

**BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET**1. CONTROL NUMBER  
PN-AAJ-6022. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION (653)  
DE10-0000-0000

## 3. TITLE AND SUBTITLE (240)

An assessment of selected cooperative development projects in Africa and Asia

## 4. PERSONAL AUTHORS (100)

Shaffer, J. R.

## 5. CORPORATE AUTHORS (101)

## 6. DOCUMENT DATE (110)

1979

## 7. NUMBER OF PAGES (120)

44p.

## 8. ARC NUMBER (170)

334.S525

## 9. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION (150)

Shaffer

## 10. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (530)

## 11. ABSTRACT (950)

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

## 12. DESCRIPTORS (920)

Cooperatives  
Credit  
Assessment  
Projects  
AsiaAgricultural credit  
Credit cooperatives  
AID  
Africa

## 13. PROJECT NUMBER (150)

## 14. CONTRACT NO. (140)

AID/DSAN-147-698

15. CONTRACT  
TYPE (140)

## 16. TYPE OF DOCUMENT (160)

334  
0525

14-000-002

AN ASSESSMENT OF SELECTED  
COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS  
IN AFRICA AND ASIA

John R. Shaffer

Contract: AID/DSAN-147-698

PO Number 3698265

May 18, 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction . . . . .	Page 1
II. Project Visits and Assessments	
Cooperative Consultation, Khartoum, Sudan . . . . .	2
Tanzania - ACDI/Tanzania Rural Development Bank . . . . .	3
Tanzania - ACDI/National Milling Corporation . . . . .	4
Botswana - FCH/Self Help Housing Agency, Gaborone . . . . .	6
Swaziland - CLUSA/Central Cooperative Union of Swaziland . . . . .	7
Kenya - ACDI/Agricultural Finance Corporation . . . . .	9
Kenya - CUNA/ACOSCA . . . . .	10
Kenya - FCH . . . . .	11
India - CLUSA . . . . .	11
Bangladesh - NRECA . . . . .	12
Indonesia - CLUSA . . . . .	14
Indonesia - NRECA . . . . .	14
Philippines - NRECA . . . . .	15
Philippines - ACDI . . . . .	15
III. Summary Observations and Recommendations Regarding the Issues Examined During Cooperative Assessment. . . . .	16
Issue 1 - Basic human needs strategy/reaching the "poorest of the poor" . . . . .	17
Issue 2 - Meeting Project goals/project problems . . . . .	18
Issue 3 - "Modus operandi" of cooperative development organizations . . . . .	18
Issue 4 - Quality of field staff of cooperative development organizations . . . . .	19
Issue 5 - Headquarters support of field projects . . . . .	20
Issue 6 - USAID attitudes toward/support of cooperative development organizations . . . . .	21
IV. Conclusions . . . . .	21
Appendix I - Programme/Participants - "Consultation on Cooperative Development in the Sudan, Khartoum, 26-31 March 1979" . . . . .	23
Appendix II-A - AID Issues Project Assessment Criteria . . . . .	34
Appendix II-B - Project Evaluation Form . . . . .	38

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared pursuant to the provisions of Contract Number AID/DSAN-147-698 which defines a scope of work as follows:

"To purchase a report that reflects an on-site assessment of a selected number of field projects, as determined by A.I.D., DS/DAA/FN, in Asia and Africa being carried out by one or more of the following organizations: Agricultural Cooperative Development International, Cooperative League of the United States, Credit Union National Association, Foundation for Cooperative Housing, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and Volunteer Development Corps. The assessment will include:

1. An examination of the relevancy of cooperative development projects to the "basic human needs" strategy of the Foreign Assistance Act and the degree to which cooperative development projects are effective in reaching "the poorest of the poor".
2. An examination of the degree to which the specific projects visited are meeting project goals, and, if problems exist, how these are being met.
3. An examination of the "modus operandi" of the cooperative development organizations including such issues as (a) relationships with LDC people and officials and (b) the appropriateness of U. S. cooperative development organizations organizing local LDC cooperatives.
4. An examination of the quality of the cooperative development organizations' field staff.
5. An examination of the degree and effectiveness of the support provided projects by the headquarters of the cooperative development organizations.
6. An examination of A.I.D. Missions' attitudes toward cooperative development organizations and the amount of administrative back-up required by these organizations."

The desire to have such an assessment of a sample of overseas projects funded by A.I.D. and being carried out by these organizations stemmed from an earlier review of A.I.D.'s work with these groups which centered principally on AID/Washington relationships and activities. A report of that phase of the assessment was submitted per contract AID/DSAN-147-672.

The field visits which contributed to this report were undertaken per the following schedule:

March 27-31 -	- Cooperative Consultation, COPAC - Khartoum, Sudan
April 1-6	- ACDI - Dar-Es-Salaam, Tanzania
April 7-9	- FCH - Gabarone, Botswana
April 10-12	- CLUSA - Manzini, Swaziland
April 17-21	- ACDI, ACOSCA, FCH - Nairobi, Kenya
April 22-24	- CLUSA - New Delhi, India
April 25-27	- NRECA - Dacca, Bangladesh
April 28-May 1	- CLUSA, NRECA - Jakarta, Indonesia
May 2-4	- ACDI, NRECA - Manila, Philippines

Planned visits to Rwanda and Lesotho were not made per the requests of the USAID missions in those two countries because of special problems related to country conditions or scheduling.

## II. PROJECT VISITS AND ASSESSMENTS

### A. Cooperative Consultation, Khartoum, Sudan, March 26-31, 1979.

Fifty six representatives from fifteen countries and thirteen international organizations plus a host of Sudanese government and cooperative officials met in Khartoum, March 26-31, 1979 at the invitation of the Joint Committee for the Promotion of Aid to Cooperatives (COPAC) and the Government of Sudan. The gathering was to provide an occasion for the Sudanese to present and discuss their interest in and aspirations for cooperatives in the development of Sudan and for the invited national and international cooperators to share experience and perspective with their Sudanese counterparts. Jointly the two groups considered a series of proposals for cooperative development projects. Appendix I contains a list of participants and the "Programme" for the consultation, including the various proposals discussed.

It was obvious from the level of official Sudanese participation (the President, two Vice Presidents, Ministers of Cooperation, Agriculture, Planning, other governmental and private cooperative leadership) and the attention paid to participants that this was an occasion of some importance to the Government of Sudan. They emphasized continually the importance Sudan places on cooperatives as the mechanism for mobilizing popular participation in development, pointing out how this is structured in their constitution, in their official governmental and political set-ups and in their encouragement of the cooperative private sector in Sudan.

Cooperative development projects proposed for discussion and funding ranged from the "Establishment of the Sudan Cooperative Development Bank" through "Strengthening Planning and Data Collection in the Ministry of Cooperation," "Cooperative Housing," "Establishment of Five Regional Cooperative Training Centers," to "Flour Grinding Mills for Rural Cooperatives-Southern Region" and "Cooperative Fish Production and Marketing." Taken as a whole they represented an ambitious exercise in analyzing and proposing cooperative solutions to many critical social and economic problems facing Sudan.

It is a range of activities and possibilities which AID should examine carefully for an appropriate assistance role. Several approaches to this are suggested:

1) The combined expertise of the U. S. cooperative development organizations should be tapped to analyze the proposals made at the Khartoum consultation and suggest among those projects proposed (and perhaps areas not discussed) what role the cooperative development organizations could play in cooperative development in Sudan. AID/Washington should provide the leadership for such an analysis.

2) USAID/Sudan is encouraged to engage the services of either a consultant on cooperative development or of a team or representatives from the cooperative development organizations (as was done recently in Nicaragua) to do an analysis of the "cooperative sector" in Sudan. This should include (a) an examination of the history of cooperatives in the Sudan, (b) an examination of the projects proposed at the consultation to assess their relevance to the USAID/Sudan programming strategy, and (c) what other national and international groups are doing to assist Sudan in cooperative development.

3) AID should give particular attention to possibilities for building the capability and capacity of the private, non-governmental structures of the cooperative movement in the Sudan, particularly the National Cooperative Union (NCU). With the substantial involvement of the Sudanese government in plans for cooperative development (gigantic in contrast to the NCU) it will require careful and continuous and substantial help on the part of someone to insure that the private cooperative structures are not simply a facade.

The leadership of COPAC in organizing this consultation was important to its success. This first-of-its-kind consultation should be seen as providing experience for similar international meetings in other countries which wish to take a comprehensive look at what can be more fully accomplished with cooperative development.

Since there was some feeling expressed at the Khartoum meeting that the participants were being confronted with a "shopping list" of projects rather than being consulted about their experience and possible approaches to problems, it is recommended that COPAC consider a two-tiered approach to any subsequent conferences. National and international cooperative organizations should be more fully involved in analyzing needs, examining experience and suggesting solutions before a set of proposals are developed.

It is recommended that AID encourage COPAC to provide the stimulus and leadership for future consultations in interested countries.

### B. Tanzania - Agricultural Cooperative Development International

#### 1. Small Farmer Credit Project - Tanzania Rural Development Bank

ACDI's project with the Tanzania Rural Development Bank (TRDB) is designed to strengthen and improve the effectiveness of the Bank in its role of primary provider of agricultural credit throughout Tanzania. The project's goals are to increase food production levels and net farmer income by means of an efficient use of TRDB credit.

Currently ACDI has two technicians providing assistance to the project-- Ron Collehon, chief of party and credit management and operations officer, and Richard Koch, financial management officer. Collehon's work with the Managing Director of TRDB brings him into contact with all phases of the bank's operations. Koch's work is primarily concerned with financial management and bank records. He is currently developing a system for transferring the bank's records to a computer. Both Collehon and Koch came to their ACDI work from backgrounds with the Farm Credit Administration.

