC nor USAID had seen closer collaboration as being of high priority. In only one country did the team encounter opposition to AID-PC collaboration; both political and programmatic factors were involved.

1. USAID Attitudes

In four countries the most common initial USAID attitude was that more extensive or intensive collaboration was either not feasible or was not worth it. The following comments encountered are illustrative of this attitude:

"Collaboration was dreamed up in the early 1980s to save Peace Corps."

"If Peace Corps needs more money, why doesn't it just go to Congress and get it -- it has friends on the Hill."

"Collaboration is just another Washington fad."

"We're focusing on policy reform and institution building, areas which are not appropriate for Peace Corps."

"PCVs are not well enough trained to work in our projects."

"If AID/W wants to pass money to Peace Corps to let them do their thing, fine -- just so long as we are minimally involved; we do not have the staff to handle any more management workload."

"Isn't it illegal to pass money from one U.S. government agency to another?"

2. Peace Corps Mission Attitudes

Peace Corps staff seemed more interested in collaboration than USAID staff. Personnel from both agencies seem to feel that PC has the most to gain from collaboration, reflecting the view that collaboration means passing resources. PC staff had heard some of the above comments by A.I.D. personnel and were concerned about the attitudes of their USAID counterparts. Some PC people felt they were considered second class citizens by USAID staffers. Perhaps reflecting this, some PC staff seemed to want to go it alone.

We noted that some PC staff and PCVs wish to avoid being closely associated with USAID because of a feeling that USAID is too closely linked to U.S. foreign policy. Some PC staff feel that PC is always responsive to what the local government and people want, while USAID at times pushes through what it thinks is best, often with inadequate input from the grass roots.

PCVs generally liked the availability of SPA funds, but this was not a universal feeling. Some felt that volunteers should not be seen by villagers as potential sources of funds. Other volunteers were concerned about having to be responsible for the control and use of the SPA funds.

3. U.S. Embassies

The ambivalence about collaboration is also found among Ambassadors and Embassy personnel. On the one hand, there is a natural inclination to favor improved collaboration as a good thing, supportive of the country team concept. At the same time, PC is usually considered by local officials as being apolitical, while USAID often is not -- especially as it becomes involved in policy reform activities. The Ambassador sees it in the U.S. Government interest, and helpful personally in his work in the country, for PC to continue to be seen as apolitical. Thus, the form and visibility of collaboration can be very important to the Embassy.

4. Washington Attitudes

The leadership of the two agencies in recent years has stressed the importance they attach to A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration and has set up the Joint A.I.D./Peace Corps Coordinating Committee to ensure that interagency cooperation receives attention at the highest level.

The evaluation teams found considerable enthusiasm for collaboration among the technical staffs in the Peace Corps's Office of Training and Program Support and A.I.D.'s Bureau for Science and Technology. The regional staffs, particularly in A.I.D., had little apparent interest in or knowledge about collaboration efforts.

5. Summary Conclusions

There is still a great deal of ambivalence within the two agencies about both the feasibility and desirability of significant increases in A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration. Some of the concerns are legitimate and need to be dealt with more adequately. There is also a certain vagueness in people's thinking about what constitutes collaboration and what benefits can be derived from it. These matters are dealt with more fully in the following sections.

B. WHAT IS COLLABORATION?

The MSI evaluation teams found that many field people felt that successful collaboration meant that there were good personal relations between the two mission directors and some funds were being passed by USAID to Peace Corps with minimum hassle to both parties. The teams found that even where there was enthusiasm for joint action, there were a number of untapped opportunities for increasing collaborative activity -- activity which would promote more rapid or effective development and would benefit both parties. This led the teams to look more deeply into the question: "What is collaboration?" and to look for the reasons why there seemed to be so little enthusiasm for the concept.

The effort to construct a model of collaboration led to the preparation of a matrix of collaboration in which the horizontal axis reflected the level of information exchange, and the level of resources exchanged was shown on the vertical axis. The implication of the matrix was that the upper right corner of the matrix represented the greatest level of collaboration, i.e., the highest exchange of information and the greatest level of resources exchanged.

It was noted, however, that the level of resources being exchanged usually meant that the level of shared decision-making also increased. For example, if a large share of the PCVs assigned to a country were being assigned to a USAID-financed activity, the local PC mission would be much more concerned about participating in decisions about their assignments and support than if only one or two PCVs were involved. Similarly, most USAIDs want as little as possible to do with the administration of the Small Projects Assistance (SPA) projects, but their attention can be expected to increase proportionately as the amount of funding being passed to Peace Corps increases.

As the teams tested the model against the reality of their field visits, they realized that "good" collaboration could involve joint decision-making without an exchange of monetary or personnel resources. Thus, the level of joint decision-making replaced concern with level of resources exchanged. Further, the teams realized that the more exchange of information and joint effort in establishing each mission's country objectives, the greater likelihood of success of each's program and the more likely collaborative opportunities would not be overlooked. A further insight was that there was no "best" model of collaboration, that the best was likely to be a function of the country-specific situation. Nevertheless, there seemed to be a need for a tool to help Peace Corps missions and USAIDs test their level of collaboration in various activities susceptible to joint efforts.

This led to the preparation of the matrix in Table II-1 below. It provides on the horizontal axis gradations of information exchange and participation in decision-making. The vertical axis lists the various functions which are susceptible to collaborative effort. The idea is that the two missions use the items on the horizontal axis of the matrix as a checklist to assess their collaboration in overall program planning. It is not anticipated that there will be a joint decision on each mission's country program, but that there will be joint brainstorming and discussion of each mission's program plans before final decisions were made by the respective director.

The second use proposed for the matrix is the joint preparation and/or review of a matrix for each Peace Corps activity and USAID-supported project in the two missions' active and planned portfolios. In project design, special focus should be placed on impact and sustainability and how progress on each can be determined and hopefully measured. Such a joint effort is likely to turn up possibilities for collaboration that would not otherwise be readily apparent.

TABLE II-1
COLLABORATION CHECKLIST

Project/Activity: _____

Process	Information Exchanged/Shared				Participation in decision process			
	None	USAID Info to PC	PC info to USAID	Joint sharing of info	Unilateral decision	USAID Input to PC decision	PC Input to USAID decision	Joint decision-making
Project identification								
Project design								
Project Approval								
Project funding								
Project oversight								
Project implementation								
Project monitoring								
Project evaluation								

NOTE: This sort of checklist could also be used to review collaboration with PVOs, when involved, host country organizations, and project/activity participants.

C. COOPERATION VS. COLLABORATION

In trying to understand the relative lack of interest and enthusiasm for A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration, team members reviewed the report to Congress and noted that it was called A.I.D.-Peace Corps cooperation, not collaboration. They then returned to the scope of work and noted that joint cooperation was in the title and in the introductory sections, but that collaboration was used predominantly in the operational sections. This finding encouraged team thinking about the difference between cooperation and collaboration.

The teams conclude that collaboration is certainly an act of cooperation, but that cooperation can include a number of things without necessarily requiring collaboration. Thus, some field attitudes became clearer. They were indeed cooperating, so why the big fuss? Most had not taken the time, which they feel is a very scarce resource, to look at the possibilities for and advantages of collaboration. Collaboration implies a greater commitment of time to information sharing and joint participation in each mission's decision-making process; a lot of acts of cooperation do not require such an investment.

The teams' findings have convinced them that a higher level of joint program planning will result in better programs for both agencies and probably more integrated A.I.D.-Peace Corps projects. Further, joint participation in project development would ensure better designed projects, i.e., more easily implementable, likely to have greater impact, and with a better chance of being sustainable. It does not necessarily follow that integrated USAID-Peace Corps projects are always the preferred mode of collaboration; in fact, a sharing of resources will not always be the result of collaboration at the planning level. Nevertheless, collaboration should result in benefits to both agencies and to the development impact of their programs.

The benefits of collaboration are discussed further in Chapter III. The team's thoughts on modes of collaboration are set forth in Chapter IV.

III. COLLABORATION BENEFITS AND OPPORTUNITIES

In the two agencies' second report to the Congress on their cooperation (August 1989), they said:

"Cooperation is not being pursued as an end itself, but as a means to increase the effectiveness of both A.I.D. and Peace Corps programs in bringing the benefits of development to people who are the ultimate concern of both agencies."

The report went on to identify specific ways that each agency benefits from cooperation. These benefits are discussed below in terms of the evaluation teams' findings. The section then continues with observations on the effect of collaboration on impact and sustainability and concludes with a discussion of opportunities for improved and expanded collaboration.

A. BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION

1. Benefits to A.I.D.

According to the report to Congress cited above, A.I.D. obtains the following from cooperation with Peace Corps:

- Vital grassroots workers who can help make A.I.D.-supported programs work at the level of poor communities.
- On-the-scene observers of the programs it is funding.
- Technically trained volunteers who are bi-cultural, bilingual, and willing to live in circumstances of poverty and isolation.
- Personnel to help plan and carry out important pilot projects which can lead to larger programs.
- A training ground for development officers.
- Peace Corps's assistance in identifying and evaluating projects and accounting for funds spent at the community level.

The teams' comments regarding the foregoing, based on their observations in the field, are set forth below.

a. Grassroots Workers in A.I.D.-Supported Community Programs

Good examples of this extension type activity are provided in the Togo, Lesotho, Ghana, and Botswana case studies (see annexes to this report). Possibilities for such cooperation were also identified in Mali and Burundi.

Unfortunately, there are trends in A.I.D. which are leading to a reduction rather than an increase in this type of cooperation. For example, there is a growing focus in A.I.D. programs on policy reform, and it is usually assumed that there is no need for grass roots types of projects in

policy reform programs. The evaluation teams do not accept this logic; rather, they feel that grass roots projects often may be necessary to know whether the policy reforms are really being effective and having the desired impact. This is discussed further in the Collaboration Opportunities section below.

Another trend identified which appears to militate against an increase in the use of PCVs in extension type projects is the increasing number of trained local nationals and the reluctance of A.I.D. and A.I.D. grantees or contractors to use PCVs when local nationals are available. In general, the teams agree that PCVs should not be substituted for host country nationals (HCNs). It is important to recognize, however, that technically trained HCNs are not necessarily as attuned to local conditions in multi-lingual societies as are culturally trained PCVs. Further, the dedication and work attitudes that PCVs bring to the job can also be beneficial in project implementation. Thus, PCV participation is still advantageous even when most of the project participants will be HCNs.

b. On-the-scene Observers of A.I.D. Programs Willing to Serve in Isolated Areas

The degree of isolation of some PCVs' assignments was brought home to the teams when they met a PCV in Mali who would not use his motor bike to go to some villages because the villagers had never seen a white person or a motor bike. Then there was the chartered aircraft trip, coupled with a several mile walk, in Lesotho to get to the area where a PCV went horseback to serve some 50 teachers in 13 schools in the highlands.

There seems to be a field attitude in A.I.D. that the availability of grass-roots observers is of reduced importance because of A.I.D.'s growing focus on policy reform. The teams found that PCVs are well grounded in the local situation and in the conditions that facilitate and hinder development. PCVs' insights would be of value to USAIDs, even in the formulation and evaluation of policy reform programs. PCVs can also be helpful in the implementation of the activities to which U.S. financial assistance in supporting policy reforms is sometimes applied.

The teams observed that there is little hard data on the impact and sustainability of either A.I.D. or Peace Corps activity. PCVs could be especially valuable in the design, management, and evaluation of data collection efforts to overcome this lack.

The design and evaluation of almost any A.I.D. project could be enhanced by including second or third-year PCVs on design and evaluation teams.

Based on other evaluations carried out by members of the evaluation teams, it is clear that A.I.D. personnel get to the field less and less and have little time when they do get there. Furthermore, information provided by host country counterpart organizations often is inaccurate, either because of weaknesses in the data collection system or because of deliberate "adjustment" of the data at various points in its collection and consolidation. Thus, the teams put greater importance on the value to USAIDs

of PCV observations and insights than most of the USAID personnel interviewed seem to do.

c. Pilot Projects

Small-scale, pilot activities carried out by PCVs can be useful in testing the feasibility of introducing new technology, methods, or organizational structures on a broad scale, both in the host country and in other countries with similar conditions and problems. If successful, they can lead to larger investments by A.I.D.

The teams saw examples of such pilot activities in Burundi and Lesotho. In addition, an A.I.D.-funded project in Togo that is terminating started out as a PC-managed project and that experience led to the success of the larger project. The larger project probably would have been more successful had PCVs continued to have more input into its design and management.

A.I.D. would especially benefit from this type of collaboration with Peace Corps in two types of activities. The first is pilot projects of the type organized by A.I.D.'s Bureau of Science and Technology. The Bureau can contract for the technical experts, but it is more difficult to find people who are sensitive to the local conditions in which the new technology needs to be introduced or adapted.

The second type of activity would be where a USAID is planning a significant intervention which is to have its primary impact at the local level or its impact at other levels will depend primarily on local attitudes or responses to factors which will affect the success of the project. The USAID would be well advised to start with a pilot project to test the waters, and Peace Corps participation could be very helpful.

d. A Training Ground for Development Officers

This has certainly been taking place. The teams encountered a large number of ex-PCVs serving with A.I.D. Generally, this facilitates A.I.D.-Peace Corps cooperation, but it does not guarantee a high level of collaboration. When ex-PCVs become A.I.D. officers, they enter a new sub-culture and encounter a different set of priorities; the working conditions are not always conducive to thinking about how collaboration could be expanded and/or strengthened. Furthermore, ex-PCVs' attitudes toward cooperation may reflect their reactions to their own PC experience which may not have been positive. The level of expertise of PCVs and training provided them may also be much better now than what the ex-PCV assumes based on his/her own experience.

Besides gaining from the employment of ex-PCVs, A.I.D. could also benefit by having new officers at a post participate in some of the modules of training given to in-coming PCVs, e.g., the host country cultural environment and an introduction to local languages.

e. Assistance in Identifying and Evaluating Projects and Accounting for Funds Spent at the Local Level

This seems to refer primarily to the identification by PCVs of small projects at the community level which are funded from A.I.D.'s Small Projects Assistance Fund and managed by PCVs in conjunction with local groups. Unfortunately, most USAID officers do not see this of any advantage to A.I.D. Given the way the program is administered, i.e., without any USAID participation, the teams would tend to agree with this conclusion. The teams believe, however, that greater USAID-Peace Corps interaction in the identification of development problems and the design of country programs (both A.I.D. and Peace Corps) could result in the design of a small projects program that could support both A.I.D.'s and Peace Corps's objectives in the country. For the most part, neither A.I.D. nor Peace Corps field staffs seemed particularly attuned to the value to each of undertaking mutually reinforcing activities.

Reference has already been made in b. above to the value of having PCV participation in the design and evaluation of A.I.D. projects.

f. PCV Activities as Follow-up to A.I.D. Projects

This kind of support to A.I.D. was not mentioned in the report to the Congress, but it was observed by the teams in Lesotho and Togo. By follow-up is meant PCV activities which are introduced or continue after an intervention by USAID has been phased out.

Although host country organizations may intellectually understand the logic behind A.I.D.'s phase-out of successful activities, they do not accept it emotionally and they can become angry. When PCVs are in the project and continue after USAID's pull out, the phase out is made less abrupt. PCVs can ensure follow up and work toward ensuring sustainability.

2. Benefits to Peace Corps from A.I.D. Collaboration

The report to Congress cited above states that the Peace Corps obtains the following from cooperation with A.I.D.:

- A.I.D. resources to support community projects sponsored by PCVs.
- A.I.D. funds to support technical improvements in PC programs and in the training of PCVs and their host country counterparts.
- The benefit of comprehensive A.I.D. analysis of the host country's problems and development needs.
- A "partner" staffed with Peace Corps alumni who can augment Peace Corps's resources and help provide technical continuity to Peace Corps programs.
- Greater access to other international development institutions.

- Strengthened host country institutions which enable PCVs to have a more effective and satisfying term of service.

The teams' comments on the foregoing, based on their field observations, are set forth below.

a. A.I.D. Resources for Community Projects

Most USAID and Peace Corps people see the transfer of A.I.D. resources to Peace Corps as the principal advantage to Peace Corps of collaboration with A.I.D. However, there are mixed feelings in Peace Corps about the availability of project funds for use by PCVs. There are some Peace Corps staff and volunteers who are not happy about PCVs being seen by villagers as a source of funds, and some PCVs do not like to have the responsibility for monitoring the use of the A.I.D. Small Projects funds. On the other hand, many PCVs that the teams met felt that the availability of funds in certain circumstances increased considerably the likelihood that their assignment would have a significant impact. This, in turn, made them feel better about their tour.

The evaluation teams see utility in providing some project money to support PCV activity, but believe the use of the funds and volunteers' experiences could be enhanced by giving the program more structure and more flexibility in funding. This is discussed further in Chapter V -- A.I.D. Financial Support to Peace Corps.

b. Technical and Training Support

This refers to the Participating Agency Service Agreements (PASAs) that have been signed between the two agencies which provide funding for program development, project design, and training (design and implementation). These come largely from technical offices in A.I.D.'s Bureau of Science and Technology and are made available to Peace Corps's Office of Training and Program Support (OTAPS). A recent exception is the grant of the Marketing, Development and Investment office in A.I.D.'s Africa Bureau to the Africa Region in Peace Corps for micro-enterprise initiatives in selected African countries.

The evaluation teams found that the availability of these funds was not well known in the field. Some who knew of the funds did not know that A.I.D. was the source. Few Peace Corps staffers were familiar with the limitations on and procedures for their use. USAID staff generally were even less informed about the PASAs.

In an earlier era, A.I.D. made special grants to private voluntary organizations (PVOs) so that they could improve their project development and evaluation skills and thus become more effective partners in development. The current use of PASA funds for program development and project design could be seen in the same vein -- as a means of strengthening Peace Corps in areas in which it has been weak -- so it can become a more effective partner with A.I.D. This can be particularly important as A.I.D. faces staffing and funding reductions, and the Peace Corps is asked to become the sole U.S. development presence in more countries.

In a similar vein, the use of A.I.D. funds to finance training for PCVs and their counterparts can make USAIDs more willing to increase the use of PCVs in A.I.D.-financed projects and hopefully accept them more as partners in such projects. Also, it can help overcome the reticence of some host governments to cut back on the use of PCVs as their own nationals become better trained. With training, PCVs can move into positions which support host country nationals.

As an example of the foregoing, the team found situations in which PCVs had originally been in teaching positions. Then, when national teachers became available, PCVs moved into support roles in teacher training or the development of instructional materials. Similar roles can be carried out in the health field, i.e., PCVs should not be dispensers of treatment, but they can be supportive in developing health education materials and the coordination of their testing and use in villages. PCVs could also play supportive and coordinating roles in agricultural research and extension, agro-forestry, and resource conservation.

c. Use of A.I.D. Analysis of the Host Country Situation

While this is of potential value to Peace Corps missions and Peace Corps officials in Washington who review mission submissions, the evaluation teams found little evidence that A.I.D. analyses were being used by Peace Corps. Increased Peace Corps participation in the USAID preparation of its strategies and assessments could stir greater Peace Corps interest.

d. A "Partner" Staffed with PC Alumni Who Can Augment PC resources and Help Provide Technical Continuity to PC Programs

Although the evaluation teams encountered good Peace Corps-A.I.D. relations in most of the countries it visited, a real sense of partnership was unusual in both agencies. There seemed to be little inclination on the part of Peace Corps staff to seek USAID financial or technical help. Similarly, there was little evidence that USAID would have been anxious to have such requests except on a limited and occasional basis. The teams agree, however, that a greater sense of partnership would be beneficial to both agencies' programs and to the achievement of U.S. development goals.

e. Greater Access to Other International Development Institutions

Again, the teams agree that this is a potential advantage to Peace Corps, but observations in the field suggest that any benefits being gained now are likely to be more accidental than intentional.

f. Strengthened Host Country Institutions

While some A.I.D.-sponsored projects do support institution building, it is unlikely that Peace Corps personnel would see this as a particular advantage of cooperation with A.I.D. unless they were directly involved in the A.I.D.-funded project.

g. Involvement in More Structured Projects

Although not mentioned in the report to Congress, the teams feel that there is a clear advantage to PCVs and Peace Corps staff when PCVs are associated with A.I.D.-funded projects. Although the issue is still being debated, most PCVs and Peace Corps staffers the teams met felt that PCVs are likely to achieve more in development terms, and thus have a greater sense of accomplishment, when they are included in an activity or project with some structure. A.I.D.-funded projects have such structure. The potential problem in such arrangements is that assigned volunteers might feel overly constrained and unable to have any secondary activities or that the volunteers feel they are being treated as cheap labor, not as a partner in the development process.

B. THE EFFECT OF COLLABORATION ON IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

Collaboration between Peace Corps and A.I.D. is not the only determinant of impact and sustainability. Impact and sustainability can occur with and without collaboration between Peace Corps and A.I.D., and collaboration does not assure them. But collaboration can and does improve impact and sustainability.

1. Collaboration and Impact

As A.I.D. efforts become more policy and less project oriented, direct contact with poor people diminishes. Nevertheless, in addition to endorsing a policy reform approach, the Development Fund for Africa (DFA) stipulates that A.I.D. show "people level" impact. PCVs work directly with poor people. It would seem, then, that A.I.D. should seriously pursue partnership with Peace Corps in meeting the "people level" impact requirements imposed by Congress.

If Peace Corps is to help A.I.D. meet its "people level impact" obligations in Africa, it must be able to show evidence of impact. Peace Corps has little experience or expertise in monitoring systems and evaluation; therefore, if it is left to its own devices, it is not likely to produce evidence of impact. Thus, A.I.D. should be prepared to provide monitoring and evaluation help to Peace Corps as a help to both agencies. In some cases, this may not be needed if the PCVs are integrated into a project administered by a PVO with the requisite skills in impact evaluation.

The evaluation teams found little hard information on impact of either A.I.D. projects or Peace Corps activities. In the few evaluations available on joint A.I.D.-Peace Corps projects, there was hardly any mention of the Peace Corps contribution, let alone an assessment of the collaborative effort. It is unlikely that this situation will change until evaluation instructions are changed to provide for such an assessment.

2. Collaboration and Sustainability

For sustainability to result, both A.I.D. and the Peace Corps need indigenous partners who see sufficient value and benefit from the activity to be willing to assume ownership of it and invest sufficient resources to continue it after external support is withdrawn.

We found very few instances where impact and sustainability factors were receiving sufficient attention. We found only one case of A.I.D./PC collaborative activity at the local level in which indigenous organizations had been involved as full partners and considered the activity sufficiently "theirs" and of sufficient value that they would attempt to sustain it if outside support was withdrawn. That instance was the Collaborative Community Forestry Initiative (CCFI) in Ghana, in which the District level local government authorities, the local representatives of the national Forestry Department, the village communities involved and a local Ghanaian non-governmental organization had all indicated a willingness to contribute resources to sustain the effort. CCFI also has the virtue of being organized in such a way that the principal activity (village nurseries) has the potential to earn sufficient income to sustain the activity and return a profit.

The two-year duration of most Peace Corps assignments and the lack of guarantees that a follow-on volunteer will be assigned to the same position are factors which militate strongly against both impact and sustainability. Volunteers identified these factors as representing a strong disincentive to undertaking significant initiatives which could not be brought to fruition or institutionalized within the time frame of their assignment. Volunteers working within the local government bureaucracy frequently saw themselves as relatively powerless to effect change because of their status. They saw A.I.D. as a valuable ally for effecting change because of its lengthier involvement, relatively greater access to higher levels of government, and its greater clout by virtue of the size of its program.

C. COLLABORATION OPPORTUNITIES

In this section, some functional areas in which Peace Corps and A.I.D. might productively collaborate are described. In addition to resource sharing and A.I.D. financial support of PCVs, "collaboration" means joint decision making and action in the areas of: project identification, objective setting, planning, management, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

1. Economic Policy Reform

A.I.D.'s economic policy focus offers opportunities for collaboration. The reforms included in a sector or macro-economic policy reform package require the recipient government to take unfamiliar actions to carry them out and to utilize effectively the local currency resources which emanate from the package. At the same time A.I.D., as in the Ghana case, is generally reducing its technical support to the government, and the government is downsizing its own bureaucracy as an austerity measure. This combination of factors opens up a number of opportunities for an entrepreneurially inclined Peace Corps Director to make useful suggestions to the recipient government

on ways which volunteers could help in implementing the reform program, irrespective of the sectors involved. Wise USAID Directors should encourage Peace Corps Directors in this direction, since the success of the policy reform program they are supporting will probably be equally dependent on technical assistance from some source. The keys to success will lie in correctly identifying the areas in which Peace Corps could be helpful and in Peace Corps being able to recruit and provide qualified volunteers in a timely manner.

2. Micro-Enterprise

One USAID Private Sector Officer suggested to the MSI team that A.I.D.'s focus on policy rather than discrete projects "leaves the field open" for Peace Corps and PVO projects in small and micro-enterprise. As part of the "policy approach," many studies of the business environment have been conducted. These could be used by Peace Corps to design projects around the problems and opportunities identified in the studies. He explained how in exchange for policy compliance, African governments receive large amounts of dollars which they must match by an equivalent amount of local currency. Some of these counterpart funds might be "earmarked" for loans to the types of businesses PCVs and PVOs work with.

Many PCVs remark that small businessmen need simple accounting, inventory, and marketing skills. The experience of small business PCVs in Mali suggests that with proper training and an unsophisticated clientele, generalists can:

Organize courses on simple business skills;

Teach simple business skills;

Consult with small businesses on accounting, inventory, market analysis, and credit facilitation; and

Set up rural-urban marketing links for agricultural products.

Some clients for, and providers of, the business training might come from among the masses of unemployed "young graduates" turned out by African schools. Traditionally, African governments have hired many of these young people, but the hiring has ceased due to austerity and privatization policies imposed by the IMF, World Bank, and A.I.D. Perhaps the "young graduates" can be transformed from an economic drag into an economic resource for Africa.

The value of PCVs to A.I.D.'s small enterprise development activities is illustrated by discussions the team had with a USAID-funded technical advisor working in this area in Botswana. Asked to tell what he felt were the most important things to be done to stimulate small enterprise development in Botswana based on his experience, he identified the following: 1) take business education efforts to the villages, do not just do them in Gaborone; 2) do the education at hours when the clientele is free to come; 3) do it with materials which are relevant to the clientele's culture, educational level, and business needs. On reflection, it was agreed that PCVs are very well suited to meet these requirements.

3. Agriculture - FSR

There may be potential for PCVs to help African farmers derive benefit from A.I.D.'s large investment in Farming Systems Research (FSR). FSR's problem (documented by recent evaluations) has been the limited extension of FSR technologies to common farmers. PCVs working in rural areas could help solve the problem. It is not suggested that PCVs become data collectors or that they become experts in FSR techniques -- although these are possibilities. Rather, PCVs might help extension efforts by finding innovative, competent farmers and gaining their confidence so that FSR staff can work with them. Also: 1) Peace Corps might have special programs for graduates of the U.S. universities carrying out FSR programs in Africa; 2) FSR might be included in PCV training; and 3) PCVs might orient FSR researchers on the realities of local farm life.

4. Basic Education

Congress has mandated the A.I.D. Africa Bureau to mount additional basic education initiatives in several countries. The Peace Corps, with its years of direct involvement in education in Africa, could be of great help to A.I.D. in launching new elementary education projects. Consultations are already underway to involve Peace Corps volunteers in new projects in Mali, Botswana, and Lesotho.

Experience in the countries the teams visited suggests that, as a minimum, new project designs should include workshops with Peace Corps volunteers who have been working in and around rural schools in the country concerned. In addition to project design, PCVs should be able to help conduct pilot efforts, develop practical teaching approaches and materials, and provide teacher training. Volunteers might also be used during implementation to get parents and communities interested and involved in community rehabilitation and management of schools.

Volunteers with the right qualifications can also be highly effective in introducing more efficient management systems in education, as the team observed in Botswana, and at far less cost than through contract technical assistance. Volunteers can also be a cost effective means of providing in-service resource support to rural primary teachers, as evidenced by an example observed in Lesotho, where one PCV on horseback serves about 50 teachers in 13 primary schools from one location. Opportunities for this kind of direct low cost grass-roots impact should not be missed in new A.I.D. primary education project designs.

5. Community Health Education

In Togo, a health PCV designed a community health education project which was supported technically by A.I.D. through a PASA with the Center for Disease Control and financially from the regional Combatting Childhood Communicable Diseases (CCCD) project. PCVs help communities organize programs and train "animateurs" for education campaigns on vaccinations, malaria control, and nutrition. CDC personnel feel the PCVs, even those with generalist backgrounds, are ideal for carrying out this extension function. The above model probably could be repeated elsewhere in Africa.

6. Natural Resources

Several instances were found of PCVs playing highly valuable roles as temporary substitutes for indigenous personnel in natural resource management, e.g., in teaching positions introducing environmental and natural resource conservation education into local communities and in introducing or assisting with environment and conservation oriented activities within communities. Spurred by increased public and Congressional awareness and pressure, the development community is giving increased attention to environmental and natural resource concerns. This fact, coupled with the shortage of indigenous expertise, the high cost of contracted external expertise, and the willingness of volunteers to work in remote areas would appear to make PCVs a valuable adjunct to expanding A.I.D. natural resources management and conservation efforts.

D. THE SYNERGY OF PEACE CORPS-A.I.D. COLLABORATION

The previous sections have discussed ways that each of the two agencies could benefit from closer collaboration with the other. The emphasis has been on the impact of such collaboration on the individual projects or activities that each agency might be supporting. Collaboration should also be focussed on each agency's objectives in the host country and carried out, to the maximum extent feasible, with host country participation. This could affect each agency's choice of projects/activities to support, as well as the mode of implementation. It is at the planning level that collaboration should begin, and it is there that benefits may be greatest.

The evaluation teams strongly believe that the synergistic effect of improved and expanded collaboration is greater than the sum of benefits to each agency. This is also the view of both the Peace Corps and A.I.D. missions in Botswana, the country where the team found the strongest interest in collaboration and the greatest efforts being made to expand it. Both they and the evaluation teams believe the benefits of increased collaboration will be reflected in the overall impact of the U.S. government development effort in the host country and in the more rational use of the taxpayers' dollars.

IV. MODALITIES FOR A.I.D. - PEACE CORPS COLLABORATION

In the countries visited, the teams found A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration occurring in the following modalities:

- o A.I.D. projects with PCVs assigned to them;
- o Participation of PCVs and A.I.D. in PVO projects;
- o Projects designed and managed by Peace Corps, with A.I.D. funding;
- o PCVs and A.I.D. working in the same sector and collaborating informally.

This chapter describes some of the problems encountered in each of these modes and recommends solutions to them. The final section collapses these modes into three basic models and relates them to future trends.

A. A.I.D. PROJECTS WHICH EMPLOY PCVS

In A.I.D. projects which make use of PCVs, the design and management of PCV activities are largely the responsibilities of A.I.D.-financed technical assistance staff. Participation of PCVs in A.I.D. projects is of benefit to A.I.D., and can contribute to the PCV experience. To enhance the utility of this modality, certain weaknesses in current practice should be guarded against:

1. During project design, PCVs tend to be used as information sources rather than design partners. Team members think that larger PCV involvement in design would result in more appropriate and/or implementable projects.
2. During project implementation there can be tension between the PCVs and A.I.D.-contracted technical assistance staff. Sources of tension between A.I.D. technical assistants and PCVs can be a responsibility/authority mis-match, sensitivities over salary differentials, and differences in operational vs. advisory roles. A.I.D. technical assistants may perceive they have the responsibility for managing the PCVs, without official authority to do so. Officially, PCVs work for Peace Corps, not for the USAID project.
3. Unless special attention is paid, PCVs are only tangentially involved or mentioned in evaluations, in which case an opportunity to learn is missed, and relations between Peace Corps and A.I.D. are harmed.

B. PCVS IN PVO PROJECTS

Conventional wisdom has it that Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs) are natural partners for Peace Corps, and that together they make natural partners for A.I.D. funding. The idea seems to be: A.I.D. provides the money, Peace Corps provides the manpower, and PVOs provide the management and technical oversight.

The CCFI project in Ghana (discussed in E. below) was the only instance in which A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration with PVO involvement could be perceived as approaching the ideal. The CLUSA project in Mali is a good example of integrating PCVs in host country national teams. Other observations and interviews with PVO representatives during this evaluation indicate that the conventional wisdom regarding A.I.D./PC/PVO collaboration is at best only partially true. Many PVOs see PCVs as useful in very specific situations, not as a general rule, because of the increasing numbers of highly qualified nationals who are attractive employees for PVOs. Following are the results of interviews with some PVO personnel.

CLUSA (the Cooperative League of the USA) in Mali is giving seven PCVs additional training in small business extension for inclusion in an A.I.D.-funded project being implemented by CLUSA. The PCVs receive the small business training along with their Malian counterparts. The logic of using the PCVs is that it will infuse the Malian small business extensionists with the American practical, hands-on way of doing things.

Planning International/Mali has no official relationship with Peace Corps/Mali; however, a significant relationship has developed between Planning International/Mali (Foster Parents in the US) and PCVs in Mali. Planning International has money to spend on small projects such as wells, but insufficient staff to identify projects, organize demand, train workers, and supervise project work. In several instances PCVs have performed these functions and Planning International is apparently willing to let PCVs manage their development investments.

Africare in Mali has funded specific PCV projects, such as bee-keeping, out of their small project funds, and found the experience satisfying. They are happy to consider using PCVs in A.I.D.-funded projects, but urge that use of PCVs not be an absolute requirement. They are fearful that Peace Corps may not be able to deliver the PCVs promised, or that the PCVs when they arrive may not be qualified. Apparently they had requested volunteers some time in the past, and Peace Corps could not deliver. In its A.I.D.-funded projects, Africare/Mali left open the alternative of recruiting its own personnel. It does not want to go to the trouble of designing and launching projects, and then having them fail because PCVs do not arrive. They also fear that insisting on the inclusion of PCVs in A.I.D.-funded projects, or rewarding such inclusion, may result in placing PCVs in jobs where they are not appropriate.

Catholic Relief Services (CRS) in Togo has employed individual PCVs to perform specific tasks in the past, but foresees no collaboration with Peace Corps in the future for two reasons. First, there is an increasing number of highly qualified Togolese nationals with the same or better skills as those PCVs bring to a project. Obviously, from a developmental point of view, it is better to employ nationals than expatriates. Second, Catholic Relief Services is moving away from "hands on" delivery of service, and toward building of local institutions that deliver the services. It is CRS's impression that PCVs bring with them more of a "hands on" than an "institution building" approach.

ADRA in Ghana is the only case found where there was unqualified satisfaction by the PVO with the role of PCVs (as well as others). The teams believe this is attributable to the collegial manner in which the project was

designed and implemented, the clear division of roles and functions among the various participants, and the open and continuous communication among them.

C. PROJECTS DESIGNED AND MANAGED BY PEACE CORPS

This mode seems to be becoming increasingly popular with Peace Corps. For example, PCVs working in and around wilderness preserves in Burundi wrote an initial proposal for national park management and promotion which was elaborated by Peace Corps and A.I.D./Washington specialists and funded by A.I.D./Washington. Project implementation is being managed by an ex-PCV contracted by the Peace Corps.

When USAID decided to discontinue funding of the home gardens component of one of its agricultural projects in Lesotho due to failure to meet production objectives, the Peace Corps developed a variant with greater PCV involvement which USAID agreed to support.

In general, we feel collaboration through the design of projects by Peace Corps, preferably with A.I.D. technical support, is a promising model. Strengths of this approach are: 1) A project based on field experience; 2) project management which understands and cares about the project concept; 3) low cost; and 4) little management load on USAID.

This approach has some correctable weaknesses, some of which are listed below.

Design: 1) Due to the inexperience of Peace Corps field staff with design of development assistance projects, the design may fail to include certain elements needed, particularly in the way of technical or administrative support. 2) If the project is not set within a broader strategic context, it may subsequently run into implementation difficulties or have its impact reduced because of policy, political, or technical problems which it cannot solve on its own. Nesting the project within the context of a broader USAID or other donor program could help overcome these problems.

Implementation: The experience in the Burundi case suggests that: 1) there can be serious project cycle mis-matches between Peace Corps and A.I.D. which damage project operations and effectiveness; and 2) roles and responsibilities of those responsible for implementation need to be clearly defined and not too broad as to be unattainable.

A more general problem is the lack of country Peace Corps Mission staff to carry out management, monitoring and evaluation functions in connection with these projects. In programs exceeding 150 PCVs there is provision for a Program and Training Officer. Mali has experimented with making this person the "Program, Management and Evaluation Officer" but without dropping the person's other duties -- which take up 95 percent of his time. In other countries, we also found that the APCDs are first and foremost front line managers of PCVs and do not find sufficient time to deal with project design and management. Their first priority has to be taking care of PCV training and support. In the Ghana CCFI case this problem was solved by hiring an ex-PCV on contract as the field level monitor.

D. A.I.D. AND PEACE CORPS WORKING IN THE SAME SECTOR AND COLLABORATING INFORMALLY

We found this mode of collaboration occurring in countries with relatively large Peace Corps programs in which volunteers were assigned to government staffs in much the same role as OPEX personnel funded by A.I.D. and other donors. Collaboration is largely informal and similar to that which would be expected among people with similar or complementary professional backgrounds working towards the same basic goals and objectives. In some cases, A.I.D. technical advisors, frequently themselves ex-PCVs, are encouraging or facilitating the placement of volunteers into the government ministries and departments they are assisting. In some instances, USAIDs have used project funds to procure equipment to facilitate the work of PCVs working in an area relevant to the project's interest, even though no direct or formal connection existed between the PCV assignment and the USAID project.

This form of collaboration is greatly facilitated in circumstances such as we found in Botswana and Lesotho where the Peace Corps and USAID staffs communicate closely and share common goals and objectives in their programs, and where the leadership of the missions strongly encourages collaboration. It represents perhaps the easiest and least costly form of collaboration between the two agencies and one from which both they and the host country derive considerable benefit.

We did find, however, that some of the same potential pitfalls identified above in the case of volunteers working in A.I.D. projects applied also to this modality. While such circumstances were exceptions rather than the rule, there were instances in which volunteers resented what they perceived as status differences, attempts by A.I.D. Technical Assistance contractors to dominate them, and the inevitable pay comparison. Their views about association with A.I.D. were mixed, with some expressing a desire for more formal collaboration and others expressing concern about being too closely associated with A.I.D.

E. SUMMING UP

Our perception is that there are no modalities which are right or wrong, and no obvious instances where a particular modality fits best in a particular sector. The character and degree of collaboration are likely to be more relevant to results achieved from the collaboration than the modality through which collaboration is accomplished. Both the character and degree of collaboration and the modality employed depend on many country specific factors such as: attitudes of the individuals concerned; the character of the A.I.D. and Peace Corps programs; the activities and strengths of PVOs; government policies and organizations, etc. But their replicability within the African region also depends heavily on current trends in policies and programs within the Peace Corps and the A.I.D. Africa Bureau.

The best type of collaboration which we encountered was the CCFI project in Ghana. We found a high degree of collegiality, with all participants sharing more or less equally in responsibility for and ownership of the development activity. Whether consciously or unconsciously, there was an effort to achieve complementarity among the inputs which each participant provided to the undertaking. There was not so much a transferring of resources as there was a pooling of resources towards a common objective. This model allowed Peace

Corps to stay within its traditional role of volunteers working at the local level in direct contact with villagers, but encased the volunteer role within a more structured development enterprise and reinforced it with additional resources. This can both expand the volunteer's impact over that which would result from a single volunteer working alone in a village and enhance the sustainability of the volunteer activity by providing for follow-on reinforcement and by providing both the format and the additional inputs required to achieve sustainability.

Two intermediate models of collaboration which occurred more frequently than the CCFI model are more in keeping with current policy and program trends within each agency, and are therefore more likely to be replicable. Both were found to have addressable pitfalls and shortcomings which have been elaborated earlier, and to which attention must be given if the collaborative and development potentials of these models are to be realized in replicated efforts.

The first of these is the development, initiation, and management of projects by Peace Corps into which A.I.D. makes inputs of financial, and perhaps technical, support. This model is typified by the Home Gardens Nutrition project in Lesotho and the Natural Resource Management Support (Bio-diversity) project in Burundi.

This model involves a somewhat new role for Peace Corps and is creating some stresses and strains in the process. The steps which have been taken to date to compensate for Peace Corps inexperience in project design and management have been ad hoc and frequently unsatisfactory.

This model has the virtues that it gets Peace Corps more involved in major development problems in a structured way, and it can fill a need in those countries where the USAID is concentrating on policy and program assistance and reducing its people-level project assistance. It may also be useful for circumstances in which A.I.D. is not planning a major presence in a country and Peace Corps is called upon to play the U.S. development role.

The second intermediate model involves volunteers working either under, in place of, or in association with A.I.D. technical assistance personnel in host country government agencies or private organizations. This model both benefits from and enhances a trend towards higher level, more professionally qualified volunteers. It offers the potential for providing technical support and advice at less cost than when it is provided by A.I.D. or other donors, and may help to offset the reduced willingness and ability of donors to provide, and host countries to accept other forms of technical assistance -- because of cost and other factors.

Collaboration is of benefit to both parties in this model because A.I.D., if it is active in the same area, can provide supporting resources to enhance the volunteer's impact, and the volunteer in turn can make complementary A.I.D. assistance more effective. The teams found and have documented instances in which both have occurred.

V. A.I.D. FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF PEACE CORPS

A. THE NATURE OF THE A.I.D. FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE CORPS

The amount of money A.I.D. transfers to Peace Corps is small compared to its own budget and to Peace Corps's budget; yet it is of strategic importance to Peace Corps. A.I.D.'S contribution provides the bulk of project funding available to Peace Corps. It can also be used to strengthen the capabilities of PCVs and their host country counterparts.

Unfortunately, as explained later in this chapter, the bureaucraties involved in transferring the funds, from both A.I.D.'s and Peace Corps's point of view, are at times out of proportion to the amount of funds transferred.

Table V-1 on the following page outlines forms of funding which the MSI evaluation teams found in the six countries visited.

Table V - 1

FORMS OF FUNDING IN A.I.D.-PC COLLABORATION

	Botswana	Burundi	Ghana	Lesotho	Mali	Togo
1. PCVs working on a USAID-funded bilateral project	X	X 1/		X	X	X
2. USAID funding of a PC-supported activity		X 1/		X	X	X
3. USAID funding of individual PCV-generated projects (SPA) (ARDN)	X	X	X	X	X	X
4. USAID funding of PVO activity which uses PCVs			X 2/		X	
5. A.I.D./W funding of PVO activity which uses PCVs			X 2/			
6. A.I.D./W funding of individual PCV-generated projects (SPA Health)	X	X	X	X	X	X
7. A.I.D./W funding of a PC-managed project or activity		X				X
8. A.I.D./W PASA funding to support PC missions in program development and training:						
a. Forestry/Resource Mgt.	X		X		X	
b. Nutrition						
c. Micro Enterprise (S&T)	X				X	
d. Micro Enterprise (AFR)			X	X		
e. CCCD				X		
f. Child Survival					X	
g. TA/SPA					X	
h. TA/SPA/Hlth					X	

/1 Completed project.

/2 The CCFI project has received both A.I.D./W and USAID/Ghana funding.

B. THE USE OF PASA FUNDS

1. The PASAs Available

A.I.D. provides most of its identifiable funding to Peace Corps through PASAs (Participating Agency Service Agreement). PASA funding and funding trends are operative as shown on the following page.

PASA monies passed to Peace Corps, either directly from Washington or from USAID missions, can generally be spent on: program development, in-service training for PCVs, training for counterparts of PCVs, and in special cases pre-service training for PCVs. PASAs cannot be used to increase the number of volunteers the Peace Corps can put in the field.

Table V-2

FUNDING PROVIDED PEACE CORPS BY A.I.D./W
(FY 1987 - 89)

Natural Resources Management PASA			BST-5519-P-PC-2053
FY-89	400,000		
88	530,000		
87	1,094,000		
Small Project Assistance (SPA) Program PASA 1/			BST-1096-P-PC-3025
FY-89	600,000		
88	1,045,650		
87	840,000		
Nutrition PASA			BST-0262-P-PC-4005
FY-89	-0-	(time added)	
88	-0-		
87	60,000		
Child Survival PASA			DPE-5930-P-PC-6055
FY-89	741,000	2/	
88	269,630	3/	
87	300,000		
Farmer to Farmer PASA			OTR-0705-P-AG-7221
FY-89	198,000		
88	-0-		
87	194,700	4/	
Small Enterprise Approaches to Employment			DHR-1090-P-AP-8039
FY-89	562,663		
88	308,700	5/	
Bio-Diversity - Burundi			AFR-0467-P-AP-8033
FY-89	-0-		
88	180,000	6/	
Africa Private Enterprise Fund			AFR-04380P-AP-9051
FY-89	134,400	7/	

- 1/ Note that funds provided by USAID Missions for In-Country SPA projects are not included.
- 2/ Includes 441,000 for Guinea Worm eradication.
- 3/ Includes 69,630 for Child Survival.
- 4/ Forward funding for FY-88.
- 5/ First year of the PASA.
- 6/ First year of a two year PASA - two year funding provided.
- 7/ First year of the PASA.