The TRDB extends credit through a series of "crop authorities" (tobacco, tea, etc.) and, increasingly, directly to small farmers through their Ujaama (cooperative) villages. Almost all of the credit to small farmers is through "in kind" inputs of seed, fertilizer, pesticides and equipment, rather than cash. USAID/Tanzania has assisted this part of the TRDB's operations through a \$3,000,000 grant to finance loans. The project also provides for participant training of both long and short term nature.

Collehon's and Koch's work is principally with the management and operations of TRDB at its headquarters in Dar Es Salaam. Koch is trying to make sense out of a jumbled and chaotic mix of systems and records. Collehon has more of a mix of headquarters and field activities and has tried to set an example for TRDB top leadership by spending time at district and village levels of their operations. Neither of the two ACDI staff are involved directly and on a continuing basis with small farmers but the resources of the project are clearly opening up new economic possibilities for such farmers.

Collehon recently collaborated in a TRDB study "Impact of Credit on Maize Production" in two regions of Tanzania. The study was a comparison between different villages which had and had not used TRDB small farmer credit, and among borrowers and non-borrowers in the same villages. The study reported significant positive differences between the borrowers in use of technical inputs (fertilizer, improved seeds, etc.), increased yield per hectare, and use of extension services.

The TRDB board of directors has requested another USAID sponsored project to follow the current one which ends next year. Both USAID officials and TRDB officials were strong in their appreciation for ACDI's work on this project.

The project itself has little directly to do with the expansion and development of cooperatives except as it contributes to the expansion of the institutional infrastructure of the Ujaama villages.

## 2. Agricultural Marketing Project - National Milling Corporation

The ACDI project with the National Milling Corporation (NMC) was designed to assist the NMC in carrying out its responsibility for buying, transporting, storing, preserving, processing and distributing food grains and grain products throughout Tanzania.

The goals of the project foundered almost from its inception on the drought and famine which struck Tanzania several years ago. Several of the former ACDI

technicians are remembered most because of their "heroic" service in getting food off relief ships and into the distribution channels, thus helping ward off mass starvation. Only now as the project is coming to a formal end are the original assistance goals again being examined. USAID/Tanzania is currently considering a new marketing project which will again examine ways in which the NMC can be assisted in its work of purchasing, handling and processing the production of Tanzania's struggling farmers.

Charles Alexander was the one remaining ACDI technician in the project (he departed Tanzania in mid-April). Alexander, a former Peace Corps Volunteer in the Philippines, has been serving as an economics analysis advisor. His work was centered in providing economic advice to the management of the NMC and in organizing and assisting in the operation of a Planning Unit. Essentially Alexander has provided an additional staff capability to NMC operations. His opportunity to broadly influence and to innovate within NMC has been limited.

The NMC utilizes more than 7000 Ujaama villages as its local buying centers, advancing funds to these villages which in turn pay the farmers cash for their produce. \$6.5 million will flow to these villages this year for their services as buying agents for NMC. In this regard the NMC is contributing to the development of the operational infrastructure and the resources of the cooperative villages.

Tanzania poses both a dilemma and an opportunity to the U. S. cooperative experience. The original cooperative structure in Tanzania was abolished by government fiat several years ago and the decision made to organize and use cooperative (Ujaama) villages as the structure for rural development, participation and enterprise. In one sense this made all of the U. S. cooperative experience irrelevant (there is very little U. S. cooperative experience with such collective enterprise) and yet opened up new possibilities for innovative cooperative organization at the village level. While the USAID/Tanzania is about to launch a broad rural development project there is little evidence that the U. S. cooperative development organizations have tried to see how they might fit into these and other efforts to build the Ujaama villages into viable, functional cooperative social and economic instrumentalities. ACDI continues to concentrate on national credit and marketing structures.

Recommendations:

1. USAID/Tanzania should utilize the Basic Ordering Agreement which ACDI has with AID/Washington to obtain the services of a short term technician who could examine (a) the Tanzanian experience with cooperatives, (b) the goals of the Ujaama villages, and (c) the relevant U. S. and other international cooperative development experience to determine if there is an appropriate role for the U. S. cooperative development organizations in Tanzania beyond that currently played by ACDI.

2. USAID/Tanzania and the current ACDI Chief of Party should familiarize themselves with the work of the existing national and international cooperative activities in Tanzania (ICA in Moshi, the Cooperative College, ACOSCA, etc.) and see how these programs might relate to an expanded and more comprehensive role for ACDI in general cooperative development in Tanzania.

C. Botswana - Foundation for Cooperative Housing

Self Help Housing Project - Gaborone Town Council

The Self Help Housing Project of the Gaborone Town Council (the capitol of Botswana) is a multi-donor project - USAID, CIDA, UK, UN - in which USAID has provided funds for building material loans and an OPG with the Foundation for Cooperative Housing to provide the services of an Housing Advisor.

The FCH advisor is Jim Upchurch who came to this project after a number of years work with the American Friends Service Committee where he was involved with self help and cooperative housing programs for migrant farm workers in Florida.

The over-all goals of the project are to deal with the problems of low-income and squatter housing in Gaborone. Progress to date suggests that Gaborone may soon become the only capitol city of a developing country that has the ability to keep ahead of its urban in-migration and that has eliminated its problem of squatter housing. The project also is an impressive example of the delivery of services to the poorest section of a society through a program that the government considers of great importance. It is being carried out with deep involvement of the poor people involved and is on a pay-as-you-go basis.

A large measure of the success of the project can be traced to the skills of its leadership and to the systematic and methodical manner in which the FCH Advisor has approached his task. Upchurch has a genius for analyzing the component parts of the housing system and developing simple but thorough solutions to problems. "No detail of a self help project can be neglected or ignored," said Upchurch, and few evidently have been in this project. Secondly, success is encouraged through a strong and continued training component for the entire operation. And, wisely, there is a realization that training is not a one shot affair. Training done in the previous year is now being repeated to reinforce the approaches taught and to introduce them anew to those who have recently moved into staffing positions. The third element of success is Upchurch's political savvy. He understands the dynamics of local politics, has established good political relationships and has stuck by his guns when called upon to compromise on matters of project principle.

The project has developed a system that insures that the poorest applicants have first priority in the allocation of building sites. A sophisticated technology (desk top mini-computers which provide timely information about the status of building material loans, stores records, payments of service levies, and certain management reports, for example) has been introduced and is being operated by persons with no previous experience and with skills that have been developed by the project.

The appreciation of the Government of Botswana for the progress of the project can be seen in the fact that they recently requested that an FCH team propose how the project can be expanded to include the other three major towns in the country. Discussions between FCH, USAID/Botswana and the Government of Botswana are currently under way to effect such an expansion.

The one weakness in an over-all impressive operation is the late placement of a counterpart for Upchurch as the Housing Officer in charge of the Self Help Housing Agency. Should the FCH advisor not remain beyond the period provided for in his current contract, or assume, as has been suggested, a larger role in an expanded project, there probably will not be time enough for the new Housing Officer to grasp the technical, administrative and political dimensions of his job. In that case much of the organizational building blocks that have been placed by Upchurch would be in serious jeopardy.

Included among the people met with in Gaborone were the married couple who are serving as co-directors of the Peace Corps in Botswana. In addition to comments of a laudatory nature regarding the Self Help Housing project they mentioned the need for assistance to the various cooperative structures in Botswana. The timing of this visit did not allow for exploration of this matter.

Recommendations:

1. FCH and USAID/Botswana should assess the problems associated with the time necessary to insure adequate preparation of the Housing Manager for assumption of full responsibility for operation of the SHHA. If accomplishing this requires an extension of the current FCH Advisor's contract, this should be anticipated and planned for now.

2. If there is an expansion of the FCH project to other towns in Botswana the current FCH Advisor should have a key role in structuring the expansion and should be placed in a supervisory/chief of party role with subsequent FCH staff. It would be a mistake to let programs in each of the other towns go their own ways and not build on the learnings and systems that have been developed in Gaborone.

3. USAID Botswana should utilize FCH to provide itself with an analysis of the state of all cooperative development in Botswana and a projection of what, if any, role AID and the U. S. cooperative development organizations might play in strengthening Botswana cooperatives.

4. The FCH Advisor should begin discussions with the Peace Corps to determine if viable and relevant assignments could be developed within the structure of the Self Help Housing Agency in Gaborone and in any proposed project expansion. In the context of recommendation three, he should also examine the possibilities for joint cooperative/Peace Corps projects.

D. Swaziland - Cooperative League of the United States of America

Central Cooperative Union of Swaziland Project

CLUSA's work with the Central Cooperative Union of Swaziland (CCU) is carried out under an OPG from USAID/Swaziland. The goals of the project are to (1) expand the economic base and activities of CCE and (2) to build the organizational and management structure of the organization and its affiliated cooperative societies with trained Swazis.

To do this CLUSA has a team of six (currently only five), headed by Lewis Townsend - a former Peace Corps Volunteer, Cooperative Advisor in Latin America, and a member of the CLUSA/Washington staff under their DPG. The CLUSA staff work in management positions in the CCU, three in senior management - Deputy Director, Marketing Director, Director of Farm Supply and Transportation (currently vacant), and three in field positions, acting as directors of three regional cooperative structures. The project is in the beginning of the second of a projected five year period.