2. Reporting

Because each PASA is separately negotiated with the different offices within A.I.D., PASA management and reporting requirements vary widely. Some of the PASAs call for quarterly reports, and some require annual reports. Some reports cover cumulative program and training activities, and some cover expenditures.

The inventories prepared (at Director Coverdell's request) for the Micro-Enterprise Development and Forestry PASAs could be considered as useful approaches to PASA reporting if combined with other PASA reports. These inventories include: volunteer (trainee) requests by project, by country; sector support of field activities by country; PCV and HCN participation by support activities; and budget allocations/requests for FYs 1989 and 1990 by support activity.

It would seem advantageous to both Peace Corps and A.I.D. if PASA contracting and reporting were standardized on a common model acceptable to both agencies. Reduced administration requirements for PASAs could facilitate their use.

3. Field Knowledge of the PASAs

The MSI evaluation teams observed that most of the Peace Corps and USAID missions they visited were poorly informed about PASAs and their uses. The missions found quite interesting the MSI matrix on the activities permissible under the various PASAs (see Table V-3 below).

Table V-3

Major Active PASAs							PASA Functions
Nutrition	SPA	Micro- Enterpr. (S&T)	Forestry	Child Survival	CCCD	MDI (ASAP -AFR)	
X	X		X			X	Needs Assessment
X	X		X			X	Project Design
X		X	X				Joint Programming Joint Planning
X	X	X	X	X	X		Joint Implementation PCV IST
X	X	X	X	X	X		PCV PST APCD IST
X	X	X	X	X	X		Training Design/Modules Staff Training/Wkshps
X	X	X	X	X			Counterpart Training Training Materials
	X		X	X	X		Program PCV Positions Materials Resources
	X	X	X	X			Technician Support Financial Resources
X	X	X	X	X	X		Management Support Evaluation
	X	X	X	X	X		Staff Training Salaries PCV Recruiting (special)
X	X	X	X	X			PVO Collaboration HC Recipient Training
	X	X	X				OTAPS New Position

Some Peace Corps staff thought the A.I.D. PASA money was OTAPS (PC/Office of Training and Program Support) money. Thus, they saw no need to coordinate with USAID.

The MSI team observed that the number, kind, and differences between PASAs make them complicated to administer. This problem is discussed in some detail in the following section on the bureaucraties of the transfer of funds from A.I.D. to Peace Corps.

C. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE CURRENT MODALITIES

1. Small Project Assistance Fund

The SPA or SPAF funding comes from each USAID budget beginning with FY 1990, whereas in prior years it was transferred to USAID by A.I.D./W as an add-on to the USAID's budget. In either case, an agreement is signed between USAID and the Peace Corps mission and the funds are then transferred to PC/Washington which in turn transfers the money to the PC mission. The projects are managed by the PC mission according to its own rules, in some cases by PCVs.

The SPA/Health fund also requires a local agreement between USAID and PC, but the funds are held at the A.I.D./W level and transferred to PC/W which in turn passes the funds to PC missions by project or by allocation.

Funds are available to PC missions to help them develop SPA or SPA/Health projects. These funds come from A.I.D./W to PC/W to PC missions upon individual request of the PC mission which must be approved by PC/W. USAIDs are generally not involved in these transactions.

USAIDs are anxious not to be involved in the administration of SPA funds and projects; they feel they have more than enough to do to manage their own direct portfolio.

Peace Corps missions generally are happy with these arrangements except that funds sometimes have not been available early in the fiscal year because uncommitted funds in one fiscal year are not immediately carried over to the following fiscal year. Each of the two SPA project funds plus each of the two technical assistance funds must be accounted for separately to PC/W.

Some PCVs welcome the chance to have access to a small amount of project funds; others do not wish to be seen as a source of funding and do not wish to be responsible for the funds. Some PCVs would like to use the fund, but find the rule that SPA projects must be finished before the PCV's departure limits the types of projects that can be undertaken. It is often not until the second year of a PCV's assignment that the volunteer has developed sufficient expertise on the area and confidence of the local group to be able to put together a meaningful project, and the project's implementation is likely to involve a lot of local labor and hence a significant amount of time.

A basic question needs to be asked: What is the primary purpose of having SPA funds available to PCVs? Is it so PCVs can have a more meaningful volunteer experience and make local people happy to have had a PCV around or is it to further development? If it is just the former, why not just increase the amount

of funds available through the Ambassador's Self-Help fund? It also comes out of the A.I.D. appropriation, and it continues to be tapped by PVCs.

If, on the other hand, the SPA activity is supposed to be supporting development, then we believe that it should be less restrictive in its uses. For example, SPA funds currently can finance agriculture, rural development, nutrition, and health activities but is not available for education and other special development activities. There seems to be no logic for the exclusion, particularly when Congress is telling A.I.D. to do more in basic education, micro-enterprise support, and resource preservation.

Since the Africa bureau of A.I.D. has the Development Fund for Africa, which encompasses all of the previous functional appropriations, it could provide SPA funding for African missions without restriction to particular functional categories.

PC missions make a point that they only undertake activities which are requested by host governments; yet, host governments generally do not approve the use of SPA funds. Mention has already been made of problems of carry over of funds from one year to another. If the USAID were to sign a grant agreement with the host country on the use of SPA funds by the Peace Corps, then host government approval would have been obtained and the funds would remain available until used up or the grant agreement expired. This procedure might not be feasible in all African countries, but we believe it is worthy of consideration in most.

2. PASA Funds for Training and Project Development

The PASA funds, other than for SPA activities and support, is provided to PC/W by offices of the S&T Bureau or the Marketing, Development and Investment office in the Africa Bureau of A.I.D./W. The use of the funds and the administration of the PASA is different for each PASA. Generally, however, funds can be spent on project design, design of training programs, in-service training, and in some cases pre-service training. The training usually must involve host country nationals as well as PCVs.

These funds are valuable to Peace Corps because it permits it to increase the professionalization of the volunteers and build rapport between volunteers and their host country counterparts. Having Peace Corps undertake pilot projects is useful to A.I.D./S&T because it facilitates the field testing of a particular technology or technique on a small scale. Normally, S&T has done this through the cooperation of USAIDs, but the latter are more and more reluctant to host such pilots because of declining staff levels and the need to minimize their management load.

The ability to use the funds for helping in the design of the project, which is allowable in some cases, is important because PC generally does not have design expertise. In one case, this outside help on design led to inclusion of a project coordinator in the funding of a PASA for a specific project, recognizing the limited management capability of the PC mission. That mission is now finding that even more administrative and logistic support should have been built in to the project. It is also looking to the possibility of having a private voluntary organization (PVO) take over the management of the project in its second phase.

It is understandable that S&T would look to Peace Corps to carry out small projects, i.e., try to use it like a PVO. USAIDs, because of pressure of personnel ceilings, are trying to consolidate smaller projects into larger ones in order to reduce its management load. Peace Corps is often not comfortable in large-scale activities, and thus looks with favor on an S&T overture which involves a smaller project and provides additional resources which can permit the PCVs to make a more significant contribution to local development--and thus have a more meaningful volunteer experience.

This evolution of roles may not be for the best. Often the USAID action described above just shifts the management or coordination load to host country government officials. Often the latter's management style is not conducive to the efficient implementation of such projects. Also, the officials are usually over-burdened trying to satisfy the requirements of the many donors eager to work in their country. For its part, Peace Corps may be getting in over its head when it starts taking on the implementation responsibility for projects (in contrast to SPA-funded mini-projects).

While there has been an expansion of PASAs with Peace Corps, there is no PASA in agriculture and rural development or in education. These are two of the most important functional fields in African development. The Africa Bureau of A.I.D. might wish to have its own PASA covering these areas and others as it has in micro-enterprise development. Because there is a single appropriation for DFA, perhaps a single PASA could be used to avoid further proliferation of PASA administrative provisions.

Unlike the SPA program, the PASA funds are available to PC missions without their having any contact with the local USAID. Most of the USAIDs we visited were not aware of the existence of most of the PASAs. In one case, the PC mission was requesting PASA funds to pass to a USAID contractor to finance the training of PCVs who would work with host country nationals being trained by the contractor under the USAID project. The USAID was unaware of the negotiations by the PC mission with the contractor and the resulting request for PASA funds.

Although the USAID is left totally out of the PASA loop and is spared any management burden, the Peace Corps seems overly burdened with administrative procedures for the amounts of money involved. Each PASA is different as far as what is permissible under it and in accounting and reporting requirements. In the field, the missions must send a request to PC/W for each use of a PASA. Only one of the six PC missions we visited had made significant use of the PASAs; none of them had a listing that showed what was permissible under each PASA.

VI. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED PLAN OF ACTION

A. GENERAL ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS

Major Findings

- (1) The principal focus of field cooperation is on resource sharing: A.I.D. financial support of PCV activities and PCV participation in A.I.D.-financed projects. There is some information sharing, little true partnership (the indicator of effective collaboration).
- (2) There is a great deal of ambivalence in both agencies about the desirability and feasibility of increasing A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration, and hence some confusion why Washington is emphasizing it.
- (3) There are untapped opportunities for collaboration -- see Chapter III and country studies (Annexes D - I).
- (4) The attitude of mission directors, especially USAID directors, is largely determinant of the level of collaboration in the field.

Conclusions

- (1) A higher level of joint A.I.D.-Peace Corps program planning in the field would result in better programs for both agencies and probably more integrated A.I.D.-Peace Corps projects.
- (2) Joint participation in project development would ensure better designed projects, projects that would be more easily implementable, likely to have greater impact, and with a better chance of being sustained.
- (3) The two agencies need to do a better job of sensitizing their personnel to the value of and potential for collaboration. It is collaboration, not cooperation, that should be emphasized.
- (4) Procedures and manuals in both agencies should give more emphasis to the value of A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration and provide better guidance to the missions of the two agencies about undertaking collaborative activity.

Recommended Actions

- (1) USAID and Peace Corps mission directors jointly review their programs and program plans, drawing on Chapters III and IV herein, to look for untapped opportunities for mutually supportive development-enhancing activities.
- (2) USAID and Peace Corps mission directors use the matrix in Table II-1 to review collaboration in individual projects and activities, giving special attention to impact and sustainability.
- (3) The new Director of the Peace Corps and the new Administrator of A.I.D. issue a joint statement affirming their support for a high level of

collaboration (not cooperation) between the two agencies and announce actions that have been or will be taken to emphasize the importance of and/or facilitate A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration. Actions announced could be drawn from those that follow below. They should also invite field comments on this report.

- (4) The Peace Corps Director and A.I.D. Administrator put collaboration on the agenda for the next regional meetings with their mission directors; if possible, the conferences should be co-located so that joint A.I.D.-Peace Corps meetings could be held to discuss collaboration.
- (5) The A.I.D. Administrator instruct the group working on a revision of Handbook III to include:
 - (a) information in Chapter I on the value to A.I.D. of obtaining Peace Corps participation in its projects;
 - (b) a provision in Chapters II and III of the Handbook that those identifying and designing new projects should invite the local Peace Corps mission to participate in the processes;
 - (c) a requirement that the scopes of work for project design teams instruct the team to assess the possibilities of Peace Corps participation in the proposed project;
 - (d) a requirement that the Project Identification Documents and Project Papers for new projects specifically address the possibilities for Peace Corps participation in the proposed project;
 - (e) a provision in Chapter 12 that all evaluations will include a section devoted to an assessment of A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration; if there was no Peace Corps participation in the project, the evaluation will address the reasons why Peace Corps did not participate and whether such participation might have strengthened the project. The assessment of A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration in final evaluations should focus particularly on:
 - how well the collaboration was carried out;
 - what contributions the Peace Corps made in terms of project implementation, project impact, and the likely sustainability of the project; and
 - any lessons learned for promoting more effective collaboration.
 - (f) provisions or statements elsewhere in the Handbook that would tend to foster improved collaboration between the two agencies in the development and implementation of projects.
- (6) Peace Corps's Office of Training and Program Support should revise its Programming and Training System Manual (October 1989) before sending it to the field to include more references to the importance of collaborating with USAIDs in the preparation of country programs, the planning and managing of projects, the development of technical training programs,

project monitoring, and project evaluation. In Section III, for example, more specificity could be made on pages 24, 26, 28, 31, 34, and 40.

- (7) Pending completion of the revisions in manuals and handbooks as recommended immediately above, the Director of the Peace Corps and the Administrator of A.I.D. should advise their field directors to invite participation of the other agency in the preparation of country programs and in the design of new projects.
- (8) The Joint Committee on A.I.D.-Peace Corps Collaboration should develop, or have developed more case material on successful collaborative projects and arrange for field personnel to discuss such activities at the proposed mission directors' conferences at which collaboration will be on the agenda. These collaborative success stories should also be written up in the two agencies' house organs.
- (9) The Joint Committee should have up-dated and distributed to the field a document similar to, but more comprehensive than, A Guide to A.I.D.-Peace Corps-PVO Collaborative Programming which was prepared in August 1984 by A.I.D.'s Office of Private & Voluntary Cooperation and Peace Corps's Office of Training & Program Support.
- (10) The Joint Committee develop the necessary documentation for an annual award for an individual (or group) who had been particularly successful in promoting effective collaboration between the two agencies and recommend that the two agencies make such an award annually.
- (11) The Joint Committee develop performance evaluation criteria on collaboration for inclusion in personnel evaluations of Peace Corps and USAID mission directors and directors of geographical offices in Washington.
- (12) The Joint Committee should review staff training programs in both Peace Corps and A.I.D. with a view to incorporating in such programs a component on A.I.D.-Peace Corps collaboration which would deal with the various types of collaboration discussed in this report, including the associated problem areas and remedies for them. Trainers and trainees from each agency should be involved in such training programs.

B. OPERATIONAL IMPEDIMENTS TO COLLABORATION

Major Findings

- (1) Peace Corps staff generally do not have significant experience or training in project design, monitoring, and evaluation; even officers who do are usually so burdened with the training and operational support of PCVs that they have little time for such activities. Hence, Peace Corps staff (and PCVs) are seldom involved in the planning of USAID-funded projects.
- (2) Most PVO representatives interviewed were not enthusiastic about incorporating PCVs in their projects except in special circumstances and on a limited basis.

- (3) Some USAID personnel feel that PCVs are not sufficiently trained to be incorporated in A.I.D. projects; others feel that there is a dwindling role for volunteers because of the increase in trained local nationals.
- (4) Many A.I.D. programs are focussing on policy reform and reducing the number of projects targeted at local communities; this is cited by some USAID personnel as a reason why there is no longer a basis for A.I.D.-Peace Corps joint activities.
- (5) A.I.D. personnel generally are not aware of the potential value to A.I.D. of Peace Corps activities that may serve as precursors or successors to USAID projects or that may be complementary to USAID sector policy reform efforts.
- 6) There was little evidence of interest by either USAIDs or Peace Corps missions in joint planning and collaborative implementation of projects; yet, the project which appeared most likely to be successful of any reviewed was collaboratively planned and is being implemented in a very collaborative fashion involving not only A.I.D. and Peace Corps but also a U.S. PVO, a local NGO, villagers, and governmental service organizations.
- (7) Some Peace Corps directors passively wait for host governments to come to them with proposals for use of volunteers rather than look for the best opportunities for PCV use. A variation is to seek to work only with a ministry with which there has been a good experience, thereby limiting opportunities.

Conclusions

- (1) Collaborative planning needs to be fostered; it would result in better programs for both agencies and better project implementation results.
- (2) Steps need to be taken to increase the likelihood of collaborative planning:
 - (a) Improvements should be made in the capabilities of Peace Corps staff in program development and project design and evaluation; this could help Peace Corps directors feel more confident in actively seeking opportunities for PCV assignments.
 - (b) USAID personnel need to be sensitized more to the value of collaboration with Peace Corps.
 - (c) Greater interaction should be fostered between A.I.D. staff and contractors, Peace Corps, and PVO personnel in situations in which attention is focussed on Peace Corps potentialities, thereby overcoming some of the misperceptions about PCV capabilities. Such meetings could also focus on the special position of PCVs in terms of their supervision and their need usually for opportunities for secondary activities.

Recommended Actions

- (1) Peace Corps increase its staff training in program planning and project design and evaluation. This might be done initially by including Peace Corps staff in specialized training programs of A.I.D.
- (2) Peace Corps reconsider its rule that staff assignments cannot exceed five years; longer tours would make staff training more cost effective.
- (3) Similarly, Peace Corps encourage more PCVs to extend their tours to three and four years and consider initiating, on a trial basis, the recruitment of volunteers committed to three or four-year tours.
- (4) A.I.D. and Peace Corps promote more collaborative workshops of the type that led to the design of the CCFI project in Ghana.
- (5) USAIDs set up workshops at the beginning of project implementation for all of the anticipated participants (e.g., Peace Corps staff and PCVs, USAID contractors, PVOs, local participating organizations, appropriate government personnel) to establish roles and responsibilities and implementation schedules.
- (6) A.I.D. instruct its field missions to look more closely for opportunities to integrate PCVs in their projects and for possibilities for Peace Corps interventions that might: (a) lead to eventual joint A.I.D.-Peace Corps projects; (b) facilitate, or ease the potential negative feelings about, the termination of AID funding -- especially in grass-roots activities; or (c) be supportive or test the results of USAID policy reform activities.
- (7) A.I.D. and Peace Corps increase staff exchanges, particularly in positions which will impact on field guidance on program development and project identification and design.

C. A.I.D. FINANCING OF PEACE CORPS ACTIVITIES

Major Findings

- (1) A.I.D. provides funding to Peace Corps for three major purposes:
 - Funding of small projects, e.g., through the Small Project Assistance funds;
 - Program development and project design; and
 - Training for Peace Corps staff, PCVs, and host national counterparts.
- (2) The amount of money A.I.D. transfers to Peace Corps is small compared to its own budget and to Peace Corps's budget, but it is of strategic importance to Peace Corps. It provides the bulk of project funding available to Peace Corps and it helps strengthen the capabilities of PCVs and their host country counterparts.

- (3) Most of the PASAs are between AID/S&T and PC/OTAPS; only two are specifically for Africa, one of which is funded by AID's Africa Bureau.
- (4) There are PASA agreements for most, but not all, A.I.D. appropriation functional accounts. Each agreement is different in terms of what can be financed and in terms of reporting and accounting requirements.
- (5) Most Peace Corps missions visited were not well informed about the technical PASAs; USAIDs' knowledge of the PASAs was even less.
- (6) Small Project Assistance funds were widely used and appreciated, although there were some PCVs and Peace Corps and USAID staff that were not pleased with PCVs being seen by villagers as a source of funding.
- (7) Although the Peace Corps mission must sign an agreement with USAID to obtain Small Project Assistance funds, USAIDs generally have minimal involvement in the administration of the program; they are generally not consulted at all on the use of the other PASAs.

Conclusions

- (1) There is no valid reason for limiting the technical PASAs and the Small Project Assistance program to a limited number of technical fields.
- (2) The PASA provisions could and should be standardized to the extent possible to facilitate their use. The Africa Bureau of A.I.D., because it has a single appropriation in lieu of the functional accounts, could have a single PASA with Peace Corps to cover all fields of activity.
- (3) Field missions should be better informed about the uses of the PASAs.
- (4) USAIDs should be more involved in decisions on the use of the PASAs; this could promote collaboration and quite possibly would result in better utilization of funds.

Recommended Actions

- (1) The technical PASAs be expanded to include the fields of agriculture and rural development and education, either from AID/S&T or from the Africa Bureau, and the Small Project Assistance funds become available for education and special development activities, particularly natural resource conservation and management.
- (2) The technical PASAs be modified to permit funds to be used for project/activity design and evaluation and for setting up data management systems for monitoring and impact data collection.
- (3) The Africa Bureau of A.I.D. consider enlarging its support to Peace Corps activities in Africa and do so through a single PASA with Peace Corps to cover all fields of activity, even if backstop responsibility were split between offices for different functional programs.

- (4) The Joint Committee on A.I.D.-Peace Corps Collaboration appoint a committee to standardize the accounting and reporting provisions of the various technical PASAs and to consider also standardizing the types of activities that can be funded under the PASAs.
- (5) The Joint Committee prepare a message for the field: (a) re-informing all Peace Corps and A.I.D. missions of the A.I.D. resources available through the PASAs and the ways they are to be used; and (b) requiring USAID clearance of Peace Corps mission requests for use of the funds.
- (6) A.I.D. and Peace Corps urge their missions to use the technical PASA funds to develop collaborative projects in Primary Education, Micro-enterprise Development, Child Survival, and Natural Resources Management and Conservation, areas of particular interest to Congress which appear ripe for expanded collaboration.
- (7) A.I.D. and Peace Corps develop and deliver a series of joint planning and programming workshops in the field and in Washington.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

There are untapped opportunities for collaboration that would be in the interest of both agencies and supportive of host countries' development efforts.

The synergistic effect of improved and expanded collaboration would be greater than the sum of benefits to each agency. This would be reflected in the overall impact of the U.S. government development effort in the host country and the more rational use of taxpayers' dollars.

The possibility of Peace Corps seeking to change its legislation and secure its own funding to replace that of A.I.D.'s PASAs and SPAs was briefly considered and then rejected as being counter to the purposes of collaboration and probably not cost-effective to the U.S. Government.

When designing new projects or activities, both agencies need to focus more on impact and sustainability and on how each agency's contribution can enhance project impact and sustainability and the measurement thereof.

SUMMARY OF SCOPE OF WORK

Evaluation Objectives

The objective of this evaluation is to determine under what circumstances, around what problems, and through what means collaboration has produced development benefits which would otherwise have been unrealized. This is primarily a qualitative effort based on observations, impressions, and structured interviews, to determine ways for A.I.D. and Peace Corps to improve their cooperative arrangements and enhance their ability to achieve mutual development objectives. However, to the extent possible, the evaluation should be quantitative. The focus is not to evaluate individual projects, but to measure the overall effect of collaboration on the program.

The evaluation is designed to examine existing program management arrangements in Washington and the field that promote and support joint A.I.D./Peace Corps collaboration. In carrying out the evaluation, the following is expected:

- Information regarding past and current A.I.D./Peace Corps cooperation will be enhanced;
- Strengths and weaknesses in the collaboration process that affect program success will be identified;
- The appropriate circumstances and means for joint collaboration are identified;
- Lessons learned are recognized and implications for future programming delineated; and
- Recommendations for strengthening and improving joint Peace Corps/A.I.D. planning, programming and implementation.

Scope of Work

The two evaluation teams will spend an initial one week in Washington to be briefed by the selected IQC firm, Peace Corps, and A.I.D. Interviews are to be conducted with previously selected staff in both Agencies in preparation for the field visits. Based on the evaluation questions listed below, a semi-structured interview is recommended.

Two teams travelling to three countries each will evaluate a variety of jointly implemented programs in each country in order to obtain a significantly valid sampling of the various programming modalities and program areas (agriculture, health, private enterprise, forestry, and so forth) in which collaboration is carried out.

Each team will conduct interviews with A.I.D. and Peace Corps staff, volunteers, host country officials and beneficiaries, and, perhaps, non-beneficiaries. Each team will travel to selected project sites, and, if available, include on their teams within each country a local USAID and/or Peace Corps staff member. Planning documents, project related agreements, evaluations, budgets and other relevant materials should be reviewed to assess the nature of the collaboration.

Each team is requested to evaluate the following:

A. Effectiveness of current collaborative programming modalities such as

- direct collaboration between A.I.D. field missions and Peace Corps posts on A.I.D. mission funded projects
- Peace Corps volunteers working with PVO projects funded by A.I.D.
- Peace Corps, A.I.D. and other bilateral or multilateral donors collaborating together on joint projects
- A.I.D./Peace Corps Washington designed PASA programs implemented jointly in the field

B. Program impact

- program impact as a result of which types of collaboration
- lessons learned about the nature and benefits of collaboration and the development problems involved
- the causes of negative benefits or no benefits
- sectors that tend to be more or less amenable to successful collaboration

C. Fulfillment of Peace Corps' mandate

- role of joint collaboration in achievement of each of Peace Corps' three mandates
- the risk(s) of joint collaboration to successfully achieving its mandates
- effect of the collaboration on the effectiveness of the volunteers

D. Achievement of A.I.D. Africa Bureau's program objectives

- achievement of benefits to the Development Fund for Africa from A.I.D./Peace Corps collaboration, or, more specifically, the contribution of collaboration toward achievement of the Bureau's Action Plan strategic objectives and targets
- the potential developmental benefits of collaboration vis-a-vis current programmed levels of funding, i.e., right amount, too little, or less funding should be made available

E. Effectiveness of joint programming

- the extent to which joint programming is jointly planned, implemented and evaluated
- the degree to which the participation of each party is commensurate with the amount of shared activity
- complementarity between A.I.D. and Peace Corps policies and approaches, both developmental and managerial
- the value placed on the participation of Peace Corps and A.I.D. by participating organizations and beneficiaries
- the general impetus for joint programming, i.e., from the field, Washington, USAID or Peace Corps post

F. Operational and organizational arrangements for collaboration

- support for successful collaboration from the operational and organizational structures of A.I.D. and the Peace Corps
- effectiveness of attempts to encourage and facilitate program collaboration
- relationship of jointly undertaken activities to the manner in which they are promoted, developed and managed, e.g., formal or informal interaction, sharing of planning documents, level of interaction, and so forth

G. Efficiencies of collaboration

- administrative and managerial advantages, cost savings, and other efficiencies to A.I.D. and/or Peace Corps from joint programming
- where and how efficiencies are realized

H. Sustainability

- the extent to which sustainability affects or is affected by the success or failure of collaboration, e.g., early termination of A.I.D. participation leaving Peace Corps financially or programmatically vulnerable, or Peace Corps volunteer departure before completion



THE UNITED STATES PEACE CORPS IN THE 1990s NEW OPPORTUNITIES HERE AND ABROAD

For nearly thirty years, volunteers of the United States Peace Corps have proven every day that citizen service to others can and does make a difference.

With our entry into Hungary in early 1990, American volunteers will have served in 100 nations around the world. Their contributions in education, health care, small business development and agriculture have improved significantly the lives of millions of people - including those of the volunteers, themselves.

As we enter the last decade of this century, the age-old problems of hunger, homelessness and disease still haunt us, and there remains much to be done if we are to rid the world of these terrible threats to the lives of millions of men, women and children.

Moreover, the Peace Corps of the 1990s faces new international **problems**, in some ways even more overwhelming because they threaten the very existence of humankind - problems such as environmental deterioration. We face new **challenges** such as providing assistance in the rapidly growing urban areas of the developing nations and increasing emphasis on projects which create jobs in a world where market economies have gained new popularity.

And, we face exciting **opportunities** to be part of the economic and social changes sweeping Eastern Europe and Africa - helping provide assistance to those nations who want to learn English, the international language of commerce, and proving that there are no barriers to Peace Corps' pursuit of peace.

To respond to these **problems**, **challenges** and **opportunities**, the United States Peace Corps has developed a set of initiatives for the 1990s designed to put our volunteers in the center of the great concerns of this decade and make Americans more aware of the Peace Corps' valuable role in the important new changes taking place throughout the world.

INITIATIVES FOR THE 1990s

* **Expansion** - Peace Corps today serves in 68 nations, approximately one-half of all developing nations. More and more countries have expressed an interest in Peace Corps programs, and it is a goal for the 1990s to have Peace Corps volunteers serving in virtually every nation that requests legitimate assistance. This could mean a Peace Corps presence in two-thirds of the developing world.

* **Eastern Europe** - With its entry into Hungary in early 1990, the Peace Corps is demonstrating its belief that there should be no cultural, geographic or political barriers to the pursuit of peace. As other Eastern European nations begin to look for assistance in adjusting to rapid economic and social changes, Peace Corps should be ready to respond.

* **Environment** - In September, 1989, the Peace Corps entered into a collaborative agreement with the Environmental Protection Agency under which the EPA will help train Peace Corps volunteers in pesticide management, waste disposal techniques, water pollution prevention, reforestation and environmental education. Destruction of the environment is a serious threat to all life on our planet. Preventing this destruction will become a major objective of our volunteer efforts world wide.

* **Urban Programs** - Fully 44 percent of the people in developing nations now live in urban areas, presenting those nations and our volunteers with an entirely new set of problems and challenges. With the growth of cities has come increased health problems, joblessness and a host of problems already familiar to us in this country. Peace Corps will recruit and train volunteers to respond to these new development challenges.

* **Small Business Development** - With the increasing interdependence among national economies, market oriented economic systems are becoming more prevalent in developing nations. The need to build strong economic foundations in both rural and urban areas is vital. Additionally, increasing life expectancies (up from 53.7 from 1965-70 to 61.5 from 1985-90) and increasing urbanization have led to a critical need for jobs formulation. Peace Corps will expand its work in small business development by providing marketing and production advice, improved techniques for enterprises from farming to banking, and by offering skills to international commerce.

* **Minority Outreach** - In an age of increasing interdependence among nations, being a volunteer in the United States Peace Corps provides tremendous benefits to those who serve as well as those who are served. To ensure that Americans of all ethnic and racial groups have an opportunity to benefit from Peace Corps experience, we are strongly committed to involving more American minorities.

* **Involving America** - All Americans benefit from the work of Peace Corps volunteers. We want to involve more Americans in this important work by giving academia, businesses, civic clubs and individuals an opportunity to support volunteer projects in the field through financial and other assistance.

- The Peace Corps is also committed to expanding international awareness among Americans. We want to rally the growing number of former Peace Corps volunteers in the United States to act as an educational resource in some of America's toughest schools. And we want to link currently serving Peace Corps volunteers with elementary and junior high school classes across America through a "World Wise Schools" program. This program will contribute to those efforts to enhance American students' geography skills, promote volunteerism and national service, and help demonstrate how important international communication and understanding are to America's future.

- Over 120,000 former Peace Corps volunteers have returned to the United States, having brought with them important cross-cultural and problem-solving skills. During the next decade, Peace Corps would like to tap these skills by encouraging the former volunteers to "volunteer again" - this time to help solve some of our toughest domestic problems such as drug abuse and illiteracy.

AN ACTION PLAN FOR FY 89 - FY 91

The Development Fund for Africa

Executive Summary

The African Context: Movement toward Economic Reform

In the first half of the 1980's, many African countries experienced serious economic decline. Economic growth stagnated and per capita incomes fell, often by 20 percent or more. In many cases, economic problems were compounded by the devastation of severe drought and war.

Africa's people, who were already among the poorest in the world, suffered further hardship. The poor, the very young, and the old were particularly hard hit. The effects of economic contraction were widely felt and, while many African governments tried to mitigate the worst effects, they found themselves with unsustainable budget and trade deficits and severe limits on their capacities to respond.

These severe financial pressures forced African governments to reassess the old way of doing business and to consider far-reaching reforms of their economic systems. By 1985, a number of African countries had begun the process of economic reform. By the end of 1988, 27 countries in sub-Saharan Africa were engaged in some form of structural adjustment, supported by both multilateral and bilateral donors.

Some recovery has been made. Modest per capita growth has now been restored in most reforming African countries. However, the pace of growth continues to be slow, in part because of resource shortages. Reforming countries have been given increased foreign aid and moderate debt relief, but these have not been enough to compensate for the large losses Africa has suffered from low prices for its exports and a halt of private investment.

A New Context for A.I.D.: The Impact of the DFA to Date

The inauguration of the Development Fund for Africa (DFA) late in 1987 presented A.I.D. with new challenges in providing development assistance in Africa. It was Congress's clear intent, in approving this new initiative, that A.I.D. would no longer conduct business as usual in Africa. Rather, A.I.D. was encouraged to take advantage of the greater flexibility of the DFA to find new ways to make U.S. assistance to the region more coherent and effective.

A.I.D. has taken this mandate seriously. We are making a major effort to concentrate our programs on countries with the most growth potential, and to take a broad, systematic look at the problems in individual countries.

The overall goal of our Africa programs is to *encourage economic growth that is broad-based, market-oriented, and sustainable*. This goal was chosen because increased growth in African countries themselves is the only way to meet Africa's tremendous human needs on a continuing basis. Improving the incomes of individual Africans is fundamental to raising low standards of living throughout the region; increased growth is also needed to enable both public and private sectors to provide needed social services.

This is why A.I.D. is emphasizing growth around the world — to support the human progress that is the heart of development. The need for increased growth is particularly great in Africa, because of the continent's past stagnation and rapidly growing population.

Although the DFA is only about a year old, we can already point to several areas of impact. First, the proportion of development assistance allocated to the best-performing African countries has increased. Second, we have made major improvements in programming our assistance to address systemic problems and in coordinating our use of different kinds of resources — food aid as well as dollars, private resources as well as public — to support changes. Third, we are collaborating more with other donors and private voluntary organizations (PVOs).

Committed to Further Changes: Implications of the DFA for A.I.D.'s Future Program in Africa

While recognizing the difficulties of demonstrating concrete results in a short timeframe, we are committed to strengthening our performance-based programming in the coming years. We intend to make U.S. assistance to Africa as effective as possible by continually focusing available resources on those issues of critical importance to the prosperity of Africa and tracking progress in meeting performance targets.

The first step in such a process is the development of this Bureau-wide DFA Action Plan. This Plan links *the goal of our assistance program under the DFA – sustainable, broad-based, and market-oriented economic growth in Africa* – with a strategy for achieving that goal. This strategy involves four key strategic objectives:

1. improving the *management of African economies* by redefining and reducing the role of the public sector and increasing its efficiency;
2. strengthening *competitive markets* to provide a healthy environment for private sector-led growth;
3. developing the *potential for long-term increases in productivity* in all sectors; and
4. improving *food security*.

The Plan emphasizes our intention to focus our limited assistance where it can make a difference, to address causes as well as

symptoms of underdevelopment, and to help the countries of sub-Saharan Africa deal with key problems which must be solved on a sustainable basis if the benefits of our assistance are to be experienced as broadly as possible. The plan stresses the importance of the political environment as well as the economic one, the role of the private sector as well as the public, and the short term as well as the long run. We are confident that the effective implementation of this DFA Action Plan will not only heighten the impact of U.S. assistance in Africa, but will also facilitate expansion of opportunities for the majority of Africans to improve their productivity and welfare over time.

Strategic Objectives, Targets, and Benchmarks: FY 89 - 91

Strategic Objective One: Improving the management of African economies by redefining and reducing the role of the public sector and increasing its efficiency.

African economies, by and large, are characterized by substantial public sector involvement. For several reasons, this approach has resulted in economic stagnation, corruption and cynicism. Good economic management centers on: (1) ensuring that fiscal, monetary, and sectoral policies are flexible enough to adjust to and to reduce the cycles of boom and bust to which market economies are subject; (2) reducing public sector involvement in areas better suited to private investment and risk-taking; and (3) using public monies to provide "public goods" efficiently and equitably.

To accomplish this objective, A.I.D. will work in concert with other donors to:

- *improve stability* in African economies through better management of debts and better fiscal and monetary policies;
- *reduce government involvement in production and marketing* of goods and services; and
- *improve equity and efficiency in providing key public goods* particularly in the areas of family planning, health, education and transportation.

Strategic Objective Two: Strengthening competitive markets to provide a healthy environment for private sector-led growth

A country's economic growth – and thus how well its population can meet their needs for food, housing, education, and jobs – is determined by the rate of growth of its resources (primarily capital) and the efficiency with which resources are used. Where there are incentives to invest in enterprises of low productivity or, conversely, disincentives to invest in activities which will bring high returns, economic growth will suffer.

Experience has shown that, with few exceptions, open, competitive markets provide the best incentive structure for economic growth. Market-determined prices accurately signal supply and demand conditions and permit both consumers and producers to better gauge

where their interests lie. Removal of distorting price or regulatory controls over markets in Africa should, therefore, contribute to increasing economic growth in the region.

This leads to A.I.D.'s targeting on *liberalizing commodity and factor markets*.

Strategic Objective Three: Developing the potential for long-term increases in productivity

Land and related natural resources, labor, capital, and technology are needed for production in Africa. The most efficient productive technique in the short term, of course, is that which results in the greatest output per unit of input today. However, this is not necessarily the most sustainable method of production. In most economies, investments are, therefore, made to ensure the continued availability of resources and to develop technologies which will permit greater productivity in the future.

The sector in which long-term increases in productivity are currently most threatened is agriculture. The mainstay of most African economies, agricultural productivity, as measured by per capita foodgrain production, has been declining across the continent since the early 1960's. Forests have literally disappeared and animal production is increasingly constrained by the diminishing quality and quantity of available pastureland. Attention must be paid now to:

- the *conservation of the natural resources* on which such productivity depends;
- the *development of new technologies* which permit these resources to be used more efficiently; and
- the *improvement of job-related skills* outside as well as in the agricultural production sector itself.

Strategic Objective Four: Improving food security

In few African countries today do all citizens have access, at all times, to enough food for an active, healthy life, i.e., food security. Global food supply is not the problem. Countries and individuals who do not produce enough to meet their own consumption needs ("self-sufficiency") can purchase all the food they want – *if they have adequate incomes and if they have adequate access to markets.*

However, large numbers of people in Africa do not have this income or market access, giving rise to long-term or chronic food insecurity. In many African countries, less than half of the people are able to obtain sufficient food from their own efforts at farming. Most people, even farmers, must enter the market to purchase food. Inability to overcome this chronic food insecurity results in inadequate levels of nutrition, high morbidity, and early death.

In recent years, however, food insecurity has also resulted from short-term reversals, drought and civil disturbance. Although this kind of food insecurity is termed "transitory," it is likely to be a recurring problem for the foreseeable future. The challenge for both

African governments and donors is to recognize that it is the causes of food insecurity which must be addressed, not just the symptoms. This perspective is hard to maintain when television screens are filled with images of starving children.

In addition to general support for increased economic growth, A.I.D.'s efforts to improve the food security of African countries will address four specific concerns:

- finding ways to use food aid so as to *reduce interyear instability in supply* and, perhaps, prices;
- increasing the capacity of donors and African countries to *anticipate serious droughts and other emergencies* and to provide timely and effective assistance when emergencies occur;
- finding ways in the short term to increase incomes through *targeted welfare* programs to those most in need; and
- *increasing agricultural production and utilization.*

A.I.D.'s Management Objectives in Africa

Changing the way we do business means changing administrative procedures as well as more clearly focussing our program around priority development objectives and targets. In addition to continuing the management innovations already launched in FY 88, the Africa Bureau has established a Task Force to surface and debate major modifications to streamline policy and program management over the longer term.

In the immediate future, FYs 1989 and 1990, A.I.D. will aim to:

- use the flexibility of the DFA to the maximum extent by *concentrating resources in programs which are performing well*;
- *tie routine management* actions (budgeting, personnel) more closely to *DFA policy and program priorities*; and
- *put A.I.D.'s resources to work* in collaboration *with those of other donors*, both U.S. and African PVOs and the U.S. and international *business community*, to expand their impact.

COUNTRY STUDY: BOTSWANA**A. SUMMARY PROFILE**

USAID/PC cooperation in Botswana has been extensive and reflects the very favorable attitude towards collaboration and the excellent communication and mutual respect between the leaders of both missions and the Embassy. The USAID Director and the Peace Corps Director stay in close touch and encourage their staffs to do likewise. Besides this close collaboration in Botswana, the two missions are also working closely on plans for startup operations by their respective agencies in Namibia. The Namibian experience could present a valuable prototype for circumstances where a limited USAID staff presence is anticipated.

USAID and Peace Corps Botswana collaborate most extensively in the Education sector. They also jointly support development activities in natural resource management, private enterprise development, agriculture and drought relief. In the case of agriculture research, two PCVs were requested by USAID contract technical staff when the government was unable to provide counterparts. In all other cases volunteers are not directly integrated into USAID projects, but frequently work alongside USAID technical assistance contractors on similar assignments.

With the encouragement of USAID contractors, similar new activities are being initiated in the health and population areas. All collaboration to date has been developed in the field without resort to use of PASAs. However, PASA resources are being used in development of the new health and small enterprise activities.

B. PROGRAM ENVIRONMENT

The new five-year A.I.D. strategy is fully consistent with GOB priorities. The program focuses on employment generation through the private sector, education and skills development, population and health, agricultural development, and natural resource management. Because Botswana is relatively well off by African standards, the A.I.D. program is not large, consisting of \$7 million in FY 1990 and projected at the same level in FY 1991, plus a small amount of regional funding.

In contrast to the relatively small A.I.D. program, the Botswana Peace Corps program is the largest in Africa and growing from 231.3 volunteer years in FY 1990 to 255.3 in FY 1991. While the GOB welcomes volunteers, it places a high premium on credentials and experience. This is reflected in both the character of the volunteers supplied and their placement. They tend to be skilled and to be in positions within Ministries or other government agencies similar to those filled by contracted expatriate personnel in operational positions.

There is a high degree of complementarity between the sectors in which Peace Corps Volunteers are working and those in which A.I.D. is active. Both are heavily involved in education with smaller programs in agriculture, health, small enterprise development, natural resource management, and drought relief.

Both the USAID and Peace Corps Directors place a high premium on collaboration and have emphasized this to their staffs. Collaboration may also be favorably influenced by the fact that 6 of 9 direct hire USAID personnel and 17 of 71 USAID contract staff are former PCVs. Program documents are exchanged and there is frequent contact between the respective staffs of the two missions. Relations with the Embassy in a country team context are excellent and there is full agreement on U.S. objectives in Botswana and the importance of the programs of both USAID and Peace Corps to their attainment. Nonetheless, until recently most collaboration between the two agencies had been of an ad hoc nature, involving people from both programs working in similar areas or within the same organization, coming together to share ideas and to reinforce one another's efforts. Only one USAID project (in agricultural research) has had PCVs directly assigned to it. This occurred when the GOB was unable to come up with suitable counterpart personnel and volunteers were requested as an alternative. Except for SPA funds, USAID funding has not directly supported Peace Corps activities, except in the instances (described below) in which equipment for ministry activities was purchased with A.I.D. project funds and volunteers trained local staff and coordinated its use.

It is anticipated that collaboration will be more substantial in the new small enterprise program which is being developed with the assistance of the A.I.D./Peace Corps MED PASA, in the new elementary education project which the USAID is developing -- with Peace Corps staff participating in the design work, and in a regionally funded natural resource project which is just moving into the implementation stage.

C. ROLES AND PLAYERS

The matrix shown below identifies key players and functions for Botswana collaboration. The Xs show which players are most responsible for which functions.

Botswana

Players	PC/ Missions	A.I.D./ Missions	PVOs	PC/ Wash	A.I.D./ Wash	HCGs	NGOs
<u>Functions</u>							
Initiation		X		X	X	X	
Planning	X	X					X
Approval	X	X					X
Funding		X			X		X
Management				X			X
Implementation	X	X					X
M&E	X	X					

D. PROJECT CASE STUDY

The following is a summary of the character of collaboration to date in Botswana, with regard to each of the project components set forth in the methodology matrix. The character of collaboration in Botswana has been quite uniform and there are no joint project undertakings to date. A separate summary for each activity has not been prepared. Where a deviation from the norm has occurred this has been noted for the individual activity concerned in the appropriate function category.

1. Initiation: A.I.D. activities are initiated through the normal project development process. Similarly, PC volunteer assignments are initiated through the normal government request process. No collaboration occurred at the initiation phase of existing USAID/PC activities, but collaboration is now occurring in the initiation of the new A.I.D. primary education project.
2. Planning: As noted above, joint planning is now occurring in the context of design of the new elementary education project. Planning in existing projects has been done individually up to the implementation phase, at which point informal planning between USAID contract technical advisors and PCVs working in the same segments of the educational sector has occurred.
3. Approval: Responsibility in this area rests primarily with the Government of Botswana (GOB) since most A.I.D./PC collaboration activities [in the education sector] are carried out under its cognizance. Approvals required from the host government and their respective headquarters are

handled separately by each agency, as are approvals required when NGOs are being supported.

4. Funding: USAID project funds have been used to purchase computer equipment used by a Peace Corps volunteer working on the computerization of Ministry of Education personnel records, and to fund print shop equipment used by a volunteer working in the Ministry of Agriculture publications division. In the natural resources area, A.I.D. has funded a forestry training workshop for PCVs and counterparts, and USAID and Peace Corps are jointly planning an agro-forestry workshop for next year which will be funded from the new A.I.D. regional natural resource management project. Otherwise funding support is the separate responsibility of each agency or the government of Botswana.

5. Management: Peace Corps Volunteers and USAID contractors manage their activities separately and independently, except in the case of the collaboration in agriculture research. In this instance, the volunteers assigned to the USAID-supported GOB agriculture research center are under the supervision of the USAID-supplied technical assistance contractors.

6. Implementation: Except for the agricultural research activity noted immediately above, and the natural resource training identified in 4. above, activities by the volunteers and A.I.D. contract staff within each sector are separately implemented but with informal interaction between the two parties. For example, technical manuals and other materials obtained from an A.I.D. Washington Forestry Support project by the USAID sector specialist were provided to PCVs working in the natural resource area. In one instance (training of secondary education teachers), volunteers expressed a desire for more formal collaboration with USAID counterparts on implementation activities, suggesting impact and sustainability would be enhanced thereby.