The project reached its three year goal of expanded activity in the first year of operation. In fact, the expansion of activity has been dazzling - and is going on country-wide. Assuming no major unforeseen problems, growth should not be a project problem.

Acknowledging the fact that this is a young project, and with an appreciation of its genuine accomplishments to date, I was still uneasy about two areas - (1) the lack of Swazis working alongside the CLUSA technicians and (2) the limited attention that was seemingly being given to expansion and development of primary societies.

One of the goals of the project is the development of the CCU leadership and management over the five year period of the project. To contribute to this four CCU leaders are currently in the U. S. on long term training, more will soon be going. In fact, though, the management of CCU is pretty much an American show at the present time.. And, I did not sense that enough attention was being given to ways in which the undesirable effects of this type of project leadership were to be ameliorated.

Secondly, the rate of cooperative development at the national CCU level does not appear to be matched by a similar expansion in the primary societies. For the structure as a whole to be sound and increasingly viable at the end of the project period this is an area which should receive greater attention.

#### Recommendations:

1. A system of counterparts should be developed immediately which provides for Swazis to work alongside the CLUSA technicians at all times. Even if the persons assigned are not the persons who will ultimately fill the positions vacated by the CLUSA technicians, the on-the-job learning which can take place even with persons rotating in and out of jobs would be valuable to the Swazi employees of CCU. Such a close working contact would also help keep the project sensitive to smaller scale training needs to supplement longer term participant training.
2. The project should explore with Peace Corps/Swaziland the potential for use of Peace Corps Volunteers in roles of assisting a 'strengthening primary cooperative societies. The former Peace Corps experience of the CLUSA chief of party should be a good background for the definition of good community development roles for Volunteers through the cooperative structure. This could bring the project closer to the grass roots.
3. Since the Ministry of Cooperative acknowledges a concern for and interest in the development and expansion of cooperative credit societies and

since ACOSCA and the Swazis have projected a pattern of expansion utilizing CCU as its apex structure, it would be well for the project to examine how credit union development can be more fully pursued utilizing the resources of ACOSCA and CUWA.

4. The USAID Director expressed interest in the work being done by FCH in Botswana and Lesotho and felt that there were opportunities for similar projects in Swaziland. FCH and the AID Office of Housing should follow up on these interests, tying in whatever might develop with the long range plans for CCU.

E. Kenya - Agricultural Cooperative Development International  
Africa Cooperative Savings and Credit Association (ACOSCA)  
Foundation for Cooperative Housing

1. ACDI - Agricultural Finance Corporation Project

ACDI has been engaged in project activity involving the Agricultural Finance Corporation of Kenya since 1972, beginning with assistance to field operations, now with assistance targeted to the head office in Nairobi and to branch office operations. The AFC is the single largest supplier of credit to farmers and ranchers in Kenya.

In addition to the AID funded project, ACDI has one technician, a Senior Credit Specialist, assigned to the AFC as part of a World Bank program aimed at improving farm development lending.

The current ACDI contract with USAID/Kenya is nearing its termination but the Mission has activity under way which will lead to a follow-on project with the AFC. ACDI intends to bid on this follow-on activity.

(Parenthetically, the current exercise which USAID/Kenya is putting itself through to competitively bid the follow-on activity of this project appears to this observer to be an exercise in bureaucratic self-torture. The Mission appears satisfied with ACDI's work. The AFC wants them to continue. They have the experience and expertise. But...."AID/Washington is stressing competitive contracting." So out for bids this follow-on activity will eventually go. The net result will be a considerably larger than necessary expenditure of everyone's time and effort. The target for awarding the new contract has slipped until there will be no over-lap of the work of the current and future technicians. AID may wish to examine this and similar situations where its over-rigid application of a reasonable contracting policy creates more problems than it solves.)

While the AFC provides financial resources and services to small farmers and thus ACDI's work contributes to this (and USAID/Kenya feels this is an important effort) there is very little about the ACDI involvement here which is either grass roots or associated with cooperative development. To the extent that those are important goals in the context of Kenyan development and Mission strategy this project doesn't contribute much to them.

Recommendations:

a. ACDI should utilize its long term presence and involvement with Kenyan institutions as the basis for an assessment of the potential role for U. S. cooperative experience to the cooperative development of Kenya, and suggest what,

if any, project activity might flow from that assessment.

b. USAID/Kenya, prior to responding to overtures on behalf of the Government of Kenya to assist in the work of cooperative education, should do the equivalent of a "sector analysis" regarding cooperatives in Kenya, examining the state of their development needs and the roles, both of U. S. cooperative development organizations as well as other national and international donors, have played in the past, and appropriate roles for the future.

## 2. Africa Cooperative Savings and Credit Association (ACOSCA)

ACOSCA, now in its second decade as an organization, functions as a Pan-African federation of national credit union movements and as the African regional unit of the World Council of Credit Unions. It has been the recipient of AID assistance through its relationships with CUNA since 1974. Prior to that time CUNA Global Projects staff had assisted in the earlier organizational and development stages through a Basic Ordering Agreement. At the present time there are no U. S. technicians associated on a full-time basis with ACOSCA.

The current AID grant is designed to assist ACOSCA in (1) developing viable national cooperative credit systems capable of mobilizing savings at the local level; (2) demonstrating the viability of an approach to production credit for small farmers through experimental programs in Lesotho and Cameroon; and (3) strengthening its program direction activities for the purpose of expanding credit unions throughout Africa and ensuring an economically viable Pan-African credit union structure.

Headquartered in Nairobi, ACOSCA activities are decentralized through regional training centers in Maseru, Lesotho, Bobo Diolasso, Upper Volta, Bamenda, Cameroon, Zaire, and Nairobi. This assessment included discussions with the headquarters staff and with the East Africa Manager/Trainer.

One cannot fail to be impressed with the progress ACOSCA has made in ten years and with the impressive steps forward being made by credit unions in Africa. The Managing Director of the World Council of Credit Unions describes it as, "Our fastest growing affiliate." It was the one African institution represented at the Cooperative Consultation in Khartoum. The ACOSCA "Five Year Development Plan - 1976 - 1980" is an ambitious (probably overly so) guide for its organizational growth and development.

ACOSCA leadership described as "troublesome" the funding relationship with AID, indicating that "reimbursable payment" was a problem and that there was not enough flexibility in how funds flowed to them - "AID's uncertain funding," they called it. The schedule and scope of this assessment did not allow an opportunity to explore the implications of this at length, but it was articulated forcefully enough by ACOSCA staff to suggest that it is a matter worth examining by the appropriate AID/CUNA people who relate to the program.

### Recommendations:

a. AID and CUNA should examine the ACOSCA concerns about funding (cash-flow, it sounded like) and see if there are ways of removing any unnecessary irritants.

b. ACOSCA is reaching new levels of complexity and sophistication in its development. Persons familiar with the earlier development of other regional confederations (such as COLAC) should be available to ACOSCA to help insure that this experience is examined for its relevancy to ACOSCA's development. Since growth in membership and resources is one of the marks of credit union "success", future success will require organizational and managerial adjustments to handle new modes of operation. The collective experience of CUNA and the World Council of Credit Unions should be readily available to ACOSCA on a continuing basis to help meet such new situations.

c. CUNA Global Projects should carefully examine the possibility of out-stationing one of the staff funded from its institutional support grant from AID at the ACOSCA headquarters in Nairobi. Such a person would thus have a day-to-day working relationship with ACOSCA and at the same time could pursue CUNA's interests in and involvement with all of Africa.

d. As CUNA explores credit union development possibilities with different AID Missions in Africa, it should examine its earlier experiences in Latin America where joint projects were carried out with Peace Corps Volunteers. It should explore such possibilities with Peace Corps staff in appropriate countries.

### 3. Foundation for Cooperative Housing

The FCH report "Cooperative Housing for Low Income Workers in Kenya", prepared for the Kenya Ministry of Cooperative Development and The Central Organization of Trade Unions (Kenya) was discussed with staff of the African-American Labor Center who had been actively involved with the proposal. They were enthusiastic about the approach suggested, including formation of a National Cooperative Housing Agency.

Opportunities to discuss this proposal and other FCH activity with the AID Regional Housing Office were frustrated by a conflict in schedules and disrupted plane schedules when Don Gardner was returning from Sudan.

### F. India - Cooperative League of the United States of America

CLUSA, which has been working in India for some twenty five years, is currently represented by a three person team headed by Rex Wingard who has been the CLUSA representative in India since 1973. Wingard and two technicians - Carl Petersen and Walter Gible - officially relate to the National Cooperative Development Corporation (a government created parastatal organization designed to promote and support cooperative development). Wingard's role is more general with regard to NCDC management (and he has other roles related to CLUSA's other work in India) while Petersen and Gible are providing management and systems assistance to the oil seeds processing cooperatives that receive NCDC assistance.

CLUSA's presence in India, in addition to projects like those at present, and the earlier Indian Farmers Fertilizer Cooperative and work with dairy cooperatives, is supported by voluntary contributions from CLUSA membership and through the utilization of local currency made available by AID and the Government of India.

Over the years CLUSA has had a close relationship with the National Cooperative Union of India (NCUI) - the apex federation which includes most Indian cooperative organizations. Conversations with directors of NCUI produced unsolicited praise and appreciation for the role CLUSA played in building this national federation. They also suggested that CLUSA might join them in expanding some of their current programs, noting particularly assistance with visual aids and communications, cooperative health programs and some experimental programs using cooperatives as a focal point for integrated rural development.