7. Monitoring and evaluation: Very little information was obtained on how this is handled in the context of USAID/Peace Corps collaboration in Botswana. Since to date there have been no joint projects, there has presumably been no joint monitoring and evaluation. The USAID project activities are periodically evaluated in accordance with Agency policy and guidelines. However no information was developed on whether these evaluations included related Peace Corps activities.

8. Impact and Sustainability: Very little specific information was available for these areas. There has likely been considerable impact of both agencies' activities in the education sector because in both instances they have been so extensive and long-running. Also sustainability is likely to be good because of the receptivity and value placed on the product by both the Botswanan government and the populations served. Similarly the drought program activity was cited as another area where impact has been significant, since peoples' livelihoods were directly affected. However both government staff and volunteers questioned the sustainability of a number of the village level activities undertaken under the Drought Program because of their inappropriate character and location. (One can question whether

sustainability should be a major concern in an emergency relief program where the primary goal is to see that no one goes hungry.)

Early termination by PCVs, lack of counterparts or follow-on volunteers to continue the innovation, and premature termination of USAID support were the factors most often cited as negatively impacting on sustainability in the activities in Botswana in which USAID and Peace Corps have been jointly involved to date.

E. FUTURE COLLABORATION

Prospects for Future Collaboration

Although already at a very high level, A.I.D./PC collaboration is on the increase in Botswana. Both missions are convinced that the results of collaboration definitely exceed the sum of its parts. Previous collaboration has been in the form of the two parties looking for ways to interface in their respective on-going programs. With the advent of new initiatives in private enterprise, natural resources, and education, both parties are involved in designing collaboration right from the onset of the new projects.

This approach has also been carried over to planning for new activities in the neighboring country of Namibia, which is on the verge of obtaining its independence from the Republic of South Africa. Both USAID and Peace Corps Botswana went to extra lengths to maximize the value of our visit, both to identify new opportunities and to enhance existing collaboration.

SUMMARY OF COLLABORATION IN BOTSWANA BY ACTIVITY

A. Kalihari Conservation Society (KCS) - USAID funds some KCS activities. A PCV happened in after her anticipated assignment did not work out. Impact and sustainability are not directly relevant since there is no connection between USAID funding and PCV work; however, PCV work helps sustain KCS through income generation.

B. Botswana Development Corporation (BDC) - Same as above except PCVs and USAID-funded operational expatriate (OPEX) personnel work closely with one another. Both provide technical support for BDC which helps sustain it and its enterprises. Impact, as reflected by employment generation figures, seems good, but there is nothing to compare them with.

C. Drought Relief - No direct collaboration. A.I.D. provides P.L. 480 food which is managed by the GOB Food Resources Department. Volunteers are used as GOB Drought Relief Technical Officers but do not deal with the food aid side of the program. The current impact study of the program plus the multi-country study by Clark University may provide a basis for assessing impact. Program sustainability is not applicable since the program was not intended to be sustained. Sustainability of projects executed under the program are questionable according to volunteers and Ministry staff because of the character of the activities and the selection criteria used.

D. Education

1. Primary Education Improvement Project (PEIP) - No PCVs are working directly with this project, but there has been USAID interaction with education PCVs on project activities.
2. Junior-Secondary Education Improvement Project (JSEIP) - there is extensive A.I.D. association with PCV secondary school teachers. Arts activities started by a PCV have become a part of the project. Two PCVs have been seconded to the project and one former PCV has been hired on local contract. There is informal interaction between PCVs and JSEIP advisors working on the faculty of the Teacher Training College (TTC). PCVs would like to see it more formalized. Impact and sustainability are a major concern of PCVs at TTC due to fear that they will not be replaced and to their assumed inability to institutionalize within their tour of service.
3. Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems (IEES) - A resident, centrally-funded TA advisor works closely with two PCVs who are working on education data base development and management. In addition JSEIP funds are used to fund equipment to facilitate work of the PCVs. There is good prospects for sustainability here, because the value and utility of the product are recognized and valued.
4. New "Network" Project - This will be a follow-on to the primary education project. Peace Corps is participating in the design. It is anticipated PCVs will be used as resource teachers, and possibly in other ways.

E. Botswana Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Mining (BOCCIM) - USAID OPEX people report no direct contact with PC but are aware of PCVs who have responded to needs for training and other assistance to the private sector. They see PCVs as playing a similar role to the International Executive Service Corps (IESC) volunteers but with the advantage that the PCVs are available on a longer term basis. The PCVs working in small and medium enterprise development could use the Resource Manual and Guide to Small Business which was produced by the BOCCIM OPEX staff and is to be distributed in January 1990.

F. Ministry of Health - It had earlier PCV involvement, but there is none now. Through urging of USAID OPEX people, MOH is asking for at least 32 PCVs to help with up-grading the skills of family nurse practitioners. MOH wants experienced, Master's level nurses and clinicians. A consultant from OTAPS (PC/W) is coming to do a needs assessment which is expected by the GOB to define both USAID and Peace Corps roles.

G. Vocational Training Brigades - PCV support is provided in both management and academics. The only USAID involvement has been through SPA Projects.

H. Agriculture Technology Improvement Project (ATIP) - The relationship was not by design. Two PCVs were assigned to work under the USAID TA staff of the project. PCVs were requested to make up for the inability of the Ministry of Agriculture to provide needed counterparts. The experience suggests to the TA staff possible ancillary rather than direct relation with PCVs in future activities.

The TA staff thinks the farming systems research model, which they have introduced into Botswana, has good sustainability prospects based on recent GOB decisions and attitude changes.

Implementation of the new conservation strategy is another area in which Agricultural Research TA people see good potential for PCV involvement, particularly in watershed development. They do not believe the government is yet aware of the problems it will encounter in achieving convergence between conservation policies and production policies.

I. Population - The USAID Population consultant (former PCV) is working with teacher PCVs who are interested in doing family life education.

J. Agriculture Information Division - The PCV assigned to this division works closely with the ATIP TA staff. ATIP bought some equipment for the printing facility, which it would not have done if the PCV had not been there.

COLLABORATION ROLES, MECHANISMS AND MODALITIES

The Team asked a number of USAID and PC staff for their perceptions about how collaboration is carried out in Botswana and how it should be done. A summary of the more significant responses and information or insights generated follows:

- 1) Each mission (USAID and PC) saw itself as the entity most responsible most often for collaboration functions.
- 2) A.I.D. and PC personnel did not agree on assignments of responsibilities for project functions; did not agree on who is responsible for what.
- 3) PVO and NGO involvement in collaboration projects is and is expected to be nearly non-existent.
- 4) Both missions expect that PCVs, the host country government, and beneficiaries will have larger roles in future collaborative projects; A.I.D./W and PC/W roles will decline.
- 5) There was little agreement on A.I.D. and PC contributions to each other's planning and programming documents.
- 6) Both sets of staff opinions on collaboration vary significantly from those of their directors.

- 7) Personnel of both missions gave high marks to both A.I.D. and PC for effective use of food aid, PASAs, and other resource transfer mechanisms. (In fact, PASA use has been limited.)

Modalities Summary

- 8) Both USAID and the PC mission see the most effective collaboration modality in Botswana as being the A.I.D.-designed project into which PCVs are slotted.
- 9) Both agencies also voted SPA as the overwhelming favorite for funding mechanisms, with OTAP's PASAs as number two.
- 10) Natural Resources was the sector chosen as the most likely for expanded collaboration; Small Enterprise Development and Education were tied for second.
- 11) There was general agreement between the agencies on collaboration advantages, disadvantages, and constraints. Both Agencies chose leadership and its variant, "the right personnel", as the key determinants to collaboration failure or success.

Observations by the Evaluation Team

Sustainability and impact continue to be elusive project design factors, apparently not well understood by either Agency.

General Collaboration Suggestions/Guidelines of the Interviewees

- 1) Develop and deliver briefings on Peace Corps programming in A.I.D. training or develop a field course.
- 2) Develop and deliver briefings on A.I.D. programming in PC training for staff and PCVs or develop field courses.
- 3) Revise A.I.D. and PC planning and programming cycles, if possible, so that they coincide as closely as practicable.
- 4) Develop joint plans for joint projects.
- 5) Develop joint evaluations for joint projects.
- 6) Develop and establish a personnel exchange program between A.I.D. and PC.
- 7) Increase funding limits on SPA and Ambassador's Self-Help Fund.
- 8) Publicize the most successful collaboration projects.
- 9) Have Botswana develop a training course on collaboration.

ATTACHMENT 1

LIST OF PEOPLE CONTACTED

USAID Staff

John Hummon, Director
John Roberts, Assistant Director
Barbara Belding, HRDO
William Elliott, PDO
C. J. Rushin-Bell, Natural Resources Officer
Puskar Brahmhatt, Engineer
Robert McCollaugh, ADO

USAID Contractors

Charles St. Clair, Botswana Development Corporation
Wes Snyder, Chief of Party (COP), Junior Secondary Education Improvement Program (JSEIP) team
Max Evans, COP, Primary Education Improvement Program
Shirley Burchfield, COP, Improving Efficiency of the Education System (IEES) team
Neil Currie, Botswana Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Mining (BOCCIM)
Robert L. Ask, BOCCIM
Johnson Odharo, JSEIP-Molepolole College of Education
Greg Miles, Ministry of Health (MOH)
Joan Mayer, MOH
David Norman, COP, Agricultural Technology Improvement Project (ATIP)
Doug Carter, INTSORMIL, ATIP
Rich Pfau, Academy for Education and Development (AED)
J. Hellerman, AED
Dick Mullaney, JSEIP
Sarah Heath, AED/BRIDEC -- Brigades Development Center (formerly PCV in Botswana)
Laura Ives, JSEIP (formerly PCV)

Peace Corps Staff

Lloyd O. Pierson, Director
Judy Baskey, APCD, Education
Binkie Ramaologa, APCD Generalist
Hope Phillips, APCD, Education
Barbara Davis, Program Officer
Arthur Caplan, SPA Coordinator
Tim Olsen, APCD Programming and Training (also SED & Vocational Training Sectors)

Volunteers

Joseph Banas
Cheryl Kitts
Sam Reed
Fred Holland
Diane Holzman
Kevin York
Margaret Edmondson
Pat DeBlake
Jonathan Hartzler
Nancy Yuill
David Stevens
Sam Harle
J. Griffin
S. Stewart
Robin Bram

Botswana Officials

Buletse Gaolathe, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Finance and
Development Planning (MFDP)
T. C. Moremi, Coordinator of Rural Development, MFDP
Solomon Mokone, Dep. Coordinator of Rural Development, MFDP
U. Tidi, Director of Food Resources, MFDP
L. Ramatebele, Dep. Dir., Unified Teaching Service, Ministry of
Education
Mrs. Gasannelwe, Actg. Undersecretary for Health Manpower, Ministry of
Health (MOH)
Don Thompson, Principal, Molepolole College of Education
Mr. R. Nkomo, Principal, Kwena Sereto Junior Secondary School

Others

Eleanor Warr, Kalihari Conservation Society
Tim Balke, Director of Operations, World Food Program (WFP)
Modiri Mbaakanyi, Director, BOCCIM

ATTACHMENT 2

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. LCDSS Botswana FY 1991, August 1989
2. ABS for FY 1991 Botswana, June 1989
3. CPMB Peace Corps Botswana
4. Brigades Development Centre Annual Report, 1987/88
5. Botswana Development Corp. Annual Report, 1988
6. USAID/Botswana Brief, October 1989
7. Botswana Briefing Book, USAID Botswana 11/18/87
8. Briefing Paper, Peace Corps/Botswana, August 1989
9. Briefing Document - The Kalahari Conservation Society
10. Unified Teachers Service Computer Expansion Proposal, submitted by Kevin York, 6 November 1989
11. National Resource Management Project, USAID Project # 690-0351 (Botswana Component)
12. USAID Botswana - Proposal for Assistance to Namibia
13. Study of Cultural Factors in the Working Environment of Botswana, IDM, Preliminary Proposal, Nov. 1989
14. PC/A.I.D. Collaboration Evaluation Sector Worksheets prepared jointly by USAID and Peace Corps

COUNTRY STUDY: BURUNDI**A. SUMMARY PROFILE**

In the past, there have been PCVs assigned to USAID-funded projects, but these have all terminated. Similarly, A.I.D. approved the use of P.L. 480 local currency generations for financing a PC activity, but that funding has been used up. The PC mission is making use of SPA and the Ambassador's Self-Help Fund to finance small projects. A.I.D./S&T is using a special appropriation for Biological Diversity to fund a project which is being administered by the PC mission.

Neither agency has seen it to its advantage to encourage joint planning. Contact is maintained at various levels, and USAID arranged for REDSO technical input to the biological diversity project when it was being formulated by Peace Corps. There has been no sharing of strategy/planning documents.

B. PROGRAM ENVIRONMENT**1. USAID Program and Attitudes**

The goal of the USAID program for Burundi is to increase and diversify the sources of employment and real per capita income. The program will concentrate on the priority of developing more efficient and expanded markets for agricultural and other products produced by Burundian farmers and small and medium size enterprises in the private sector. A secondary priority will be in the area of population and health.

The A.I.D. strategy will be implemented through a sectoral level, policy-oriented enterprise promotion program complemented by: population assistance; human resources development support; small farming system research; and AIDS and child survival assistance. The sectoral program will involve cash grants made in conjunction with policy reforms designed to promote private enterprise. The local currency counterpart of the cash grant will be available for use of the Government of Burundi, with concurrence by USAID. Thus, these funds could be used to support projects consistent with the general thrust of promoting private enterprise.

The USAID Director is interested in supporting any PC activity which is in support of the A.I.D. thrusts mentioned above; he is particularly interested in support for enterprise promotion and family planning and related health activities. He is also supportive of PC activities in areas such as resource management, but does not expect to be able to provide financial resources. He is willing to review proposals put forth by PC, but does not feel he has adequate personnel resources to help PC develop proposals.

2. PC Program and Attitudes

The principal PC activity, in terms of numbers of volunteers assigned, is Inland Fish Culture with some 18 PCVs assigned. However, from the point of view of funding and PC responsibility, the Natural Resources Management Support project (also referred to as the Biological Diversity project) would rank most important. Other activities include Vocational Education (1 PCV), Marketing and Management (2 PCVs), and Professional Education -- business use of computers and audio-visuals (2 PCVs). PC/B hopes to expand its marketing and small business management activities and had a TDY expert visiting to help develop a larger program.

PC officers have good informal relations with USAID personnel, and sought the latter's help with the preparation of the biological diversity project. PC did not coordinate with USAID before seeking TDY assistance to develop a larger small business management program; A.I.D. had already financed a number of studies related to the needs of small businesses in Burundi. Because of previous internal political problems in Burundi, the U.S. Ambassador has imposed a ceiling on PCVs of 30.

3. Host Country Attitudes

GOB officials are somewhat sensitive about foreigners working in the rural areas of Burundi. They want to ensure that activities being carried out are in response to local felt needs; however, there are no villages and no local government structure. Thus, the field personnel of GOB ministries decide what they think the people want. In some cases, they may feel that the PCVs are working at cross-purposes with them, e.g., PCVs in fish culture work with farmers encouraging them to use some of their organic material in their fish ponds, while the agricultural extension people want the organic material used as a crop fertilizer.

C. ROLES AND PLAYERS

The matrix which follows summarizes the different functional roles played by the collaboration parties in the project case studies discussed in Section IV. below.

Burundi

Players	PC/ Missions	A.I.D./ Missions	PVOs	PC/ Wash	A.I.D./ Wash	HCGs	NGOs
<u>Functions</u>							
Initiation	1,2	3				2	
Planning	1,2	3					
Approval		2	2	1,3	1	2	
Funding		2,3	2		1		
Management	1,2	3					
Implementation	1,2,3					3	
Monitoring	1,2	3				1	
Evaluation	2	3		1	1	2	

- 1 = Natural Resources Management Support (Biological Diversity).
 2 = Inland Fish Culture.
 3 = Bururi Forest.

D. PROJECT CASE STUDIES1. Natural Resources Management Support

1) The Project

In conjunction with the GOB National Institute for the Environment and the Conservation of Nature (INECN), and with financial support from an A.I.D./W PASA, PC is to conduct a biological diversity program in Burundi designed to provide:

- a) vegetation and wildlife inventory surveys for five tropical forest parks/reserves;
- b) conservation education materials;
- c) general management and tourism plans for each park/reserve; and
- d) training of GOB park/reserve rangers.

Currently, four PCVs are developing management plans, training park supervisors, and conducting inventories of flora and fauna in the Ruvubu National Park, the Kibira Forest, and in the Rumonge Agro-forestry project area. A fifth PCV works at INECN headquarters in Gitega. The work of all five PCVs is coordinated by an ex-PCV (Central African Republic and Burundi) project coordinator contracted by PC using PASA funding.

2) Characteristics of Collaboration

a. **Initiation:** The project was initiated by PC/Burundi with encouragement from PC/W.

b. **Planning:** The project proposal was prepared by PC/B. It subsequently was reviewed by a specialist from A.I.D.'s regional office in Nairobi (REDSO/EA) and by personnel from A.I.D./W--S&T and PC/W--OTAPS.

c. **Approval:** The proposal was endorsed by USAID in principle and by the GOB. It was approved in A.I.D./W and PC/W.

d. **Funding:** A.I.D./W--S&T is funding the project using special funding provided for Biological Diversity. S&T executed a PASA with PC/W.

e. **Management:** The project is managed by a Project Coordinator funded under the project. However, the administrative support provisions of the PASA are inadequate and the Coordinator must call on PC to provide some assistance in order to carry out his management functions.

f. **Implementation:** PCVs have responsibility for day-to-day implementation of the project under the general guidance of the Project Coordinator and in conjunction with their INECN counterparts.

g. **Monitoring:** The Project Coordinator monitors the work of the PCVs. The PC Director and the Director of the ICECN provide general oversight to the project.

h. **Evaluation:** No evaluation plan was included in the PASA, but a mid-term evaluation is planned for early 1990. The evaluators would be from A.I.D. and PC/W.

i. **Impact:** If the management plans are done well and reasonably complete inventories are prepared during the project, the GOB and interested scientists from around the world will have an excellent base from which to establish conservation policies which can be expected to have a very positive impact on the preservation of the remaining endemic and other endangered species.

j. **Sustainability:** It is doubtful if the present project will be sufficient to sustain the activities initiated, particularly given the two-year duration of the PASA. Follow-on activity will be needed: additional training and some funding for carrying out the buffer zone projects that will

be recommended. The follow-on activity might involve more than one project and might be administered by PVOs, with at least one of them preferably being in the conservation field.

2. Inland Fish Culture

1) The Project

The project began in September 1985 with the posting of six fish culture volunteers in five provinces for the purpose of teaching rural farmers to raise fish in small manually constructed ponds. Financial support for the activity came from P.L. 480 local currency funds. The project was suspended by the GOB in 1987 and then re-instituted about a year later. At that time, PC was requested to expand the project to more areas of the country.

Eighteen PCVs are now working in 14 provinces. Funding is provided by 2 U.S. PVOs: FICAH and CRS. In the areas where volunteers started the program in 1987, fish ponds have caught on; in new areas, people still need convincing.

The GOB sponsor of the activity is the Department of Fisheries and Fish Culture of the Ministry of Tourism and the Environment. However, the Department has no field service, so the counterparts of the PCVs are the field personnel of the agricultural extension service; the latter have no training or orientation in fish culture.

2) Characteristics of Collaboration

a. Initiation: The project was initiated by PC with approval of the GOB.

b. Planning: PC planned the activity and discussed with USAID which agreed to P.L. 480 local currency financing if GOB occurred.

c. Approval: The local currency support for the PC activity was approved by the GOB and USAID in a Country Use Counterpart Agreement.

d. Funding: The initial activity was financed through the local currency account which was jointly administered by the PC Director and the GOB Director of Water and Forests. The follow-on activity is being financed by FICAH and CRS.

e. Management: Overall management of the activity is the responsibility of the PC APCD in conjunction with the GOB.

f. Implementation: PCVs are responsible for day-to-day implementation of the project. They are largely on their own.

g. Monitoring: Monitoring of the activity is the responsibility of the PC APCD.

h. Evaluation: There is no provision for evaluation.

i. Impact: It is clear that a substantial increase in fish ponds is likely to result from the project. What the impact will be on family nutrition or on family income is less clear and unlikely to be determined unless an evaluation plan is established and implemented. Also of interest would be the impact of fish culture on agricultural crops.

j. Sustainability: Plans are to develop model farmers in every province in such numbers as to allow fish culture to continue without any governmental or outside assistance. A higher level of training will be needed by the model farmers than is now available from the PCVs.

3. Bururi Forest

1) The Project

This was a USAID-funded bilateral project from FY 1982-88. In response to recommendations in the first project evaluation, PCVs were introduced into the project to work with Burundian counterparts. The project involved the planting of harvestable forests, in part to serve as a buffer zone to the Bururi National Forest and in part to provide a source of revenue for the INECN to cover the costs of maintaining Bururi Forest. Although A.I.D. funding ended January 1988, PCVs continued for some time longer on the project.

2) Characteristics of Collaboration

a. Initiation: The project was initiated by USAID.

b. Planning: The project was planned by USAID.

c. Approval: The project was approved by USAID and GOB through a Grant Agreement.

d. Funding: This was a bilateral USAID-funded project.

e. Management: GOB's INECN was responsible for day-to-day management of the project.

f. Implementation: The project was implemented initially by INECN personnel. Subsequently, PCVs also helped implement the project.

g. Monitoring: Monitoring of the project was the responsibility of the USAID Project Officer.

h. Evaluation: Two evaluations were carried out during the project. An A.I.D. regional forester out of REDSO/EA participated in the 1984 evaluation. PC was not involved in the evaluations.

i. Impact: If INECN is able to maintain the forests that were planted under the project, the purpose of the project should be attained and the result will be the maintenance of the Bururi National Forest.

j. Sustainability: At the moment, the project's sustainability is in question because of the GOB budgetary crisis. The INECN does not have the \$10,000 needed to prune the 400 hectares of pine forest that was planted under the project, the harvesting of which is to provide the financing for ensuring sustainability.

E. FUTURE COLLABORATION PROSPECTS

1. Fish Culture -- Training

There is a need for an orientation-type workshop on fish culture for agricultural extension personnel in the field with whom the fish culture PCVs work. In addition, there is a need for some longer term technical and business training for model fish farmers so that the PC activity can be self-sustaining in the countryside. If PC/B could prepare the training plan and budget, USAID could recommend to the GOB that the training be financed by USAID's Human Resources Development project.