It is apparent from even brief contacts with the leadership of NCDC, NCUI, IFFCO and others that the continued presence of CLUSA staff in India for such an extended period has provided frequent and varied opportunities for CLUSA to share in the development of many facets of the Indian cooperatives. CLUSA is currently beginning a new program utilizing PL 480 surplus oil which is projected to run for eight years and which will provide resources through the sale of oil to expand and strengthen the oil seed cooperatives of India.

Recommendations:

1. USAID/India and CLUSA should jointly make an assessment of the current state of cooperative development in India to determine whether the current programs of CLUSA are to the full extent to which U. S. cooperative resources and know-how might be made available to the Indian cooperative movement. Particular attention should be given to the interests expressed by the NCUI, including the concept of cooperatives as a focus for integrated rural development.

G. Bangladesh - National Rural Electric Cooperative Association  
Rural Electrification Project

NRECA is assisting in the implementation of the first phase of a planned twenty five year effort to bring electrification to the entire countryside of Bangladesh.

Stemming from a feasibility study completed in late 1976 the NRECA team now numbers six headed by Ed Gaither, a former rural electric systems manager from Colorado. All of the NRECA team are products of the U. S. rural electric network.

Work under the auspices of a recently created Rural Electric Board (REB), headed by a young, retired Brigadier, is moving along on schedule. The first several cooperatives have been organized. Training has taken place from top to bottom in REB. Sign-ups for service in the first cooperative has been double the number projected in the feasibility study. There is a great sense of movement and satisfaction with progress. The project moves ahead with a sense of mission.

The NRECA chief of party and the Chairman of the REB both responded with some enthusiasm to informal discussions of a larger role for the newly developed electric cooperatives in community development activities in the areas in which they are organizing. It was felt that should the Peace Corps return to Bangladesh

the rural electrification project could provide a useful program structure for village level community development, with Volunteers having defined jobs and a structure of joint direction/supervision by Bangladesh and NRECA staffs.

Two aspects of this emerging project deserve some careful attention and an assessment of their impact made by the project and by USAID/Bangladesh. The first has to do with the pattern of leadership emerging in the boards of directors of the new cooperatives. The kinds of people being selected (teachers, doctors, merchants, etc.) could lead to the development of an "elitist" leadership structure which leaves the poorer and less educated participants with limited leadership and participation roles. I had the feeling that there was a tendency in the project to confuse illiteracy with incapability. Unless early and careful attention is given to bringing all segments of the community into leadership roles in the beginning stages, there is little likelihood that a diversity of participation will emerge in the future.

The second aspect worth careful examination is the socio-economic make-up of the people who are signing up for electric service. In the first cooperative it was projected that 15% of the households would initially sign up for service. Already sign-ups are in excess of 30%. It would be useful for the project to have a good profile of the families who are signing up so that there can be an examination of who are not being reached by the project in the initial stages. Such information would be instructive for several reasons. First, it would show whether the project is either moderating or accentuating existing socio-economic divisions in the rural population. Second, the data would be helpful in anticipating how available funds for house-wiring loans can be most effectively utilized to assist the poorest and least able to afford this new community resource.

This matter should be examined now for my impression was that the leadership of REB is more concerned with establishing a nationwide network of electric cooperatives at the earliest possible date rather than with comprehensive coverage in particular areas. While the systems are being designed to be able to serve 75% of the households in an area, there is not as much concern shown for how soon that 75% might be served. In fact there was some indication that if too many sign up too soon that this could slow down the matter of a total national coverage by cooperatives because of the increased cost of a more extensive than planned service. Such attitudes, to the extent that they exist, will tend to mean that the poorer people of Bangladesh will be the last served.

#### Recommendations:

1. The two issues of board membership and an analysis of service sign-ups should be examined by NRECA, REB and USAID to determine the degree to which these are important issues and to insure that there is agreement among project principals as to basic service and involvement strategies.
2. Attention should be given to how the allocation of house-wiring loans can be made to insure that the poorest families have first priority in the use of these limited funds.
3. AID and NRECA should explore the possibility of utilizing Peace Corps Volunteers in a village level community development role associated with the emerging electric cooperatives.

H. Indonesia - Cooperative League of the United States of America  
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

1. Cooperative League of the United States of America

CLUSA activities in Indonesia are headed by Ed Fox, a former AID Mission Director in Indonesia in the early '60's. Fox's work, in addition to being a resident CLUSA representative (USAID/Indonesia has designated CLUSA as its primary contact with U. S. cooperatives), is with the Ministry of Cooperatives, assisting them in the development of new approaches to cooperative development and in providing training to parts of the cooperative structure. He is assisted in his work at the Ministry by Jim Heckman, a former Peace Corps Volunteer in Ethiopia, who has been working as an intern in a program with the Experiment in International Living. Heckman is going to continue with CLUSA in Jakarta as an administrative assistant to Fox.

CLUSA also has project activity under way, or anticipated, in four sites in Indonesia, none of which were visited on this assessment. They include a rice mill project in Java, a Seaweed Growing and Marketing Cooperative, a rice bran stabilization project in Bandung, and (as a sub-contractor to Cecchi) a cooperative development effort in a transmigration project in Luwu.

Fox's presence and efforts (he's been there a little over two years) should help CLUSA establish the kind of presence in Indonesia that could provide a long term influence on cooperative development in that country. The government has just prepared a five-year plan for development (including cooperatives) and has asked Fox's assistance in taking what amounts to a basic policy statement regarding cooperatives and fleshing it out into an operational plan. It's a unique opportunity for CLUSA.

Recommendations:

a. As Ed Fox helps the government flesh out a cooperative development plan or blueprint he should be prepared to suggest to USAID/Indonesia and to the U. S. cooperative development organizations the appropriate role for the U. S. cooperatives.

b. Given the need to develop a strong network of independent primary cooperatives, particular attention should be given to possible roles for grass roots cooperative organizing and strengthening.

2. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

The rural electrification project in Indonesia is NRECA's latest major new effort in assisting LDCs to expand rural electrification. Operating principally under the aegis of the Indonesian National Power Company (PLN) the project is being carried out combining assistance to the rural electrification efforts of PLN and, in outer islands, through the development of rural electric cooperatives. The work in the outer islands is being developed through a new rural electric cooperative structure in the Ministry of Cooperatives.

This division of labor has not been accomplished without considerable hostility to the idea from PLN which sees the cooperatives as "horning in" on its

domain. This conflict will probably be a continuing problem in the project and will be a matter demanding the careful attention of project leadership.

Several of the NRECA staff who have worked in the Philippines have joined the project in Indonesia. They should provide helpful experience to the cooperative portion of the project.

Recommendation:

a. The NRECA project in Bangladesh and the cooperative component in Indonesia are enough alike to confront some of the same problems (including fights between bureaucracies). NRECA and AID should insure that problem solutions and approaches which are developed in either of the projects are shared with the other. An initial approach to this might be a trip by project leadership (U. S. and Indonesian) from Jakarta to Bangladesh.

I. Philippines - National Rural Electric Cooperative Association  
Agricultural Cooperative Development International

1. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

Large scale NRECA participation in the work of the National Electrification Administration (NEA) in the Philippines has come to an end (there were as many as ten staff in 1975-76), and while debate rages in AID and other places as to the efficacy of rural electrification as a priority for LDC development the Philippine government is preparing to observe in July the installation of its 1,000,000th meter with a major celebration and an international conference to proclaim its pleasure and pride. Firm plans have been made and steps taken to insure that all of the Philippine's 1454 towns are electrified by 1981 and all barrios in the country by 1990.

NEA estimates that it will have cost about \$200 per household to do the first 1,000,000 and anticipates that this rate will continue even though the areas to be covered in the future are more complex.

Regardless of the outcome of the debates about rural electrification as a priority, one has to be impressed with the Philippine's accomplishments and, presumably, can take at face value the accolades the Philippine and USAID officials throw in NRECA's direction. The fact that NRECA uses the Philippines as a training ground for its projects in Indonesia and Bangladesh suggests that they feel pretty good about their work there.

Pete Mc Neill, the NRECA chief of party, has good relationships with USAID, NEA and seems not to be too burdened with the passing parade of visitors, AID and otherwise, who come to see what has been done. The NRECA technicians who participate in specialized roles in the Philippines in the future will have a good legacy to follow.

2. Agricultural Cooperative Development International  
Farmer Institutional Development Project

Four years of ACDI assisted activity in the province of Nueva Ecija, north

of Manila, has demonstrated the viability of Area Marketing Cooperatives and Cooperative Rural Banks as structures for the financing and marketing activities of Philippines cooperatives. A \$6,000,000 loan agreement signed between the U. S. and the Philippines in May 1978 will provide the wherewithal to expand the Nueva Ecija experiment throughout the country. While the contract for the work has not yet been awarded by the Government of Philippines, ACDI is a prime contender for providing assistance to the expansion effort.

Coincident with this effort (and an integral part to its ultimate success, in my opinion) is a program of village cooperative development and strengthening which will provide the local structures which tie in with the Area Marketing Cooperatives and Rural Cooperative Banks. The effort will be financed with \$1,000,000 in local currency and will be assisted by a team of 10 Peace Corps Volunteers who are scheduled to begin work in October.

A guiding spirit behind these efforts is Mark Van Steenwyk, ACDI Cooperative Development Specialist. Mark, who came to the Philippines eight years ago as a Peace Corps Volunteer assigned to work with cooperatives, has immersed himself in the successes, failures and history of cooperative development in the Philippines since that time. He probably has as full a grasp of the dynamics of the entire cooperative scene in the Philippines as any expatriate there. His accomplishments and planning are impressive.

Assuming that they have a role in the projects designed for the future, ACDI has a unique opportunity to help build a strong and viable agricultural cooperative structure throughout the Philippines - one which has taken advantage of the learning which has emerged from the misstarts and failures of the past.

Recommendation:

a. USAID/Philippines is urged to take advantage of the comprehensive background of Van Steenwyk with the Philippine cooperative scene to examine other aspects of cooperative development in that country. While he does not intend to continue in the implementation phase of the new projects, the Mission should obtain his services for a several month consultancy where he could fill in whatever gaps he may have in his understanding of cooperatives other than those with which he has already worked and prepare a "sector analysis" for cooperative development, including suggestions for appropriate activities beyond those now contemplated by USAID and the U. S. cooperative development organizations.

III. SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING ISSUES EXAMINED DURING COOPERATIVE ASSESSMENT.

As indicated in the Introduction there were a series of specific issues that were to be examined during this assessment of cooperative development organizations and projects. In this section I will summarize as appropriate some observations that grow out of the collective impressions gained during the visits to individual projects.

ISSUE 1. An examination of the relevancy of cooperative development projects to the "basic human needs" strategy of the Foreign Assistance Act and the degree to which cooperative development projects are effective in reaching "the poorest of the poor".

Disregarding the debate which continues over the definition of "poorest of the poor", certain comments can be made about the countries in which these cooperative development projects are located and about the general focus of the activities of the projects visited.

Utilizing data contained in AGENDA 1979, published by the Overseas Development Council (ODC), the following facts are of note.

The average per capita GNP for all developing countries in 1978 was \$494. The cooperative development projects visited (and four not visited in Africa and Asia (Lesotho, Liberia, Rwanda, Thailand) were all in countries which had per capita GNPs below the average for all developing countries. The range was from \$110 for Bangladesh and Rwanda to Swaziland's \$470.

Examining need from the ODC's Physical Quality of Life Index (a composite of average life expectancy at age one, infant mortality, and literacy) the indicators are again that the cooperative development projects are located in the LDCs of greatest need. The average PQLI for all developing countries is 56 (of a possible 100). With the exception of Thailand and the Philippines (both with PQLIs of 71) all other countries where cooperative projects are located score below the average for the developing world. The following table lists each country and indicates per capita GNP and PQLI.

Country	Per Capita GNP 1978	PQLI 1978
Bangladesh	\$110	32
Rwanda	\$110	27
India	\$150	41
Lesotho	\$170	48
Tanzania	\$180	30
Indonesia	\$240	48
Kenya	\$240	39
Sudan	\$290	34
Thailand	\$380	71
Botswana	\$410	51
Philippines	\$410	71
Liberia	\$450	26
Swaziland	\$470	33
Average/All dev. countries	\$494	56
Average/World	\$1628	65

Such data suggests that unless a project was clearly irrelevant to one of these nation's development needs (which none were) the benefits of project activity are going to some of the poorest people in the world and to people in countries of highest relative need. They are projects aimed at building basic infrastructure which will institutionalize the flow of benefits.

ISSUE 2. An examination of the degree to which the specific projects visited are meeting project goals, and, if problems exist, how these are being met.

Generally, the projects visited were found to be on target in terms of their project goals and where problems existed they were being dealt with. In no place did I find a project immobilized or in serious trouble by either a failure to recognize problems or failure to deal with them.

ACDI's National Milling Corporation project in Tanzania was winding to a close after some heroic work over time by individuals but with general agreement that the original project goals had been defeated by events associated with the Tanzanian drought and famine.

CLUSA's Swaziland project, as noted earlier, while making great strides in the area of expanded services falls short on the issue of training cooperative leadership.

In Indonesia, because of conflicting government policy and lack of real coordination between NRECA and C. T. Main, the U. S. engineering firm doing the engineering work on the rural electrification effort, that project is out of phase with its schedule.

Assuming that rural electrification projects will remain a part of AID's approaches to development, the three current projects involving jointly NRECA and three different consulting engineer firms offer an opportunity to examine different models for the relationships between these two implementing agents in the projects. In the Philippines separate contracts and independent activities reportedly worked well. In Bangladesh and Indonesia problems of coordination and relationships exist. In Dacca NRECA has been given the responsibility for over-all project activity. The engineering firm is responsible to them. In Indonesia responsibilities are divided and this is proving troublesome.

Recommendation:

NRECA and AID's Office of Engineering should examine the several models for joint work on cooperative rural electrification projects and determine if the problems being experienced in Bangladesh and Indonesia could be ameliorated by a different kind of structure of relationships and responsibilities.

ISSUE 3. An examination of the "modus operandi" of the cooperative development organizations including such issues as (a) relationships with LDC people and officials and (b) the appropriateness of U. S. cooperative development organizations organizing LDC cooperatives.

While the projects visited are involved in activities which ultimately benefit the poor of the countries visited, I was left with some uneasy feelings regarding the limited degree to which the staffs of the cooperative development organizations were in direct touch with and/or directly involved with the poor. The greatest expenditure of time and effort was going into activity which would result in benefits that get to the poor majority, but the work of the cooperative development organizations was often pretty far removed from them. Also, little was going on (again with some notable exceptions) to contribute to the building of a primary cooperative infrastructure at the grass roots level.

is

It is important to note that this/not a goal of most of the projects visited. To that degree it represents, in my judgement, a shortcoming of the AID programming process.

The issue of cooperative development organization staff working at levels of government or cooperative organizations far removed from the poor should be examined in the context of deciding the degree to which it is perceived that development is enhanced by a top-down improvement process and/or by a bottom-up organizational process. An 'either/or' argument is probably pointless, but it is of note that the preponderance of the technical assistance currently being provided in the projects visited is of the top-down variety. The least direct assistance is being provided at the local community level.

CLUSA in Swaziland, NRECA in Bangladesh, the ACDI staff proposals for the Philippines, CUNA/ACOSCA's approach to credit union development in Africa, and FCH's proposals for expanded activity in Botswana appear to be thoughtful examples of how projects can be structured to impact at a variety of levels of LDC societies.

Regarding a role for U. S. cooperative development organizations in the organizing of primary cooperatives (or even pre-coops) there is considerable difference of opinion, some favoring it, others questioning it. On the issue of need for this type of organizing there is little dispute. There is also agreement that this kind of grass roots organizing and institution building is not taking place to anything like the degree that is needed.

In several earlier sections of this report I suggest a joint role in organizing and strengthening local cooperatives for the cooperative development organizations and the Peace Corps. There may be other alternative approaches. This certainly is an area of need that should not be ignored simply because it is difficult or simply because it doesn't represent the current level of most U. S. cooperative activity.

#### ISSUE 4. An examination of the quality of the cooperative development organizations' field staff.

The level of prior experience and current competency to do the jobs assigned was uniformly high among the cooperative development organizations' staff seen during this visit to projects. Further, the fact that in some cases technicians had been terminated early for lack of requisite abilities is an indication that these organizations are remaining attentive to staff quality.

While there were differences in competency among the people seen I found no examples (as had been suggested I might) of persons who would fall into the category of "cast-offs from the U. S. cooperative movements". Five of the twenty nine technicians were former Peace Corps Volunteers. The age range was 27-66 (three in their 20s, six in their 30s, seven in their 40s, eight in their 50s, five in their 60s). Two of the oldest were thriving on their village level cooperative organizing activities in Bangladesh - no mean challenge.

Generally speaking there appeared to be less over-concern among the staff of the cooperative development organizations for amenities than one tends to find among the official American community; though, there was some chaffing at the differences in privileges provided AID staff in contrast to contractors.

The issue of language training was raised with some regularity. Generally speaking, cooperative development organization staff do not have local language competency. This is an area which warrants additional attention

Two other issues deserve note - (a) the degree to which skills are being transferred to counterparts, and (b) the planning for eventual take over of the functions now being performed by the cooperative development organization staff.

Uniformly, in all countries visited, there was a lament over the lack of trained managerial talent in counterpart structures. Almost as uniformly there was no approach to solving the problem other than through AID's participant training - and there was general discontent expressed about how that worked.

Recommendation:

The cooperative development organizations should collectively assess problems of counterpart training and determine the degree to which this is an issue that should be approached together. They should also explore together how, systematically, they can insure planning for and actual transfer of skills and experience to counterparts.

ISSUE 5. An examination of the degree and effectiveness of the support provided projects by the headquarters of the cooperative development organizations.

No serious complaints could be elicited from the cooperative development organization staffs when discussions were held regarding the support received from their U. S. headquarters. Most comments were very positive. There was a sense that headquarters and field operations were effectively in tandem.

There was a general feeling expressed, however, that project success was essentially a function of the field staff and that the headquarters were too far away to be of real help in any day-by-day sense and that projects succeeded or failed based on the competency of field staff and on their abilities to be self-generating and self-monitoring.

Visits to these projects by headquarters staff ranged from quarterly to annually. Most projects will see headquarters staff at least twice a year. Good use seems to be made of phone and telex communications between field and headquarters.

The independence with which field operations appear to take place points up the importance of good staff selection on the part of the cooperative development organizations. In the projects visited the selection systems appeared to have worked well.

A recurring issue that relates to support had to do with problems cooperative development organization staff were having in understanding and handling the new income tax provisions for U. S. nationals working abroad. In addition to providing information to their staffs, the coop organizations should be examining this matter jointly, looking at the way employee benefits are structured and provided so that tax inequities are minimized, and determining, if necessary, the appropriate approaches to Congress to insure that the law is as equitable as possible for their overseas staffs.