2. Small Enterprise Promotion/Support

If PC were willing to develop a project that could encompass the Artisanal Village proposal of the Ministry of Rural Development and possibly some micro-enterprise training and technical assistance (perhaps under the umbrella of the Chamber of Commerce as is being done in Mali), and not restrict its planned project to activities under the Ministry of Social Affairs, the resulting project should be of sufficient interest to USAID and the GOB that it could be funded from the counterpart that will be generated from the cash grants being provided by A.I.D. under the policy reform program.

3. Health//Child Survival

In Togo a PCV worked in the health ministry and developed a health education activity which involved a number of volunteers working in local health centers. The proposal was welcomed by the GOT and supported by the A.I.D. regional CCCD project. The upcoming evaluation of the CCCD project, which will likely make recommendations regarding a follow-on project, would provide the opportunity to explore the feasibility of incorporating some PCVs in the USAID-supported health effort in Burundi.

4. Other Possibilities

The Fish Culture activity of the PC could be strengthened by an infusion of training as mentioned in 1. above, by some additional back-up, closer liaison with the USAID-supported Farming Systems Research project, and by emphasizing more the business management aspects of fish culture, e.g., by including marketing and simple bookkeeping. This strengthening will likely require some TDY assistance for project development, the recruitment of some small enterprise development PCVs for the project, and possibly the structuring of the management of the project in a way similar to that used in the Natural Resources Management Support project.

Looking a little farther into the future, PC and USAID might consider encouraging Catholic Relief Services (CRS) to expand its effort in agro-forestry. PCVs are already involved in CRS's current effort. The specific project(s) would flow from the recommendations for agro-forestry buffer zones that will likely be included in the management plans now being prepared for the National Parks and Forests under the Natural Resources Management project. Perhaps the project could be worthy of USAID support for its enterprise promotion activities; otherwise, A.I.D./W might be able to find funding from Biological Diversity funds or support the activity through PVO co-financing arrangements.

The use of PCVs in the USAID-funded Small Farming System Research project would likely increase the effectiveness of the field operations and the training of middle level personnel.

Attachments

- 1 - List of Persons Contacted
- 2 - List of Documents Reviewed

ATTACHMENT 1

LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

U.S. Embassy

James D. Phillips
David Dunn

Ambassador
DCM

USAID

Don Miller
Cam Wickam
Larry Dominessy
Donald Hart

Director
Program Officer
Agricultural Development Officer
Private Enterprise Officer, LABATT-Anderson

Jeff White

University of Kansas contractor on
Farming Systems Research project

Peace Corps Staff

Erica Eng
Dann Griffiths
Peter Trenchard

Director
Programmer & APCD/Fish Culture
Project Officer for Biological Diversity
project (Gitega)

Peace Corps Volunteers

Leif Davenport
Kevin Doyle

Kibiri, Biological Diversity
Gitega, INECN, Public Education,
Biological Diversity
Cankuzo, Ruvubu National Park,
Biological Diversity
Bujumburu, Computer Training
Fish Culture in south
Fish Culture in north
Bujumburu, Small Enterprises
Cankuzo, Fish Culture
Butagonzwa, Fish Culture

Don Gay

Rick Sturges
Robert Gould
Joe Bennett
Stephanie _____

Hannah Hamilton
Suzette & Robert Rosenberger

INECN

Andre Niyokindi

Director General of the National
Institute for the Environment and the
Conservation of Nature (INECN)

Catholic Relief Service

Myriam Mpirikanyi
Paul Cowles

Assistant Director
Contract employee, ex-PCV in forestry
with A.I.D.-funded Bururi Forestry
project

Chamber of Commerce
Bernard Ciza

APEX Project

AFVP
Jean Philippe Butelleul

Country Director of the French
Association of Volunteers for Peace
(AFVP)

ATTACHMENT 2

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. USAID briefing paper on its program and program objectives
2. Peace Corps/Burundi briefing paper on its program
3. A PC/Washington briefing paper on the Burundi program
4. PASA between A.I.D. and PC under Project 698-0467, Natural Resources Management Support, July 20, 1988
5. Counterpart Agreement of November 7, 1985 for support to Peace Corps Fisheries Project
6. Ruvubu National Park Development and Operations Proposal

COUNTRY STUDY: GHANA

A. SUMMARY PROFILE

Ghana has one PC/AID collaborative project operating: The Collaborative Community Forestry Initiative (CCFI), begun in 1987.

- (1) CCFI Resource Transfers include a matching AID grant to a PVO, Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA); PCV management and staffing of the project; past AID/W PASA funding, and AID/G mission funding of project planning workshops.
- (2) CCFI Common Planning by AID/G, PC/G and the GOG, ADRA, and a local NGO, Amasachina, led to the design, development, and implementation of an apparently successful project.

The Ghana CCFI Project was the most exciting example of complete AID/PC collaboration seen by the anglophone Evaluation Team. Extensive resource transfers were matched by extensive common planning, continuing information sharing, and collaborative management.

The commitment, intensity, and evident grass-roots success of this project make it a shining example of what joint projects ought to be. But it was also the only PVO-led project either team saw; and its development success is attributed to prior Peace Corps and AID mission administrations.

Its current operational success appears to be the result of grass-roots management by the PVO, Peace Corps, the host government, and an effective community development NGO, Amasachina. The project has taken on a life of its own; but it is plagued by uncertainties of both source and timing of funding. It would be most ironic if the best collaborative project we saw died from the expressed lack of interest in collaboration by both Peace Corps and AID missions in Ghana.

B. PROGRAM ENVIRONMENT

The programs, priorities, and personalities in both USAID Ghana and Peace Corps Ghana have changed since CCFI collaboration was initiated. Because of this, the character, amount, and mode of future collaboration are likely to be different. Both parties find themselves in staffing and programming circumstances which will make intensive direct collaboration of the type involved in CCFI difficult.

Peace Corps Ghana is losing its APCD/PTO slot because of bureau guidelines on type of staff relative to number of volunteers, and this will reduce PC capability for collaboration. In any case, the PC Director does not wish to see PC too closely associated with A.I.D. because of A.I.D.'s identification as an instrument of U.S. Foreign policy.

The USAID is now in an expanding program mode, and the character of the program has changed from project assistance to a program which is largely in the form of budget support to the Ghanaian Government. The USAID feels both this mode of assistance and the time required of limited staff to develop and manage its expanding program make direct collaboration with Peace Corps on design of new activities difficult, if not impossible. It sees its role as being a potential funding agent for activities developed by either the Ghana Government or PVOs which advance the strategy set forth in its Action Plan. While these activities might include the Peace Corps, USAID neither wishes nor feels it has the time to be involved with the implementation phases of joint activities. It will however be willing to review project designs submitted by PC/Ghana for USAID funding support. The USAID has set aside \$200,000 to fund a potential Peace Corps small enterprise development initiative, subject to presentation of an acceptable proposal.

USAID and Peace Corps in Ghana have not shared planning documents, but may be willing to do so in the future.

C. ROLES AND PLAYERS

The matrix shown below identifies key players and functions for the CCFI project. The Xs show which players were most responsible for which functions.

	PLAYERS						
	PC/Mission	AID/Mission	PVOs	PC/W	AID/W	HCGs	NGOs
<u>Function</u>							
Initiation	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Planning	X		X			X	X
Approval	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Funding		X	X		X		
Management	X		X			X	
Implementation	X		X				
M&E	X						

D. PROJECT CASE STUDY

1. CCFI was an outgrowth of the 1987 Mombasa Natural Resources Workshop jointly funded by AID and PC/W, and attended by all project participants except the eventual NGO.

2. Planning was facilitated by USAID/G funding of two planning workshops attended by USAID/G, PC/G, a PVO, an NGO, and the GOG.

3. Approvals for project funding came from AID/W, USAID/G, and the PVO ADRA. Project approval was secured from the GOG.

4. Funding (\$50,000) was provided by AID/W to ADRA in a matching grant, by USAID/G for planning workshops, and by Peace Corps in the form of PCV services and support. A \$640,000 grant to complete the project is being sought from a World Bank loan to the GOG for Natural Resources Management.

5. Overall management of CCFI is assigned to the PVO ADRA, but CCFI is managed cooperatively by all its participants.

6. Implementation is the joint responsibility of the GOG, PCVs, ADRA, and Amasachina, the community development NGO. The Peace Corps staff and the NGO seem particularly effective.

7. Monitoring & Evaluation in CCFI have been informal and sporadic. In the absence of hard data, listed below are unattributed comments about CCFI by in-country respondents.

"Community development-based projects succeed because recipients become participants and owners of the project.

"The CCFI project succeeds because the joint programming workshop built a team of all the necessary players.

"The CCFI project encourages business, income generation, and other related economic development activities.

"The virtue of CCFI is that it's not seen as an AID or a Peace Corps project.

"The development of the projects at the grass roots level is the single most important aspect of CCFI.

"The capital input has not been so great, but the impact of CCFI is greater than other projects."

8. Impact & Sustainability. Currently, Peace Corps does not measure program or project impact or sustainability. USAID/G is responsible for measuring and reporting on impact and sustainability, but points out the

difficulty of proving impact causality, particularly in program assistance. Impact and sustainability are inferred.

In the only AID/PC cooperative project in Ghana, community forestry, it is claimed by the GOG, the PVO, and the NGO that this project produces more seedlings per nursery, amplifies more greatly the extension efforts of the Forestry Department, and reaches and motivates more recipients than similar activities run by the Forestry Department alone. But there are no data to substantiate these claims.

If things go according to plan, the AID financing role in CCFI will be taken over by the World Bank loan. Hence future AID inputs in this activity may be limited to financing continuing PC Washington OTAPS support through the Forestry PASA. Prospects for impact and sustainability of the Project itself are quite favorable. Even though the project is only beginning its second year of operation, impact in the villages is quite apparent. One PCV nursery manager spoke of the surprising amount of interest shown by school children brought on an outing to the nursery site, and of subsequent visits by their parents requesting seedlings. Villages not yet contacted by Amasachina organizing activities are already requesting access to the project's activities.

The first annual review of progress was held in the project area this year and was attended by Government District Secretaries. The latter offered to make local government resources available to assist the project, such as badly needed transport, and also offered useful ideas for improving project results. Sustainability has been a principal concern and objective at all stages of CCFI's development. Experimentation is now under way to try to ensure that benefits flow to the most needy village members, e.g. nursing mothers and older men less able to engage in other agricultural practices, and to build in performance incentives. For example, in an experiment at two sites this year, instead of receiving wages, the villagers operating the nursery will be compensated only by their sale of seedlings to the Forestry Department and others, thus encouraging villagers to maximize the number and quality of seedlings produced.

E. FUTURE COLLABORATION

Peace Corps Ghana fears that close AID cooperation will politicize the PC/G program and damage its credibility and effectiveness. USAID Ghana does not see PC/G as a development agency, and does not believe the Peace Corps program there is large enough to have impact. The AID mission has said it would not support CCFI if such a project were begun now. Neither AID nor PC in Ghana feels that closer collaboration will necessarily serve their individual agency interests, so neither is working to enhance collaboration, despite the evident success of CCFI.

ATTACHMENT 1

LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Adam Abu	-	Regional Forestry Officer
Irael Agboka	-	Director/ADRA
Colleen Almaras	-	PCV, Nursery Manager, Salaga
Jonathan Ameyaw	-	Regional Food for Work Coordinator, ADRA
Samuel Antwi	-	CCFI Coordinator, ADRA
Ed Birgells	-	Program Officer, USAID
Steve Hurlbut	-	Administrative Officer, Peace Corps
Fuseini Iddrisu	-	General Secretary, AMASACHINA
James Lassiter	-	Peace Corps Director/Ghana
Steve McFarland	-	Rural Development Sector Specialist, Peace Corps
Edward Nsenkyire	-	Principal Conservator of Forests
W. Korcu Nutakor	-	Assistant General Development Officer, USAID
Gary Towery	-	USAID Director
Virginia Wolf	-	PTO/PC Ghana

NOTE: It was not possible to meet additional PCVs and other project participants and beneficiaries because of flooding which made some roads unpassable.

ATTACHMENT 2

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. Ghana Peace Corps Strategy Statement
2. Working Document from the December '87 Collaborative Agreement Conference (Project Design Workshop)
3. Collaborative Community Forestry Initiative for Northern Ghana, Bruce Burwell, Peace Corps, January '88 (Proposal)
4. CCFI Project Start-Up Workshop Documents, September '88
5. FY 1989 Title II Innovation Grant Proposal for CCFI Project, Ghana, submitted by ADRA to USAID December '88
6. AID/G Action Plan
7. AID/G ABS
8. PC/G CMPB
9. Program feasibility study for Small Enterprise Development, Peace Corps, Ghana, Mark Huet, OTAPS SED Consultant, June 1989

COUNTRY STUDY: LESOTHO

A. SUMMARY PROFILE

Lesotho has several A.I.D./L projects in which PCVs work, but only one project that could be considered truly collaborative: the Home Gardens/Nutrition Project (HGP). HGP gardens are built as individual household plots within a communal fence. Three home gardens are part of the "old" HGP system, and three are newly started as part of the "new" HGP. Home gardens are designed to feed households as well as to produce vegetables for sale to any wishing to buy.

A.I.D. - Peace Corps interaction to date has largely been in the Agriculture and Rural Development areas and somewhat less in the Education and Health areas. The USAID has large ongoing institutional development projects in both the Agriculture and Education areas and Peace Corps volunteers have been assimilated into both projects. The health activity is more limited and involves a buy-in to an A.I.D./W centrally funded project.

In agriculture and education, collaboration involves Peace Corps volunteers implementing USAID-designed and funded activities. There has been a good fit between in-service volunteers located at production sites with village organizations being supported by the A.I.D. agriculture projects. The volunteers complement USAID technical assistance and are able to draw on A.I.D. financial and technical resources to extend their own activities at the village or farm level. Two examples cited: a volunteer developed a single animal plowing system with USAID project support to replace the traditional multi-oxen system; another PCV has been active in developing gravity flow water systems.

Collaboration in agriculture has become more formalized in the previously mentioned project designed by Peace Corps Lesotho (The Home Gardens Nutrition Project), to which the GOL Ministry of Agriculture and USAID (through its LAPIS agriculture project) are co-signatories.

USAID is active in the primary and non-formal education areas whereas Peace Corps has worked mainly in the secondary school area. Nevertheless, there has been what was characterized as good but unplanned cooperation, especially as the USAID BANFES Primary Education Project has sought to move more activities out of Maseru and into the rural areas in recent years.

The BANFES Primary Education Project began in 1984 and is scheduled to end in 1990. It is run by the Academy for Educational Development under a \$23 million contract to USAID/Lesotho and the MOE of the GOL.

PCVs work at the National Teacher Training Center (NTTC) -- as A.I.D. T/A specialists -- and PCV teachers use BANFES-developed materials. PCVs are slotted into MOE/BANFES requirements; PC/Lesotho has no current planning, programming, or implementing responsibilities.

USAID has a small health education program related to the CCCD program. The health education resident advisor (an RPCV furnished through a buy-in to an A.I.D./W project) was preceded by a PCV who had worked in the Health Education Division of the Ministry of Health. The presence of three additional PCVs has considerably expanded the capacity of the division to produce quality education materials, but the PCVs doubt the project's effectiveness.

1. Resource Transfers

All current PC/A.I.D. Lesotho projects are funded by the USAID/L mission, either through contractor-managed projects (LAPIS, BANFES, and CCCD Health Education) or through SPA. No PASAs are in evident use, but two projects formerly funded by USAID/L, to which PCVs were assigned, are being funded by CARE and other donors: a fruit tree nursery and a village water supply project.

2. Common Planning

The Home Gardens/Nutrition Project (HGP) began as a subproject within LAPIS, funded by USAID/Lesotho in 1985 and contracted to be run by the GOL Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) and American Agriculture International (AAI), a U.S. firm. PCVs were used as technical assistant specialists under the Production Initiative Component (PIC). This component of LAPIS was directed at improving the production of small farmers and households. In 1989, USAID/Lesotho decided to reduce, then eliminate, PIC funding because production objectives were not met. The entire LAPIS Project is scheduled to end in 1991.

PC/Lesotho developed a proposal and negotiated a July 1989 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the MOA, USAID/Lesotho, and LAPIS, which provides for a modified continuation of the earlier HGP. The modification adds nutrition agents from the MOA; provides for project management by an ex-PCV paid by AAI, a PCV coordinator, and 6 field teams at 6 sites the first year, and 16 teams and sites the second year. Field teams are composed of a PCV, a GOL Nutrition Agent (NA), and/or a designated community representative. In one or more cases, a GOL agricultural extension officer is part of the field team.

USAID/Lesotho will consider continued funding beyond FY 1990 if the activity is successful in its first two years and if HGP meets future USAID project requirements, subject to availability of funds.

For FY 1991, Peace Corps/USAID and the GOL have tentatively budgeted amounts equal to those for FY 1990.

B. PROGRAM ENVIRONMENT

The collaborative environment in Lesotho seems promising. Peace Corps has taken the lead in moving from slotting PCVs into A.I.D. projects to planning and implementing a PC-led activities supported, in part, by A.I.D. mission funding. The Peace Corps program is well managed, and the PCVs

generally well placed. Other current PC/A.I.D. collaboration in the form of a number of PCVs working in A.I.D. projects has caused mixed reviews:

"PCVs are performing well as A.I.D. T/A specialists."

"PCVs are unhappy making volunteer wages when A.I.D. T/A specialists are paid high salaries."

The A.I.D. mission is apparently pleased at having PCVs in its projects, and is proud of its open communication with Peace Corps. Country team meetings and A.I.D. country program and sector strategy sessions appear to be the main conduit for information exchange; some planning documents are exchanged, but A.I.D. and PC project planners do not regularly meet, nor is either agency fully aware of the other's planning and programming procedures.

The best indicator of cooperation may be an obviously fostered climate of good will between both agencies. An excerpt from the A.I.D. mission director's statement may aptly summarize the environment for both agencies:

"Overall Country Development Context - Peace Corps Volunteers are briefed on country development issues from A.I.D.'s standpoint during their initial orientation and training. Similarly, Peace Corps staff are included and participate with A.I.D. staff in all briefing and program discussions related not only to the overall country context, but for specific sectors and sectoral components as well. A.I.D. staff are regularly invited to participate with Peace Corps staff and volunteers in particular program sessions. Peace Corps staff have participated with A.I.D. staff, contractors and other U.S. Mission and NGO personnel in fora devoted to identifying A.I.D. country program and development constraints."

C. ROLES AND PLAYERS

The principal roles and players in Lesotho collaboration are identified only for the Home Gardens/Nutrition Project, since all other "collaboration" is either PCV-slotting into A.I.D. projects or SPA funding for PCV projects. Please see the matrix below.

	PLAYERS						
	PC/Mission	A.I.D./Mission	PVOs	PC/W	A.I.D./W	HCGs	NGOs
<u>Function</u>							
Initiation	X						
Planning	X	X					X
Approval		X		X			X
Funding	X	X					
Management	X						X
Implementation	X						X
Monitoring and Evaluation	X						

D. CASE STUDY COMPONENTS - LESOTHO

1. Initiation: The HGP was originally initiated as an A.I.D. project, but redesigned and re-initiated by Peace Corps with GOL and A.I.D. concurrence.
2. Planning: PC/Lesotho wrote the current project with the assistance of USAID and the direct participation of the GOL.
3. Approval: PC/Lesotho secured the approval of the GOL by arranging for new GOL participation in providing nutrition agent staff and their support. PC/L further secured the approval of USAID/L in carrying the project forward.
4. Funding: For FY 1990 PC/L is to provide and support PCVs estimated to cost \$201,000; the GOL's contribution is \$37,000 to fund its participating personnel, and USAID will provide \$84,000 in material support.
5. Management: Officially managed by AAI as the original LAPIS A.I.D. contractor; unofficially appears to be managed by Peace Corps.
6. Implementation: PCVs are responsible for implementation with assistance from GOL Nutrition Agents, Ag extension agents and USAID contractor (AAI) technical support.

7. Monitoring and Evaluation: are the responsibilities of AAI and PC/L. A briefing survey to support future monitoring and evaluation is currently being conducted. A project review is scheduled for the third quarter of fiscal year 1990. [Accounting for USAID funds is the responsibility of the USAID controller.]

8. Impact & Sustainability: In the Home Gardens Nutrition Program each mature garden conservatively supports 20-40 households at each site. At least 600 rural people should be directly impacted the first year and 1,500 by the end of year two. Since the project is set up to do extension work away from the garden plots and to train counterparts, the indirect multiplier effect could be even more substantial.

The sustainability issue is being addressed through counterpart training in both the primary education and Home Gardens Nutrition Program and also through the commercial marketing aspect of the latter program. After 1991, sustainability of the Home Gardens Nutrition program is viewed by Peace Corps as depending on identifying USAID or other donor funding sources, a Peace Corps commitment to continue to provide PCV support, and an MOA assumption of project management responsibility. In our view it would be wiser to work towards transfer of the activity to local control through either the Village Development Councils or an organization of participants as a means of achieving sustainability after USAID or other donor and Peace Corps support are terminated.

E. FUTURE PROSPECTS

The revised Home Gardens Nutrition project has started USAID and PC/L on a more collaborative track. USAID is now developing a new Primary Education Project which may include in its design the use of PCVs to conduct in-service training workshops for primary teachers in remote locations.

This opportunity for a joint A.I.D./PC Primary Education Project would match A.I.D.'s primary education earmark requirement with PC/Lesotho's current success providing in-service support to primary teachers. One PCV on horseback now serves about 50 teachers in 13 primary schools from one location. Each school serves about 50 students. Impact could be substantial.

The advantage for USAID in Peace Corps involvement is the opportunity it provides to extend operations into the more remote areas of Lesotho and to have an on-the-ground presence in those areas for implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (feedback) purposes. Volunteers, by virtue of their language ability and day-to-day contact with rural villagers, are able to gauge the potential value and returns from development interventions and their actual versus projected potential for long-term impact and sustainability. Volunteers also help overcome one of the major constraints identified to effective execution of development projects in Lesotho, which is the shortage of trained counterparts.

Additional constraints which will need to be dealt with in future activities are the declining resources base and the rapidly growing labor force (20,000 new job seekers each year who cannot find employment.) There seems to be a sense on the part of the majority of the informants consulted in the preparation of this report that the best opportunities for impact in terms of realizing the USAID's goal of increasing incomes and employment lies in working with the private sector and/or directly at the local village level.