ISSUE 6. An examination of AID Missions' attitudes toward cooperative development organizations and the amount of administrative back-up required by these organizations.

USAID staff comments regarding the quality of cooperative development organizations staff and relationships with Missions were on the whole very positive. Further, there were no feelings expressed that these organizations required undue assistance or support from USAIDs.

In only one case - the early stages of the CLUSA project in Swaziland - did a mission staff complain about the cooperative development organizations demanding an inordinate amount of time and attention.

In only one case did a cooperative development organization express the feeling that the mission was too over-involved with the detailed operations of a project.

A recurring theme from both AID and the cooperative organizations was the matter of turn-over of AID staff. In a majority of cases the staff of the cooperative development organizations had been in country longer than their AID project officers. Often the coop staff appeared to have a more detailed understanding than their AID counterparts of life and conditions in the country in which they were operating. I had the distinct impression that AID was suffering from tours of duty that were too short and the cooperative development organization staffs felt they had as part of their on-going responsibility the periodic orientation of new AID staff.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

From the point of view of a U. S. taxpayer I feel confident that the projects visited during this assessment represent a reasonable and effective use of my tax money.

From the point of view of the issues I was asked to examine by AID these projects certainly fall within and acceptable (if not better) range in terms of program focus and management. Were this a sample of all AID contractors (which it wasn't) I'd feel positive about the quality of work being performed by AID overseas.

From the point of view of an advocate for cooperative development, however, I was left with a feeling that in this mix of projects there was little sense of an overall strategy about cooperative development. Some of these projects were not even involved with cooperatives. Where they were, it generally was with one isolated part of the total cooperative scene in a particular country. Except for ACOSCA in Africa, I had little sense that there exists within the cooperative development organizations ( and perhaps even the other national and international cooperative structures) a strategy for development of cooperatives. I think that is an important lack.

This assessment was also intended to provide some background for an examination of approaches to the evaluation of cooperative development projects. In furtherance of this Appendix II contains two documents attempting to suggest ways in which reactions to issues about project operations can be recorded. The first is

related to issues identified under the terms of this contract. It suggests an approach where AID identifies the issues to be examined in the evaluation and then a system is structured to allow a common collection of information about those issues. The second is an adaptation of a system used in the evaluation of projects associated with VISTA, the domestic volunteer program. In this system a series of factors which have been identified as essential to project success have been identified and then weighted in terms of their perceived importance. The system highly favors community development and the building of systems which will allow maximum participation and control by poor people.

Neither of these are included as the answer to evaluation. They are meant to be grist for discussion regarding the establishment of an on-going system for the evaluation of cooperative development programs. That step is a must.



## CONSULTATION ON CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT IN THE SUDAN

Khartoum 26 - 31 March 1979

### Programme

#### *Monday, 26 March*

- 17:00 p.m. : Registration  
*First Session*  
 Chairman : H. E. The Minister of Cooperation, Commerce and Supply.
- 18:00 p.m. : Opening  
 -- Statement by the Chairman of Copac.  
 -- Statement by Dr. Mohamed Hashim Awad, Minister of Cooperation, Commerce and Supply.  
 -- Opening Address by H. E. The President Gaafar Mohamed Numeiri.
- 20:30 p.m. : Opening of the Cooperative Exhibition by H. E. The President followed by a Reception.

#### *Tuesday, 27 March*

- 09:00 a.m. : Organisational Arrangements for the Consultation.  
*Second Session*  
 Chairman : The Governor, Bank of Sudan.  
 Discussion by participants of priorities  
 Subject : Introduction and discussion by participants of priorities and needs for external assistance for: Strengthening the Financial and Institutional Structure of the Cooperative Movement.
- 09:30 a.m. : — SUD/CP/01) — Establishment of the Sudan Cooperative Development Bank.  
 — SUD/CP/14) — Cooperative Development Bank special fund for cooperative intensive Animal Production.  
 — SUD/CP/81) — Establishment of the Sudan National Cooperative Union Fund.
- 11:00 a.m. : Coffee Break.
- 11:30 a.m. : — SUD/CP/55) — Establishment of a Regional Cooperative Bank — Southern Region.
- 13:00 p.m. : Break for lunch.
- 15:30 p.m. : — SUD/CP/02) — Strengthening Planning and data collection in the Ministry of Cooperation.
- 21:00 p.m. : Dinner by H. E. The Minister of Cooperation.

#### *Wednesday, 28 March*

##### *Third Session*

Chairman : H. E. The Minister of Agriculture.

Subject : Introduction and discussion by participants of priorities and needs for external assistance for: Development of Cooperative Agricultural Production and Marketing.

- 09 : 30 a.m. : — SUD CP 08 — Pilot Development of Rural Service Cooperatives for irrigated areas, Nile Province, El Ghonboush, Kair El Zein, Um Saraia.  
— SUD CP 09 — Pilot Development of Rural Cooperatives for rainfed areas, Northern Kordofan Province.  
— SUD CP 07 — provision of Maintenance Workshop to the Red Sea Province Trucking Cooperative Societies.
- 11 : 00 a.m. : Coffee Break.
- 11 : 30 a.m. : — SUD CP 10 — Support to Mechanised Farming Abba Island Cooperative Union — White Nile Province.  
— SUD CP 11 — Cooperative Storage and Processing of vegetables for the Khartoum Market.  
— SUD CP 12 — Workshops for Maintenance of Cooperatively owned Machinery and Vehicles.
- 13 : 30 p.m. : Break for lunch.
- 17 : 30 p.m. : — SUD CP 13 — Cooperative Fish Production and Marketing.  
— SUD CP 86 — Strengthening Marketing and Supply Capacities.
- 20 : 30 p.m. : — SUD CP 53 — Development of Cooperative Agricultural Marketing and Supply — Southern Region.  
— SUD CP 54 — Development of Consumer Cooperatives in Eastern Equatoria — Southern Region.
- 21 : 30 p.m. : Dinner by the Secretary of the Cooperative Committee of the SSC.

Thursday, 29 March

*Fourth Session*

*Chairman* : H. E. The Minister of Planning.

*Subjects* : Introduction and discussion by participants of priorities and needs for external assistance for :-

1. Development of Cooperative Artisanal Production and Handicrafts.
2. Development of Cooperative Housing.
3. Development of Cooperative Training.

- 09 : 00 a.m. : — SUD CP 15 — Rugs and Carpet Makers Cooperative Society Sodani Northern Kordofan Province.  
— SUD CP 16 — Suakin Cooperative Salt Production, Red Sea Province.  
— SUD CP 17 — Cooperative Leatherwork Industry, Nvaia Southern Darfur.  
— SUD CP 18 — Cooperative Ready Made Clothes Workshop — Khartoum.  
— SUD CP 32 — Sudan National Cooperative Union Printing Shop.
- 11 : 00 a.m. : Coffee Break.
- 11 : 30 a.m. : — SUD CP 57 — Development of Artisans' Cooperatives — Southern Region.  
— SUD CP 58 — Flour Grinding Mills for Rural Cooperatives — Southern Region.  
— SUD CP 84 — Development of Cooperative Small Scale Industry in the Sudan.  
— SUD CP 19 — Development of Cooperative Housing.  
— SUD CP 59 — Development of Cooperative Housing — Southern Region.  
— SUD CP 85 — Construction of National Cooperative Centre

- 13:30 p.m. : Break for lunch.
- 17:00 p.m. : -- SUD CP 03 -- Strengthening Cooperative Member Education.
- SUD CP 83 -- Strengthening SNCU Business efficiency.
- 20:30 p.m. : -- SUD CP 04 -- Establishment of Five Regional Cooperative Training Centres.
- SUD CP 50 -- Establishment of an Agricultural Cooperative Unit -- National Cooperative Development and Training Centre.
- SUD CP 51 -- Establishment of a Regional Cooperative Training Centre -- Southern Region.
- SUD CP 52 -- Strengthening Cooperative Member Education -- Southern Region.
- 21:30 p.m. : Dinner by Chairman of the National Cooperative Union.

Friday, 30 March

- 19:00 p.m. : Closing Session Friendship Hall .
- Dinner*

Saturday, 31 March

- 07:00 a.m. : Visits Gezira Province.
- 08:00 p.m. : Sudanese Folklore Dance.
- ~~21:00 p.m. : Dinner - Cooperation.~~
- ~~SNCU - The Sudan National Cooperative Union~~

CONSULTATION ON COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT IN THE SUDAN

KHARTOUM, 26 - 31 MARCH 1979

PROVISIONAL LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

HOTEL

DENMARK

S.E. Westien (Swedish Cooperative Centre)  
Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)  
Amaliegade 7  
Copenhagen

Excelsior

EGYPT (ARAB REPUBLIC OF)

Mahmoud Mohamed Daoud  
Minister of Agriculture  
Cairo

Ibrahim Saad Hagrass  
Deputy Minister of Agriculture  
Cairo

Ibrahim Gancury  
First Assistant Deputy Minister of  
Agriculture  
Cairo

S. Naguib  
Under Secretary of State  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Cairo

Hassanien Radwan Osman  
Chairman Board of Directors  
Consultation of Cooperative Union  
Cairo

Ahmed M. Salim  
Agricultural Engineer  
Minister's Office, Ministry of Agriculture  
Cairo

FINLAND

Tikka Vainio-Mattila  
Pellervo-Seura  
Simonkatu 6  
Helsinki 10

Hilton

Klaus H. Beierlein  
Regional Cooperative Advisor, Middle East  
Friedrich-Ebert Foundation  
45, Sharia Lebnan  
Cairo-Mehandessin

Grand Hotel

Heinz F. Berger  
Head Africa Department  
Evangelische Zentralstelle für Entwicklungshilfe (EZE)  
53 Bonn 2  
Mittelstrasse 37  
(also representing Bread for the World)

Acropole

GERMANY (DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC)

Wolfgang Schlesier  
Director  
Tberna  
DDR 110 Berlin  
Thulestrasse 44

Meridier

IRELAND

Malachy Prunty  
Education Officer, Irish Agricultural Organization  
Society, Ltd.  
Director, Irish Foundation for Cooperative  
Development, Ltd.  
The Plunkett House  
84, Merrion Square  
Dublin 2

Hilton

NETHERLANDS

H.M. Slingerland Van Bemmelen  
Secretary of Embassy  
Khartoum

NORWAY

P.O. Lilleeng  
Cooperative Coordinator  
Norwegian Church Aid  
NCA/SP P.O. Box 18256  
Nairobi, Kenya

Hilton

O.K. Øiestad  
Chief Planning Officer  
Norwegian Church Aid  
Underhaugsvn. 15  
Oslo 3

Hilton

P. Westborg  
Director  
Norwegian Church Aid - Sudan Programme  
NCA/SP P.O. Box 18256  
Nairobi, Kenya

Hilton

G. Danaila  
Secretary of the Central Council of Cooperatives  
Bucharest

D. Eurtol  
Rumanian Central Council of Cooperation  
Bucharest

SPAIN

T. Cardalliaguet  
General Direction of Cooperatives in Spain  
Ministry of Workers, General Direction of Cooperatives  
Madrid  
(representing Ministry of Cooperatives of Spain)

Hilton

SUDAN

M.A.H. Giha  
Under Secretary  
Ministry of Cooperation, Commerce and Supply  
Khartoum

M.A. Gammar  
Deputy Under Secretary  
Ministry of Cooperation, Commerce and Supply  
Khartoum

M.A. Dawood  
Director  
National Cooperative Development Training Centre (NCOTC)  
Khartoum

G. Sabbagh  
ILO Project Manager  
NCOTC  
Khartoum

M. Ali Said

Ministry of Cooperation, Commerce and Supply  
Khartoum

M.A. Bouraee  
Director  
Field Work and Follow-up Department  
Ministry of Cooperation, Commerce and Supply  
Khartoum

Hassan Mohamed Salih  
Convener, Consultation on Cooperative Development  
in the Sudan  
Ministry of Cooperation, Commerce and Supply  
Khartoum

Ezekiel Kutjok  
General Secretary  
Sudan Council of Churches  
P.O. Box 469  
Khartoum

Kosti Manibe  
Project Coordinator  
Sudan Council of Churches  
P.O. Box 469  
Khartoum

**B. Majack**

National Cooperative Union  
Khartoum

Osman El Aoud  
Assistant Secretary  
National Cooperative Union  
Khartoum

Hassar A. El Shaik  
Treasurer  
National Cooperative Union  
Khartoum

Caesar Zemangi Ndego  
Director  
Regional Ministry of Cooperatives, Commerce and Supply  
Southern Region, P.O. Box 66  
Juba

Hilton

SWEDEN

S.E. Westlen  
Swedish Cooperative Centre  
Fack, 104 65  
Stockholm

Excelsior

TANZANIA

E. Barongo  
Minister of Agriculture  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Dar-es-Salaam

Grand Hotel

U.S.S.R.

Stanislav V. Diatchkev  
Counsellor  
Representative of the U.S.S.R.  
Soviet Embassy  
Khartoum

U.K.

F. Howarth  
Cooperative Adviser  
Ministry of Overseas Development  
Middle East Development Division  
c/o British Embassy  
Amman, Jordan

Acropole

R.A.K. Baker  
British Council Sudan  
45, Gama'a Avenue  
Khartoum

Sudan

Tom Carter  
ODM Planning Adviser  
Ministry of Public Works, Transport  
and Communication  
P.O. Box 134  
Juba, Sudan

Boris J. Eastwood  
Adviser  
Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and  
Administrations  
4, Millbank  
London S.W. 1 3JD  
U.K.

Grand Hotel

Colin Roger Seelig  
Representative  
Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and  
Administrations  
4, Millbank  
London S.W.1 3JD  
U.K.

Hilton

Karle E. Simpson  
Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and  
Administrations  
4, Millbank  
London S.W.1 3JD  
U.K.

Hilton

U.S.A.

B. Harvey  
Executive Vice-President  
Agricultural Cooperative Development International  
1012, 14th Street  
Washington D.C. 20005

Hilton

John R. Shaffer  
Consultant  
United States Agency for International Development (USAID)  
Department of State  
Washington D.C. 20523

Irak

Elwin T. Chapman  
Development Officer  
USAID / Khartoum

HOTEL

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Africa Cooperative Savings and Credit Association (ACOSCA)

Aloys Stephen Matoye  
ACOSCA Eastern Region Manager and Training Officer  
P.O. Box 43278  
Nairobi, Kenya

Grand Hotel

Arab Organization for Agricultural Development

Eussein Mohamed Hassan  
P.O. Box 474  
Khartoum, Sudan

European Economic Communities (EEC)

John Milne  
Khartoum, Sudan

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Ibrahim A. Abdallah  
Agricultural Credit and Marketing Officer  
FAO Regional Office  
P.O. Box 2223  
Cairo, Egypt

Hilton

Adnan A.K. Seghaier  
FAO Representative in Sudan  
P.O. Box 1117  
Khartoum, Sudan

International Co-operative Alliance (ICA)

Graham Alder  
Development Officer  
11, Upper Grosvenor Street  
London W1X 9PA, U.K.

Sudan

Ernest B. Hamley  
Fisheries Organization Society  
General Secretary  
588 London Road  
Sutton, Surrey, U.K.

Sudan

International Cooperative Housing Development Association (ICEDA)

Sara Wakeham  
Senior Housing Adviser  
11, Upper Grosvenor Street  
London W1X 9PA, U.K.

Sudan

T. Sidibe  
Chief, Cooperative Branch  
CH 1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland  
Hilton

L.E. Pickett  
Senior Staff Member, Cooperative Branch  
CH 1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland  
Hilton

Ghazi A. Sabbagh  
Project Manager - Cooperative Training Development  
c/o UNDP, P.O. Box 913  
Khartoum, Sudan

S.S. Tyagi  
Chief Technical Adviser  
c/o UNDP, P.O. Box 913  
Khartoum, Sudan  
Hilton

Fahd M. El Samawi  
Marketing and Supply Expert  
c/o UNDP, P.O. Box 913  
Khartoum, Sudan

Kurt V.H. Stridsland  
ILO Expert  
c/o UNDP, P.O. Box 913  
Khartoum, Sudan  
Acropole

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Peter Quennell  
Assistant Resident Representative  
P.O. Box 913  
Khartoum, Sudan

Sida Kumar Das  
Area Officer  
P.O. Box 913  
Khartoum, Sudan

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

Stephen J. Szives  
Senior Industrial Development Field Adviser  
P.O. Box 98 Cairo, Egypt  
Hilton

World Bank

T. Holten  
Senior Project Adviser  
IBRD/UNDP Planning Assistance Project  
Box 2666, Khartoum, Sudan

Siri Piazak  
World Bank Industrial Adviser  
IBRD/UNDP Planning Assistance Project  
P.O. Box 2666, Khartoum, Sudan

World Council of Credit Unions (WCCU)

HOTEL

Paul Hebert  
Executive Assistant Managing Director  
1120, 19th Street, N.W., Suite 404  
Washington D.C. 20036, U.S.A.

Hilton

World Food Programme

Gasten Syben  
WFP Representative  
P.O. Box 913  
Khartoum, Sudan

Committee for the Promotion of Aid to Cooperatives (COPAC)

M.P. Cracknell  
Chairman of COPAC  
1, rue d'Hauteville  
75010 Paris, France

Hilton

John Markie  
Assistant to Executive Secretary  
CCPAC Secretariat  
c/o FAO  
Rome, Italy

Hilton

Vittoria Zaffarano  
Secretary  
COPAC Secretariat  
c/o FAO  
Rome, Italy

Hilton

AID ISSUES  
PROJECT ASSESSMENT

1. The project reaches only people in the bottom  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the country's population and project staff are directly involved with this population in the delivery of services. (5)

The project reaches only people in the bottom  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the country's population but project staff are not directly involved with this population in the delivery of services. (4)

The project reach some people in the bottom  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the country's population and project staff are directly involved with these people in the delivery of services. (3)

The project reaches some people in the bottom  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the country's population but project staff are not directly involved with this population in the delivery of services. (2)

The project is not targeted at any particular segment of the country's population but staff is directly involved with the recipients of services. (1)  
population

The project is not targeted at any particular segment of the country's/and the staff is not directly involved with the recipients of services. (0)

2. The project is essentially on target in meeting project goals. (2)

The project is somewhat on target in meeting project goals. (1)

The project is not on target in meeting project goals. (0)

3. Project problems have been identified and steps have been/are being taken to resolve them. (2)

Project problems have been identified but steps have not been taken to resolve them. (1)

Project leadership does not recognize or acknowledge project problems. (0)

4. The project staff have clearly recognized and positive relationships and rapport with host country officials and with local poor people in the area where the project operates. (3)

The project staff have clearly recognized and positive relationships and rapport with host country officials but this does not extend to local poor people. (2)

The project staff has problems in its relationship with host country officials but works well with local poor people. (1)

Project staff identifies principally with other expatriates. (0)

5. The project staff interacts with host country primary cooperatives and is assisting in their development on a regular basis. (3)