This is true even in the education sector, where we are informed that up to 98% of the schools are actually operated by the Catholic, Lesotho Evangelical, or Anglican Churches. While the government pays for many of the teachers in these schools and oversees the curriculum utilized by them, the view of the most knowledgeable people interviewed is that the best place for development assistance to have impact on the educational system is at the level of the schools and not at the Ministry of Education in Maseru. The USAID supports local management of schools and involvement of local communities in the management of schools and feels this may represent an opportunity for Peace Corps collaboration in USAID's future primary education program, along with the teacher development role.

In its future agriculture program, USAID will continue to work on seeking production and marketing successes in horticulture, particularly export specialty crops. It will look for niches in which Lesotho can have a comparative production advantage in an integrated regional economy.

USAID will also continue to grapple with the overstocking and overgrazing problem through a combination of policy reforms, promotion of controlled rotational grazing, and improved livestock marketing.

USAID is exploring greater use of PVOs as intermediaries for implementing its future activities in the agriculture sector as it moves toward a more grass roots implementation approach. There are numerous examples from other countries of successful collaborative efforts of this type between USAIDs, PVOs, and the Peace Corps and this should represent an opportunity in Lesotho as well. USAID has identified approximately 50 PVOs as currently present in Lesotho.

There may also be opportunities for USAID and Peace Corps to work collaboratively with indigenous NGOs, such as the Lesotho Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Lesotho is, for better or worse, a part of an integrated regional economy dominated by the Republic of South Africa. Until the very recent past, there have been strong colonial and cultural constraints against development of an indigenous commercial and industrial sector. As a result, entrance into these sectors has frequently been seen as a last resort for those who did not have the skills or education to find remunerative employment elsewhere. The opportunities for employment by Basotho in the mining industry in South Africa has also served as a brake on the development of indigenous private enterprises in Lesotho; however, it has created a financial liquidity in the rural areas of Lesotho which might be profitability directed into commercial enterprises if the proper environment could be created.

Both the USAID and Peace Corps Lesotho are actively seeking opportunities for promotion of rural small economic development activities. The Lesotho Chamber of Commerce and Industry represents a large number of existing or nascent small enterprises (2,000), virtually all of whom are ;involved in retail trading and located outside of Maseru. The Chamber of Commerce is seeking to establish a role for itself which is valued by its membership, and sees its best opportunity for this in the areas of training and proposal preparation. A forthcoming TDY by a representative of the International Executive Service Corps is expected to clarify the status and potential role of the Chamber of Commerce and opportunities for USAID/Peace Corps collaboration with it. Peace Corps Volunteers might be especially valuable in helping to set up rural branch offices of the Chamber of Commerce and Industries and make them functional. An A.I.D. supported PVC activity of this sort in Mali, in which PCVs are involved, is discussed in the Mali case study.

Attachments

- 1 - List of People Contacted
- 2 - List of Documents Reviewed

ATTACHMENT 1

LIST OF PEOPLE CONTACTED

Howard Bell, Program Officer, CARE
Lois Braun, Home Gardens Volunteer Coordinator
Michael Brother, Catholic Secretariat
Ed Douglas, Resident Advisor, Healthcom Project
Barry Freeman, Chief of Party, LAPIS Project
Jim Freer, APCD/Administration
David Gittelman, Technical Officer, CCCD Project
Shelley Goedken, PCV, Primary Education
Alan Gordon, USAID Controller
George W.K.L. Kasozi, Assistant General Development Officer, USAID
Koali, Deputy Director of Field Service, Ministry of Agriculture
(MOA)
Mike Lasta, PCV, MOA
Bill Macheel, APCD/Program and Training Officer
Robert Matji, General Secretary, Lesotho Chamber of Commerce
James McLaughlin, Catholic Relief Services
Nini Pax Mohase, Nutrition Assistant, MOA
S. Molokeng, ACL Secretariat
Michael Motsoene, Director of Field Services, MOA
Kevin Mould, PCV, District Water Supply Engineer
Pule Nthesare, Executive Director, Lesotho Chamber of Commerce
Florina Pheko, Associate PC Director/Education
Curt Reintsma, A.I.D. Agriculture Development Officer
Phil Rodes, PCV, Home Gardens
Steve Saltman, PCV, Secondary Education
Barbara Sandoval, A.I.D. Deputy Director
M. Seitleko, Secondary Education Officer/Secondary Education
Inspectorate
Mofota Shomari, Chief Nutrition Officer, MOA
M. Sinclair, ODA Science Advisor, Secondary Education Inspectorate
Jesse Snyder, USAID Director
Terri Steppe, PCV, Secondary Education
Dave Stevenson, PCV, Home Gardens
Andrew Strain, C.O.P. BANFES Project
Bruce White, Home Gardens Specialist
Tom Wimber, Programming & Training (PSC) Peace Corps

ATTACHMENT 2

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. Annual Budget Submission FY 1991 Lesotho, June 1989
2. Basic & Non-Formal Systems PIR (BANFES), April 1989
3. FY 1985 CDSS for Lesotho, January 1983
4. FY 1986 CDSS for Lesotho update, February 1984
5. Home Gardens Nutrition Programme, Memorandum of Understanding & Project Plan, July 1989
6. Africa Food Systems Initiative, Peace Corps
7. Peace Corps Lesotho Briefing Paper, October 1989
8. Project Implementation Report, Lesotho Agricultural Production & Institutional Support (LAPIS); April 1989
9. Report of USAID Program Retreat, Maseru, February 26 27, 1987

COUNTRY STUDY: MALI

A. SUMMARY PROFILE

There are no PCVs integrated into USAID-funded projects, but there are plans to include seven PCVs in the CLUSA sub-project in the Development of the Haute Vallee project. Also it is proposed to let PCVs have the primary implementation responsibility for the final stages of the Manantali Resettlement project. The USAID is directly funding the PCV-managed small enterprise training activity under the aegis of the Malian Chamber of Commerce.

PC/Mali is benefiting from SPA and SPA/Health funds (projects and technical assistance) and from the technical PASAs in the fields of forestry/resource management, child survival, and small enterprise development.

There are frequent but irregular meetings between USAID and PC staff, but there are no joint planning activities. PC had the opportunity to review and comment on USAID's Country Development Strategy Statement (CDSS), but not on the Action Plan prepared to implement the CDSS. PC/Mali did not share its Country Management Plan and Budget (CMPB) with USAID. PC staff serve on two USAID-sponsored committees: Women in Development and Private Sector Promotion.

B. PROGRAM ENVIRONMENT

1. USAID Program and Attitudes

The USAID strategy for its \$20+ million program in Mali has two main objectives:

- 1) To promote economic growth through:
 - a) Fostering economic restructuring and policy reform
 - b) Improving the performance of the agricultural sector; and
- 2) To promote health, family planning, and nutrition.

Under policy reform, particular attention is being paid to strengthening the private sector, including particularly small enterprise. Both macro-economic policy measures and project assistance are being utilized to boost agricultural output. Projects include support to a parastatal regional development organization, Operation Haute Vailee (OHV), which operates in the second region, agricultural research activities, and livestock development. Activities in support of natural resources management and preserving biological diversity will be included in the above activities and will also be supported through co-financed projects with private voluntary organizations (PVOs). PVO co-financed projects in support of small enterprise will also be supported.

USAID health support will be focused on child survival, women's health, nutrition (particularly infants and mothers), family planning, and control of

AIDS. This will be carried out through projects with the Government of the Republic of Mali (GRM) and with PVOs.

The USAID has also been selected by A.I.D./W as one of the pilot countries to carry out Primary Education projects in Africa in response to a directive from the Congress. USAID's part of a multi-donor effort will focus on educational reform, curriculum development (particularly in developing practical subjects), and teacher training.

USAID officers have good relations with PC staff and occasionally have informal contact with some of the PCVs. They were not well-informed, however, on the nature and magnitude of the PC effort in Mali; some were surprised to learn that there were 30 PCVs operating in the second region in collaboration with the OHV organization which USAID is supporting. USAID was aware that some PCVs were to be assigned to work with CLUSA, a PVO contracted by A.I.D. to carry out an activity in the OHV area, but it did not know that PC was planning to use funds from an A.I.D./W PASA to pay the extra training costs that would be involved in their assignment.

USAID's draft FY 1990-94 CDSS had been sent to PC/Mali for review, but the subsequently prepared implementing Action Plan had not been.

2. Peace Corps Program and Attitudes

PC/Mali has been gradually phasing out of earlier activities and concentrating its resources in the African Food Systems Initiative (AFSI) project, supplemented by two small enterprise activities.

The general thrust of AFSI is to carry out a 10-year program to help Mali overcome its food security problem, a high priority of the GRM. Since 1986 the number of AFSI PCVs has expanded from 34 to 142 by September 1, 1989, and the teams are now deployed in four of the seven regions of Mali. The AFSI teams include specialists in gardening/agricultural extension, agroforestry/soil conservation, and water resources. Some teams are being expanded to include volunteers in small enterprise development and "ruralization" (the teaching of practical subjects in rural primary schools).

One of the non-AFSI small enterprise activities involves managing the teaching of practical business subjects (accounting, inventory control, and marketing) to small entrepreneurs and/or their employees or family members. This is carried out under the umbrella of, and with some technical support from, the Chamber of Commerce in Bamako and four regional capitals. Funding support is provided by USAID from its regional Human Resources Development project.

The other small enterprise activity will involve the assignment of seven PCVs to work with the CLUSA teams which will be working with village associations (tons villageois) to learn how to prepare bankable projects, obtain bank loans for their projects, keep financial records, and manage funded projects. The CLUSA activity, which is scheduled to work with over 220 villages in the OHV region, is funded by USAID.

Although PC officers have good relations with their USAID counterparts, they seem not to have sought to involve USAID in the planning of the AFSI project even though it is quite large and USAID has a lot of agricultural expertise available. PC has not shared its CPMB with USAID.

3. Host Country Attitudes

Host country officials are anxious to increase development activity in Mali's rural areas. Hence, they have told the PC Director that they would accept all the PCVs she could recruit. Some of the middle level field officials in GRM development organizations are less enthusiastic about having PCVs around, in part because PCVs often have closer relations with villagers than the development officials, and because of the different philosophies of development -- top down for the GRM officials and bottom up for the PCVs. Attitudes of the village and arrondissement officials are mixed, some pleased with having PCVs around, other less so.

C. ROLES AND PLAYERS

The various roles played by the collaborators is summarized in the matrix which follows.

Mali

Players	PC/ Missions	A.I.D./ Missions	PVOs	PC/ Wash	A.I.D./ Wash	HCGs	NGOs
<u>Functions</u>							
Initiation	1	2,3	3				
Planning	1,2	2	3				
Approval		2,3		1		1	2
Funding	1	2,3		1			
Management	1,2			3			
Implementation	1,2		3			2	
Monitoring	1,2	2,3				1	2
Evaluation	1,2	2,3					

1 = African Food Systems Initiative.

2 = Small Enterprise Development (Chamber of Commerce).

3 = CLUSA -- Village Associations.

D. PROJECT CASE STUDIES

1. African Food Systems Initiative (AFSI)

1) The Project

AFSI is a 10-year program to help selected African countries overcome their food security problems. The program was launched in Mali in 1986 with the placing of 34 volunteers in three geographic zones to work as teams in gardening/agricultural extension, agroforestry/soil conservation, and water resources.

Since 1986, there have been an additional five groups of AFSI volunteers sent to Mali. The teams are being expanded to include volunteers in small enterprise development and ruralization (introducing the teaching of practical subjects in primary schools). Gradually, the PC program has evolved to an almost exclusively AFSI program. Of 142 volunteers in Mali as of September 1, 1989, 122 were AFSI volunteers located in 48 arrondissements (counties), concentrated in four of the seven administrative regions of Mali. This number and proportion will increase when the present class of trainees is deployed. New volunteers are expected to follow earlier volunteers and to continue their projects.

2) Characteristics of Collaboration

a. Initiation: This program was an initiative of PC/W. It is strictly a PC initiative in Mali.

b. Planning: The program was planned by PC/M, with assistance arranged by PC/W.

c. Approval: With PC/W's blessing, PC/M got general approval from the Government of the Republic of Mali (GRM). Individual placements are worked out with field representatives of the GRM or one of its regional development organizations.

d. Funding: All funding is by PC, except that the PCVs may submit projects for funding from SPAF, SPA/Health, and the Ambassador's Self-Help Fund (SDA). Some A.I.D./W PASA funds have been used for project development and training in small enterprise development, forestry/soil conservation, and health (CCCD and SPA/Health/TA).

e. Management: The AFSI program in Mali is managed by PC/Mali.

f. Implementation: The program is implemented by PCVs in the field.

g. Monitoring: The program is monitored by PC/Mali and at least nominally observed by regional GRM administrative or development officials. Since it is a multi-country program, the AFSI coordinator in PC/W visits each of the AFSI countries periodically.

h. Evaluation: The AFSI Backstop office in PC/W arranged for two consultants to review the Mali program in March 1988, and it plans to have follow-up reviews about every two years.

i. Impact: Having PCVs follow in the footsteps of their predecessors and continue operating successful projects increases the likelihood of achieving measurable impact. On the other hand, no inventory was taken in the arrondissements to determine the priority requirements for meeting food needs and no long-term plan has been established indicating priorities for PCV attention. Since no base line data are available, it will be impossible for PC to demonstrate what, if any, impact their program will have in Mali.

j. Sustainability: Although the PCVs nominally have counterparts, there is no attempt made to pass technology to them. Any technology transfer is to individual farmers or local groups of men or women in the villages. Insofar as PCVs are successful in determining villagers' felt needs and helping them satisfy them with their own resources, the chances for sustainability are relatively good. It may be difficult, however, to demonstrate this without a better data system.

2. Small Enterprise Development (Chamber of Commerce)

1) The Project

A 12-week course is offered to owners or employees of small enterprises. The curriculum is basic business skills: accounting, inventory control, and marketing. This course is offered in the capital and four regional centers under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce. The courses are organized and managed by PCVs in conjunction with a Chamber counterpart. Funding for the courses is provided from USAID's Human Resources Development training project. The PCVs also provide technical assistance to the firms which send participants to the courses.

2) Characteristics of Collaboration

a. Initiation: The project is an outgrowth of private enterprise studies financed by USAID. The Chamber of Commerce was the only local non-governmental organization with regional offices, but it was not organized to carry out the training. Thus, USAID looked to the Peace Corps to make it feasible to carry out the project.

b. Planning: Both USAID and Peace Corps participated in project planning. In addition, special pre-service and in-service training for PCVs was planned by PC/Mali with assistance of the S&T Micro-enterprise PASA and a team from PC/W (OTAPS) and A.I.D./W (S&T/RD).

c. Approval: USAID obtained Government of Mali approval by including the activity as part of the annual training plan approved by the GRM for funding under USAID's Human Resources Development project.

d. Funding: USAID funds the activity under the Human Resources Development project.

e. Management: PCVs manage the training courses under the general supervision of the APCD/Small Enterprise, PC/Mali.

f. Implementation: PCVs are responsible for day-to-day implementation of the project, with some general guidance provided by an officer of the Chamber of Commerce and back-up assistance from the PC/Mali APCD.

g. Monitoring: Monitoring of the activity is the responsibility of the PC/Mali APCD. Some loose monitoring is also provided by the Chamber of Commerce. Monitoring of the accounting and reporting on the use of the USAID funds is carried out by the USAID Controller.

h. Evaluation: An evaluation was held this year which was carried out by the PC/Mali APCD and a local national employee of USAID.

i. Impact: Anecdotal data suggest a potential for significant positive impact. There is a continuing interest in the classes by small enterprises and the Chamber of Commerce. The consulting services provided by PCVs have been well received. These services have been in marketing and loan preparation. For example, a rural bee-keeping group organized by an Agriculture PCV was put in contact with a middle man and urban honey markets by a Small Enterprise PCV. One Small Enterprise PCV is facilitating the preparation of a loan request for a weaving factory. The impact could be expanded if there were a U.S. or local PVO that could provide overall management of the activity, including particularly funds management.

j. Sustainability: It is too early to evaluate the chances of the activity becoming sustainable. Only with some additional experience will it be feasible to decide what type of structure is most likely to be sustainable. It may be desirable to have a somewhat larger project to increase the capability of the Chamber of Commerce to administer the program, or it may be more appropriate, given local conditions, to foster a local NGO or private entrepreneur to take over the activity. Some further experimentation with the fee structure for the classes will be necessary to determine whether the activity could be self-financing.

3. CLUSA--Village Associations

1) The Project

CLUSA has a cooperative agreement with USAID to carry out a program to help over 220 of the 900 village associations in the Second Region of Mali to develop productive, self-financing projects, obtain funding for the projects, and develop processes for the management, monitoring, and accounting of the projects. This will involve training Malian teams to work with the leadership of the village associations. PCVs will be integrated into the teams. This a five-year project, the first one of which will involve considerable in-service training intertwined with field work with the village associations.

2) Characteristics of Collaboration

- a. **Initiation:** The initiative came from CLUSA, based on their positive experience with a similar type program in Niger.
- b. **Planning:** The program was planned by CLUSA and presented to USAID.
- c. **Approval:** The proposal was approved by USAID and by GRM through signature of the Development of the Haute Vallee grant agreement.
- d. **Funding:** USAID funds the activity under the Development of the Haute Vallee project. Funding for the in-service training of the PCVs along with the Malian teams was requested by CLUSA from PC/Mali which in turn has requested PC/W to obtain the funding from the Small Enterprise Development PASA with A.I.D./W.
- e. **Management:** CLUSA will manage the project.
- f. **Implementation:** The project will be implemented by the Malian "animateurs" hired by CLUSA and the PCVs assigned to work with them.
- g. **Monitoring:** Day-to-day monitoring will be by the CLUSA staff. General monitoring will be by the USAID Project Officer. PC/Mali will monitor loosely the performance of the PCVs.
- h. **Evaluation:** Evaluations will be carried out in accordance with the evaluation plan set forth in the Cooperative Agreement.
- i. **Impact:** This activity can have a very important impact on rural Mali if it works as planned. CLUSA believes its program will be strengthened, and thus have greater or more immediate impact, because of the assignment of PC volunteers to the teams.
- j. **Sustainability:** The sustainability is to be built in at the village level; no GRM cadres are being trained under the project. The sustainability issue will be reviewed during the mid-course evaluation.

E. FUTURE COLLABORATION PROSPECTS

1. Operation Haute Vallee

There are 30 PCVs and 100 extension agents of the OHV operating in the Second Region. Their work is not coordinated or integrated. There are good reasons why the two groups might at times be focussing on different activities. There are also possibilities for re-organizing the PCV activities in the area that might improve the impact of the PCVs, e.g., working with the arrondissement development committees. Because USAID is making a major investment in the development of the OHV and the Second Region, it seems appropriate for USAID to become more interested in the PC activity in the region and the volunteers' relations with OHV. The PC-USAID Collaboration Evaluation Team recommended that

an ad hoc USAID-PC committee be established to review the situation and explore ways that the PC contribution in the OHV area might be strengthened. Through its project, USAID should be able to finance any additional costs that might be involved.

2. Basic Education

USAID has a recently-approved project in this area, in conjunction with World Bank, France, and other bilateral donors. Two contract technical advisors will be working in in-service teacher training and curriculum development (ruralization and maternal language training) and monitoring and evaluation of pedagogical interventions. PCVs are working in a number of primary schools to help out with the ruralization program. Some were consulted in the design phase of the USAID project. It would be well to consult them further as the details of the USAID-funded interventions and training programs are elaborated. The PCVs will have ideas about the content of the ruralization curriculum and, perhaps more important, they can provide insight into the situation existing in the classrooms and the types of cultural and institutional challenges which the planned interventions must take into account.

3. CLUSA Program in OHV Area

This innovative program could provide useful information to guide both PC and USAID in future development activities in Mali. It is important, therefore, not to undercut the CLUSA program by making available too many free resources in the area in which CLUSA will be working. PC/Mali may wish to discontinue or restrict the use of SPAF and SDA grants in the OHV area. USAID might also review any proposed PVO Co-Financing and Self-Help activities in the region.

4. Other Possibilities

Other USAID-funded activities where increased cooperation between the two agencies seems possible include agricultural research activities, natural resources management/forestry, livestock, the P.L. 480 local currency program for grain storage loans, and the PVO Co-Financing project which funds natural resources management, child survival, and small enterprise development. lay overed communications on the expected impact of each other's programs could be beneficial to both agencies.

Attachments

- 1 - List of Persons Contacted
- 2 - List of Documents Reviewed

ATTACHMENT 1

LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

EMBASSY

Robert Pringle, Ambassador

USAID

Dennis Brennan, Director
Joseph Clark, Deputy Director
Richard Byess, Program Officer
Claudia Cantell, Assistant Program Officer
Tracy Atwood, Agricultural Development Officer
Dennis Bilodeau, Project Officer for Development of Haute Vallee Project
Jack Winn, Controller
Ibrahim Diop, Financial Analyst, Office of Controller

PC/Mali Staff

Hilary Whittaker, Director
Thomas Elam, Program Officer
Lynn Wick, APCD/Water Resources
Julia Morris, APCD/Forestry
Jill Donahue, APCD/Small Enterprise
Farafan Keita, APCD/Agriculture
Oumar Cisse, APCD/Education
Chuck Parks, Administrative Officer

PC/W Staff

Paul Olsen, AFSI Coordinator (on TDY)

PC Volunteers

Mark Chamberlin, Bamako, Small Enterprise
Don Lauder, Bamako, English

Region II

Aaron Chassy, Narena/Karan, Ag./gardening
Ms. Jodi Thomas, Narena/Faradje, Forestry
Georgia McPeak, Kati/Sogolonbougou, Appropriate Technology (AT)
Wim Bos, Kourouba/Nyagadina, Water
Ms. Gail Bos, Kourouba/Nyagadina, Ag.
Bill Moseley, Ouelessebougou/Diera, Ag.
Charles McCabe, Sanankoroba/Sanankoroba, Ruralization
Marilyn Fell, Sanankoroba/Sanankoroba, Ag.
Amy Martin, Siby/Niame, Forestry
Renee Pardello, Sirakorola-Koula/Koula, Water

Region III

Jack Brooke, M'Pessoba/Fanfana, Water
Ms. B.A. Otto, M'Pessoba/M'Pessoba, Ag.
F.W. Nugent, Zangasso/Zangasso, Water
Peter Nichol, Yorosso-Koury/Palessou, Water

Region IV

Leah Newell, Baroueli/Diawarala, Ag.
Sue Young, Tamani/Tamani, Forestry
Mike Walsh, Tamani/Fansougou, Water
Karen Lippold, Niono/Niono, Small Enterprise
Mary Dewitt, Segou/Segou, Small Enterprise
Tomm Dunn, Farako/Son, Ag.
Carmen Lowry, Sansanding/Ladiwere, Ag.
Billy Fanjoy, Markala/Tien-Markala, Water
Buddey Polovich, Bla/Bla, Ruralization

Region V

Todd Holmes, Fatoma/Fatoma, Ag.
Ms. Patty Day, Bandiagara/Bandiagara, Water
Tim Franklin, Bandiagara/Bandiagara, Water
Chris Thullen, Douentza/Douentza, Forestry
Karl Dallarosa, Koro/Diankabou, Forestry
Stephen Gasteyer, Sofara/Sofara, Ag.
Kathy Reynolds, Sofara/Boungel, Forestry

AFRICARE

Dan Gerber, Country Director

CLUSA

Dana Dalrymple, Country Director
Papa Seme, Training Director

Operation/Haute Vallee

M. Sacko, NGO Coordinator
M. Konate, Chief du Sous-Secteur, Djitemou

ATTACHMENT 2

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

A.I.D.

FY 1990-1994 Country Development Strategy Statement for Mali dated May 1988

Action Plan to implement FY 1990-1994 CDSS

Project Paper, Development of the Haute Vallee, 1988

Draft Project Paper, Primary Education project

Annual Budget Submission, FY 1990

Report on the business climate in Mali

Tabular reports from CLUSA on its assistance to village associations

Tabular report from Africare on its active projects in Mali

Peace Corps

Peace Corps/Mali Briefing Paper, PC/Washington

Peace Corps/USAID Points of Collaboration, PC/Mali, October 3, 1989

Corps de la Paix, Republique du Mali (brochure)

State of the Corps in Mali, Hilary Whittaker, PCD, June 19, 1989

Peace Corps' African Food Systems Initiative in Mali, 9/89

List of Volunteers by specialty and location, September 1, 1989

A Plan for Pre-Service and In-Service Training in Micro-enterprise Development for Peace Corps/Mali, 1989-90, Buzzard, Burwell and Bigelow, January 1989

Program and Site Criteria Used by PC/Mali

Training Schedule for New Volunteers for 1 August to 28 October

Protocol (in French) between PC/Mali and the Bamafele Arrondissement

A Case Study of the Africa Food Systems Initiative in Kourouba, Mali, Jeffrey A. Cochrane, September 12, 1989

Arrondissement files for Koulikoro Region (Region II -- site of the A.I.D.-supported Haute Vallee project)

COUNTRY STUDY: TOGO

A. SUMMARY PROFILE

PCVs are an integral part of the Animal Traction Development project which is funded by the Office of the A.I.D. Representative (OAR). However, the OAR-funded contract team departed last year and OAR funding of this project is being terminated December 31, 1989; PCVs will continue with the project. A PCV health education initiative is also being supported from the regional A.I.D. project Combatting Childhood Communicable Diseases (CCCD). PC/Togo has received A.I.D. support through the SPA and SPA/Health programs and from the CCCD PASA with PC/W. PCVs have also worked with CARE on an OAR-funded activity.

There was joint planning when the Animal Traction Development project was being designed -- it was a successor to a PC activity. Recently, PC and OAR have worked together on a low cost housing proposal which has been sent to A.I.D./W for funding. There are no current A.I.D. strategy documents to share with PC. The OAR is planning health and agriculture sector studies, and it will consider inviting Peace Corps to participate. Peace Corps does not share its Country Management Plan and Budget (CPMB) with the OAR. OAR has a PC Liaison officer.

B. PROGRAM ENVIRONMENT

1. A.I.D. Program and Attitudes

There is no current strategy document for A.I.D.'s program in Togo. However, the current strategy as articulated by the Office of the A.I.D. Representative (OAR) focuses on alleviating problems and policies related to agricultural production, rural credit, child survival, and population growth.

OAR is implementing this strategy primarily through two bilateral projects: Togo Rural Institutions and Private Sector (TRIPS) and Health Sector Support for Child Survival. The former project, which is being implemented by CARE and the World Council of Credit Unions, seeks to expand the participation of the private sector in technology transfer, input distribution, and agricultural marketing and financial systems. The Child Survival project aims to improve the capability of the Ministry of Health to plan, manage, and coordinate the delivery of child survival services in a rational, cost-effective manner. It is reinforced by two regional projects: Combatting Communicable Childhood Diseases and Family Health Initiatives. USAID plans to develop a follow-on Health Sector project to engender some policy reform in the health sector as well as support specific child survival interventions.

OAR also gives high priority to maintaining the support of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) for the effort of the Government of Togo (GOT) to establish a private free export processing zone near Lome's port.

OAR recently worked closely with the PC to improve the presentation of a low cost housing proposal that A.I.D./W might finance and that PC hopes to implement. The Health Sector Support for Child Survival project provides funding to support a PC health education effort now on-going with the support of the regional CCCD project. Otherwise, the A.I.D. Representative does not see any scope for joint A.I.D.-PC activity. The OAR staff was not aware of the A.I.D./W PASA arrangements in support of the Peace Corps.

2. Peace Corps Program and Attitudes

The PC program in Togo is in transition, having been heavily oriented to rural areas in agriculture and rural development, education, and health. It is being forced to re-orient its program because of the PC/W policy requiring a dramatic reduction in the number of motorcycles that can be used by PCVs. Since transportation is essential to PCVs' effectiveness in many of their current assignments, PC/Togo is looking toward orienting its program more to urban areas. The proposal submitted on low cost housing seems to be the only plans yet developed for significantly adjusting the program.

Although there are good relations existing between some of the PC staff and their A.I.D. counterparts, there appears not to have been any serious effort at collaboration other than the low cost housing proposal.

3. Host Country and PVO Attitudes

The Togolese manager of one of the activities in the now terminating Animal Traction project spoke highly of the PCVs that had been assigned to that project and was grateful that they were continuing in the project beyond the A.I.D. cut-off. The CDC advisor indicated that the PCVs working in health education were well received by Ministry of Health officials.

On the other hand, the PC Director pointed out that there was an increasing number of volunteers from other countries working in Togo, most with resources (often including vehicles) available to them. In addition, there is an increasing number of trained Togolese, so there is a need for more qualified PCVs to work in Togo. The GOT is scrutinizing proposed PCV activities more intensely than before.

PVO representatives contacted by the team made the point also about the large number of trained Togolese available and said that they generally did not see the need to incorporate PCVs in their activities in Togo. The only exception made recently was when a third-year PCV came to them with a specific proposal which they had accepted.

C. ROLES AND PLAYERS

The roles played by the various collaborators in the project case studies are summarized in the matrix which follows.

Togo

Players	PC/ Missions	A.I.D./ Missions	PVOs	PC/ Wash	A.I.D./ Wash	HCGs	NGOs
<u>Functions</u>							
Initiation	1,2,3						
Planning	1,2,3	1,3	3				
Approval					1,3	1	
Funding		1			2,3		
Management		1,2	3	1,2a/			
Implementation	1,2,3		3				
Monitoring		1	3	2a/		1,2,3	
Evaluation		1			2,3a/		

1 = Animal Traction Development.

2 = Health Education.

3 = Low Cost Housing.

a/ A.I.D./W contractor.

D. PROJECT CASE STUDIES

1. Animal Traction

1) The Project

The USAID-funded Animal Traction Development project (693-0218) involved the setting up of a special project structure and 16 centers for demonstrations, experimentation, and training of farmers in the use of bullocks as draft animals for farming. PCVs were an integral part of the project. There was an advisory and coordinating A.I.D.-funded technical assistance team. The project was authorized July 30, 1983 and will terminate December 31, 1989; the technical assistance team left in the summer of 1988.

The antecedents to the project go back to the early 1960s when there was a joint A.I.D.-PC agricultural training center project in the Kara region in north central Togo. Some animal traction activity was a part of the project.

Although A.I.D. support to the project terminated by 1970, PCVs continued to work in animal traction in the Kara area all through the 1970s.

In the late 1970s, A.I.D. provided funding to expand the work of the PCVs. This was done through an Accelerated Impact Program (AIP) grant from the African regional project by that name. The success of the AIP activity led to the follow-on bilateral project now being concluded.

2) Characteristics of Collaboration

a. Initiation: There was a joint A.I.D.-PC project in the 1970s. Subsequently, only PC carried on with the activity. Later, A.I.D. developed a mini-project which was largely implemented by PC. Then in 1983 USAID worked with PC in developing the project.

b. Planning: Both OAR and PC participated in the project planning.

c. Approval: PC participated with A.I.D. in the presentation of the project to the Regional A.I.D. office in Abidjan (REDSO/WA) for approval. Subsequently, OAR presented the project to A.I.D./W for approval.

d. Funding: The project was funded as a regular bilateral project with the GOT.

e. Management: The A.I.D.-funded contract team, in conjunction with their GOT counterparts, provided overall management of the project.

f. Implementation: PCVs and their Togolese counterparts were primarily responsible for day-to-day implementation of the project. The A.I.D.-funded technical assistance team provided general supervision of the PCVs.

g. Monitoring: Monitoring of the project was by the OAR Project Officer and appropriate Togolese officials.

h. Evaluation: An evaluation was carried out in 1988 which led to the extension of the project until the end of 1989. Peace Corps was not a party to the evaluation, although some PC staff were interviewed by the evaluation team. The Peace Corps contribution to the project was hardly mentioned. The extent and nature of any A.I.D.-PC collaboration was not discussed.

i. Impact: There seems to be general agreement that the use of animal traction has expanded rather rapidly in the north and central regions of the country, faster than anticipated in the project paper. A positive impact seems ensured.

j. Sustainability: The continued use of animal traction by those that have embarked on this path seems assured. The continuation of all of the centers established under the A.I.D.-funded project and all of the functions of the centers, however, is unlikely; some functions are being

maintained with the assistance of PCVs who are continuing to work in animal traction. This increases the chances of those elements being sustained.

2. Health Education

1) The Project

Health education is an activity that was developed by a PCV couple working in the Ministry of Health (MOH). Their proposal was accepted by the MOH and by PC, and additional PCVs were recruited to work in village health centers to carry out the program. A.I.D.'s regional Combatting Communicable Childhood Diseases (CCCD) project has provided financial support to the activity. Follow-on funding is to be provided by OAR's bilateral Health Support for Child Survival project as soon as implementation problems are worked out.

2) Characteristics of Collaboration

- a. Initiation: The activity was initiated by PC.
- b. Planning: The activity was planned by PCVs.
- c. Approval: The MOH approved the proposal and PC/W agreed to support it by recruiting the needed PCVs.
- d. Funding: A.I.D.'s regional CCCD project provided initial funding. OAR's bilateral project for child survival is to continue the needed financial support.
- e. Management: The activity is managed (loosely) by the MOH, with technical support of the CCCD advisor.
- f. Implementation: The activity is implemented by PCVs and their MOH counterparts.
- g. Monitoring: General monitoring is provided by the MOH, the PC, the CCCD advisor, and the OAR health project officer.
- h. Evaluation: This activity was reviewed as a part of the CCCD evaluation and will be in the future as a part of the evaluation of the Health Sector Support for Child Survival project.
- i. Impact: It is not clear whether it will be possible to measure the impact separately of this activity. However, it is clear that the MOH, CCCD, and OAR are convinced that the impact of other activities they are carrying out will be enhanced by the PCV effort.
- j. Sustainability: Part of the PCV effort is to identify volunteers in villages who help in carrying the message for health education, particularly for immunizations, to villagers. This type of activity has shown its usefulness and seems likely to be sustained by local health authorities and villagers.

3. Low Cost Housing

1) The Project

This proposed activity would involve PCVs working with an American PVO which would have responsibility for implementing, with A.I.D./W funding a low cost housing project in Lome.

2) Characteristics of Collaboration

a. Initiation: Writing up a project proposal was a PC initiative, but A.I.D. had informed PC of the possibility of funding for the project.

b. Planning: PC did the planning and arranged for help in project design. OAR reviewed the proposal and made suggestions for improvement.

c. Approval: The proposal was forwarded jointly to A.I.D./W for review and approval. A decision had not yet been made at the time of the team's visit to Togo.

d. Funding: The funding, if approved, will come from A.I.D./W funds.

e. Management: The project would be managed by an American PVO specializing in low cost housing projects.

f. Implementation: PCVs would be part of the implementation team operating under the general direction of the PVO.

g. Monitoring: Day-to-day monitoring would be the responsibility of the PVO and its Togolese counterpart. PC/Togo would also do some monitoring, at least in relation to the PCV's work. OAR might have some monitoring responsibility depending upon the financial arrangements decided upon by A.I.D./W.

h. Evaluation: No information available.

i. Impact: No information available on expected impact or steps planned to measure impact.

j. Sustainability: No information

E. FUTURE COLLABORATION PROSPECTS

1. Health Sector

It would seem desirable to continue and strengthen the collaboration in health education and perhaps look for ways to expand PCV activities in this field. PC/Togo should be invited by OAR to participate in the health sector study that OAR is planning in the next few months.

2. Small Enterprise Development

OAR is interested in private sector development as are a number of PCVs. If there is no interest by the implementors of the TRIPS project in having PCVs in the project, PC/Togo may wish to consider developing its own project along the lines of the Chamber of Commerce project in Mali. Also, the establishment of a free zone is likely to create a significant demand for services to support the larger firms in the zone. This could be a fertile area for the development of small enterprises. PC might also consider whether some of the appropriate technology activities could become more oriented toward promoting small enterprise activity that might be tied into the TRIPS project.

3. Animal Traction

A.I.D. is phasing out of the Animal Traction Development project, but PCVs are continuing to work in this activity. OAR might wish to consider whether some small amount of support to this activity might be appropriate under the TRIPS project.

4. Agro-forestry/Resource Conservation

OAR has proposed a regional project in Agro-forestry/resource conservation. If approved, this could be an activity that could be supported by PCVs. Based on discussions in A.I.D./W and observations of PCVs in Mali and Burundi, the team believes that PC can be counted on to provide well-qualified volunteers in this specialty.

Attachments

- 1 - List of Persons Contacted
- 2 - List of Documents Reviewed

ATTACHMENT 1

LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

U.S. Embassy

Ambassador Rush W. Taylor, Jr.
Tibor P. Nagy, Jr., DCM

Office of A.I.D. Representative (OAR)

Mark Wentling, A.I.D. Representative
Evelyn McLeod, Program Officer
Dennis Panther, Rural Development Officer
Hyacinth Sodji, Program Assistant
Brian Fitzgibbon, CCCD
Louis O'Brien, Personal Services Contractor (PSC) in Child Survival
Peter Rice, PSC in Animal Traction (Kara)
(ex-PCV in Animal Traction project)

Peace Corps

Robert Nicolas, Director
Gregory Austreng, APCD/Rural Development
Kodzo Amesefe, APCD/Ag. Education, etc.
Tchao Bamaze, APCD/Health
Sam Connor, PCV (Kara - Appropriate Technology)
Michael Haner, PCV (Kara/Niamtougou - Appropriate Technology)
Mark Voss, PCV (Kara/Ketao - Coops)
Harold Tarver, PCV (Kara/Massdena - Animal Traction)
Virginia Swezy, PCV (Baguida - Health)
Amy Davis, PCV/Senegal
Marilyn _____, PCV/Senegal

GOT

Dr. Kossivi Apetofia, Director PROPTA (Project pour la Promotion de la
Traction Animale), Atakpame
Ministry of Health counterpart of PCV Virginia Swezy
Director, Ketao Health Center
Director of Health Clinic in Baguida

Catholic Relief Services/Togo

Michael Hastings, Director
John Deidrick, Program Officer

CARE/Togo

John Schiller, Director of TRIPS project

World Council of Credit Unions (WCCU)

Chet Aeschliman, Principal Technical Counselor to the Togolese Federation
of Credit Unions (FUCEC)

ATTACHMENT 2

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

A.I.D.

FY1986 Small Program Strategy Statement Update, March 1984

Summary of USAID Program in Togo and Benin, 9/30/89

Project Implementation Reports for Animal Traction Development (693-0218) and Health Sector Support for Child Survival (693-0228) projects.

Project Papers for Animal Traction Development and Togo Rural Institutions and Private Sector (693-0227) projects.

Evaluation Reports for Animal Traction Development and Zio River Development projects.

Grant Agreement for Health Sector Support for Child Survival project.

Small Enterprise Development Pilot Project Design, Catholic Relief Services, July 1989.

Project de Construction et d'Utilisation de prototypes de Materiel a Traction Animale, PROPTA undated (1987 or 1988).

Annual report on development of animal traction equipment, PROPTA, 1989.

Peace Corps

Write-up on Peace Corps in Togo dated April 1989 which was supplied by Peace Corps/Togo.

Briefing Paper on Peace Corps in Togo undated, provided by Peace Corps/Washington, with attachment dated 5/15/89 from PC/LOME.

Volunteer Roster as of 9/30/89

Quarterly Reports on Small Project Assistance, 7/19/89 and 10/10/89.

Financial data on PC/Lome use of A.I.D. PASAs.

LIST OF PEOPLE CONTACTED IN WASHINGTON

A. PEACE CORPS

Carroll Bouchard, RD/F
 Mary Killeen, D/OTAPS
 Linda Borst, CHOPS/AF
 Theresa Joiner, D/CHOPS/AF
 Margaret McLaughlin, CHPT
 Ray Panczyk, PO/P&T/AF
 Moira Crabill, Burundi CDU
 Karen Smith, Burundi CDU
 Stephanie Campbell, Ghana CDU
 Kurt Pope, Ghana CDU
 Nancy Gehron, Mali CDU
 Matt Towers, Mali CDU
 Chris Casey, Lesotho CDU
 Bill Hodges, Lesotho CDU
 Theresa Queenan, Togo CDU
 Susan Olson, Togo CDU
 Paul Olson, African Food Systems Initiative
 Robert Riley, AF/Administration
 Wayne Fussel, AF/Agriculture
 Harry Rea, AF/Fisheries
 David Reynolds, AF/Natural Resources
 Colleen Conroy, AF/Health
 Paul Vitale, Urban Development/Community Development
 Jeanette Cason, Small Enterprise Development
 Jim Ekstrom, Chief of Operations
 Becky Parks, Director of Program Support
 Barbara Ferris, WID Coordinator

B. A.I.D.

Walter Bollinger, AA/Africa (Acting)
 John Westley, AFR/DP
 Turra Bethune, AFR/DP/PAB
 Arnold Baker, PPC/PB/CPA
 Cindy Clapp-Wincek, AFR/DP/PPE
 Keith Brown, AFR/SA
 Earline Wilkinson, AFR/SA
 Nan Newman, AFR/SA
 Sid Bliss, AFR/PD/SAP
 Cynthia Rozell, AFR/PD/SAP
 Bonnie Pounds, AFR/CLWA
 Rudy Thomas, AFR/CCWA
 Alan Getson, AFR/PD/CCWAP
 Louise Werlin, AFR/SWA
 John Burns, AFR/PD/SWAP

B. A.I.D. (cont'd)

Mable Meares, AFR/CCWA
Harry Marwitz, AFR/EA
Dan Mackell, AFR/PD/EAP
Carlton Terry, AFR/PD/EAP
Janis Weber, AFR/EA
Brian Kline, AFR/TR
Ron Bonner, AFR/TR
Peggy Meitas, AFR/TR
Buff MacKenzie, AFR/TR
Dan Deely, SGT/FENR
Ross Bigelow, S&T/RD
Frances Davidson, S&T/Nutrition
Robert Clay, S&T/Health
Myra Tucker, AFR/TR/HPN
Sam Larooy, AFR/PD/CCWAP

C. OTHERS

Tom Scanlon, Benchmarks, Inc.
Bill Burrows, PC Micro-Enterprise Contractor

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED IN WASHINGTON

A. A.I.D./Peace Corps

1. A Guide to A.I.D.-Peace Corps-PVO Collaborative Programming, A.I.D./PVC and PC/OTAPS, August 1984.
2. PASA BST-1096-P-PC-3025-00, Field Service and Program Support; Small Project Assistance Fund (931-1096.60), January 8, 1983 and amendments and progress reports.
3. PASA AC/DSB-000-5-80, Forest Resource Management Joint A.I.D. Peace Corps Forestry Initiative, September 1, 1980 and amendments and progress reports.
4. PASA DPE-5939-P-PC-6055-00, ORT-HELP -- Peace Corps Child Survival PASA (936-5939.22), August 25, 1986 and amendments and progress reports.
5. PASA BST-0262-P-PC-4005-02, Nutrition: Scientific, Technical and Planning Support (Mali) - 931-0262, March 18, 1984 and amendments and progress reports.
6. PASA OTR-0705-P-AG-7221-00, A.I.D./Peace Corps Farmer-to-Farmer Pilot Project (938-0705), 9/1/87 and amendments and progress reports.
7. PASA AFR-0467-P-AP-8033-00, Natural Resources Management (Burundi - 698-0467), 7/25/88 and amendments and progress reports.
8. PASA DHR-1090-P-AP-8039-00, Small Enterprise Approaches to Employment (931-1090), September 30, 1988 and amendment and progress reports.
9. PASA AFR-0438-P-AP-9051-00, African Private Enterprise Fund (1698-0438), 9-01-89 and amendment.
10. State 193269 of January 17, 1989, Subject: A.I.D./Peace Corps Cooperation and Field Responses.
11. Cooperation between the Peace Corps and the Agency for International Development. A Report to the Congress of the United States, February 1986.
12. Cooperation between the Peace Corps and the Agency for International Development. A Report to the Congress of the United States, August 1989 (draft).
13. Various memoranda of the A.I.D./Peace Corps Coordinating Committee.
14. Memorandum of Understanding on the Use of the Small Project Assistance (SPA) Funds, January 28, 1983.

B. A.I.D.

1. An Action Plan for FY89-91, The Development Fund for Africa, May 1989.
2. State 283555 of September 2, 1989, Subject: The Structure of Mission Action Plans: Strategic Objectives, Targets, and Benchmarks.
3. Program documentation on countries to be visited.

C. Peace Corps

1. CMPB Summaries (various countries).
2. Program and staffing documentation on countries being visited.
3. Catalog of MOUs signed between Peace Corps and PVOs (February 1, 1989).
4. African Food Systems Initiative documentation.
5. The Peace Corps and PVOs: Steps to Effective Collaboration in Field Projects (undated).
6. Integrated Programming System (Programming Manual PR-002), September 1986.
7. Integrated Programming System (Programming Manual PR-002), October 1989.
8. The Annual Report for the Small Project Assistance Program, 1988, February 1, 1989.
9. Guidance on Small Project Assistance.
10. Project Plans for Countries Visited.

D. Other

1. Mid-Term Assessment Peace Corps/A.I.D. Child Survival PASA, April 1989, Mary Ann mercer, Dr. PH, The Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health.
2. Evaluation of the Peace Corps Small Project Assistance (SPA) Program, March 21, 1989, TVT Associates.