The project staff interacts with primary cooperatives on occasion but is not principally involved with these groups. (2)

The project staff does not interact with primary cooperatives but works only with regional, national or international cooperative structures. (1)

The project staff is not directly involved with cooperative organizations. (0)

6. Project staff are fully competent for their jobs. (2)

Project staff are somewhat competent for their jobs. (1)

Project staff do not have the required skill to do their jobs. (0)

7. Project staff are effectively transferring their skills to counterparts. (2)

Project staff have been only limitedly effective in transferring their skills to counterparts. (1)

Project staff are not transferring skills to counterparts. (0)

8. Project has plans for counterparts to take over the functions being performed by project staff and these plans are being implemented. (2)

Project has plans for counterparts to take over the functions being performed by project staff but these plans are not yet being implemented. (1)

Project has no plans for counterparts to take over the functions being performed by project staff. (0)

9. Project personnel report that support from their headquarters is -

Outstanding (3)

Good (2)

Fair (1)

Poor (0)

10. The project is normally visited by headquarters personnel -

Quarterly (4)

Semi-annually (3)

Annually (2)

No regular schedule (1)

Not at all (0)

11. USAID staff views the work of the cooperative development organization as -

Outstanding (3)

Good (2)

Fair (1)

Poor (0)

12. Compared with other contractors, the USAID staff considers the cooperative development organization as -

- Superior to most - (3)
- On a par with most - (2)
- Inferior to most - (1)
- Ineffective - (0)

13. Compared with other contractors, the USAID staff considers the cooperative development organization staff to be -

- Superior to most - (3)
- On a par with most - (2)
- Inferior to most - (1)
- Ineffective - (0)

14. The cooperative development project require the following support from USAID -

- Very little - (3)
- Some - (2)
- A great deal - (1)
- Dependent upon USAID/little self support - (0)

AID ISSUES	Sudan COPAC Cons.	Tanzania ACDI/TRDB	Tanzania ACDI/NMC	Botswana FCH	Swaziland CLUSA	Kenya ACDI/AFC	Kenya CUNA/ACOSCA	India CLUSA	Bangladesh NRECA	Indonesia NRECA	Indonesia CLUSA	Philippines NRECA	Philippines ACDI	Average	Percentage
1. Involving "poorest of poor" (3)	NA	2	2	5	2.5	2	2	2	3	2.5	2	2	3	2.5	50.0
2. Project goals being achieved (2)	NA	2	0	2	1.5	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1.7	85.0
3. Project problems dealt with (2)	NA	2	1	2	1.5	2	2	2	2	1.5	2	2	2	1.8	90.0
4. Relations with host nationals (3)	NA	3	2	3	2.5	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2.4	80.0
5. Activity with host coops (3)	NA	2	2	0	2.5	0	2.5	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.9	63.3
6. Competency of staff (2)	NA	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1.9	95.0
7. Transfer of skills (2)	NA	1.5	0.5	1.5	1	1.5	2	1	1.5	1	1	2	1	1.3	65.0
8. Take over of functions (2)	NA	1.5	0	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1.4	70.0
9. Project support from Hqtrs. (3)	NA	2	1.5	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2.1	70.0
10. Hqtrs. visits to project (4)	NA	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.0	75.0
11. USAID's view of coop orgn. (3)	NA	3	1	3	2	3	3	2.5	3	2	2	3	2	2.5	83.3
12. Contrast with others (3)	NA	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2.3	76.7
13. Comparative staff competency (3)	NA	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2.4	80.0
14. USAID support required (3)	NA	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2.7	90.0

PROJECT EVALUATION FORMI. Project Goals

1. Clearly defined goals exist for the project 0-1
2. Project goals are in keeping with AID objectives 0-1
3. Project goals are realistic in terms of achievability 0-1
4. Agreement with respect to the goals of the project exists between:
  - a. Coop Staff, AID and Host Agency/Govt. (5)
  - b. Coop Staff and Host Agency/Govt. (4)
  - c. Coop Staff and AID (3)
  - d. AID and Host Agency/Govt. (2)
  - e. None (0)

0-1-2-3-4-5

Actual Score \_\_\_\_\_  
(Maximum score 8)II. Project Operation

5. The U. S. Coop staff spend most of their time in the following activities:
  - a. Community development (5)
  - b. Service to target population as planned steps toward community development (4)
  - c. Technical services to target population (3)
  - d. Providing personal services to target population (2)
  - e. Jobs assigned by AID or Host Agency in lieu of regular agency staff (1)
  - f. Other (Specify) (0)
6. The target population is aware of specific project achievements, e.g., public improvements, personal improvements. 0-1-2
7. The target population (or individuals or groups within it) is actively engaged in working toward solutions to its own problems as a result of the U.S. coop presence 0-1-2
8. The coop project, or coop staff within it, are trying to change some of the institutions (or systems) which serve the poor in order to make them more responsive to the needs of the target population. 0-1-2
9. The coop project is providing direct services to people which they would not otherwise receive if the U.S. coop staff and the project were no in operation. 0-1

0-1-2-3-4-5

Actual Score \_\_\_\_\_  
(Maximum score 12)

III. Creativity

10. The project has assigned the U.S. coop staff to non-traditional roles for their work. 0-1-2-3-4
11. The U.S. coop staff are using creative techniques to carry out their assignments. 0-1-2-3-4
12. The Coop project is producing creative change in the way(s) in which AID and the Host Agency/Govt. utilizes its resources to serve the target population. 0-1-2-3-4
13. The U.S. coop staff are engaged in activities not previously undertaken by AID. 0-1-2-3

Actual Score \_\_\_\_\_  
(Maximum score 15)

IV. Project Maintenance

14. The following are involved in the planning for, or will be involved in the implementation of the project's future activities:
- |                        |     |             |
|------------------------|-----|-------------|
| Target population      | (2) |             |
| AID                    | (1) |             |
| Host Agency/Government | (1) |             |
| U.S. coop staff        | (1) |             |
| Other (Specify)        | (0) | 0-1-2-3-4-5 |
15. The project includes plans and timetables for the take over of the U.S. coop functions. 0-1-2
16. The project has made progress toward taking over the U.S. coop staff functions (e.g., target population take over, Host agency take over, etc.) 0-1-2-3

Actual Score \_\_\_\_\_  
(Maximum score 10)

V. A. Internal Factors - U.S. Coop Staff

17. The U.S. coop staff adjusts to the life styles of the target population 0-1-2-3-4-5
18. The U.S. coop staff identifies and encourages indigenous leadership 0-1-2-3-4-5
19. The U.S. coop staff is flexible enough to meet demands of new situations. 0-1-2-3-4
20. The U.S. coop staff is able to work independent of supervision. 0-1-2-3
21. The U.S. coop staff is able to take direction. 0-1-2-3

Actual Score \_\_\_\_\_  
(Maximum score 20)

V. B. Internal Factors - Host Agency/Government

- 22. The Host Agency/Govt. is committed to assisting the target population in effecting social change and acts upon this commitment. 0-1-2-3-4
- 23. The Host Agency/Govt. provides the amount and kind of supervision required by the U.S. coop staff. 0-1-2-3-4
- 24. The Host Agency/Govt. has a knowledge of and utilizes the resources available in the community. 0-1-2
- 25. The Host Agency/Govt. clearly defines the role of the U.S. coop staff as distinct from other staff in the implementation of the project. 0-1
- 26. The Host Agency /Govt. supports the goals and objectives of AID. (Basic human needs strategy). 0-1

Actual Score \_\_\_\_\_  
(Maximum score 12)

V. C. Internal Factors - USAID

- 27. USAID is cooperative and flexible in working with the U.S. coop staff 0-1-2
- 28. USAID supports the U.S. coop staff when there is a personal or project crisis. 0-1-2
- 29. USAID has the confidence of the target population. 0-1
- 30. USAID evolves or is prepared to evolve new goals for the project as the needs of the community are expressed. 0-1
- 31. USAID supports the goals and objectives of AID (Basic human needs strategy). 0-1
- 32. USAID has the confidence of the community-at-large. 0-1

Actual Score \_\_\_\_\_  
(Maximum score 8)

VI.A. External Factors - Target Population

- 33. The target population has been involved in the planning for and/or implementation of the project:
  - a. As the host agency for the project (4)
  - b. As supervisors of the U.S. coop staff (3)
  - c. As co-workers with the U.S. coop staff (2)
  - d. Under the supervision of the U.S. coop staff (1)
  - e. Not at all (0)
- 34. The target population perceives the project as contributing to the solution of its problems. 0-1-2-3-4

Actual Score \_\_\_\_\_  
(Maximum score 6)

VI. B. External Factors - Community-at-Large

- 35. Coordination and cooperation exist between the Host Agency/Govt. and/or the U.S. coop staff and other community agencies and organizations which are involved in similar activities. 0-1-2
- 36. Overt opposition to the coop project does not exist in the community, e.g., hostile press, organized citizen groups, "city hall", etc. 0-1
- 37. The community contains adequate resource to aid the coop project effectiveness. 0-1

Actual Score \_\_\_\_\_  
(Maximum score 4)

Overall, how would you rate this project:

- Excellent \_\_\_\_\_
- Good \_\_\_\_\_
- Fair \_\_\_\_\_
- Poor \_\_\_\_\_

Disposition of the project:

- Continue as is \_\_\_\_\_
- Continue with some minor changes \_\_\_\_\_
- Continue with Major changes \_\_\_\_\_
- Discontinue \_\_\_\_\_

Discussion and Recommendations:

