

# 途上国における人材育成プロジェクトの実施

平成6年7月

国際協力事業団  
国際協力総合研修所

総 研
J R
94-66

000  
213  
IIC



# 途上国における人材育成プロジェクトの実施

JICA LIBRARY



1114429(2)

平成6年7月

国際協力事業団  
国際協力総合研修所



マイクロ  
フィルム作成

「国総研セミナー」とは……

国総研セミナーとは国際協力事業団国際協力総合研修所において行っているセミナーの略称で、国内外の有識者、援助関係者により、わが国の国際協力にかかわる関係者を対象に開発援助の現状、課題、展望等の情報を提供することを目的としています。

本出版物は、講師の了解を得て講演の要約をまとめたもので、編集の責任は国際協力総合研修所にあります。

国総研セミナー

テーマ：途上国における人材育成プロジェクトの実施

－Implementing Human Resource Development Projects in Developing Countries－

日 時：平成6年7月21日（木）14：00～16：00

場 所：国際協力総合研修所 2階 202号室

講 師：Dr. Neil Kemp OBE

Head of Operations,

Development and Training Services, The British Council

（講師略歴）

EDUCATION:

ONC : Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics,  
Mid-Essex Technical College

BSc(Hons) : Chemistry (main) with Mathematics and Physics  
University of Wales

PhD : Analytical Chemistry  
(photoelectrospectroscopy)  
University of Wales

Research Associate : Educational Planning and Economics of Education  
Institute of Education,  
University of London

EMPLOYMENT:

1991 to date Head Operations,  
Development and Training Services,  
The British Council

1990-1991 Director, The British Council, Sri Lanka

1985-1989 Head, Projects Unit,  
The British Council, New Delhi, India

1980-1985 Head, Science and Technology Dept.,  
The British Council, London



## 途上国における人材育成プロジェクトの実施

(講演内容の要約)

### The British Council について

The British Council (以下BC) は、非営利の公的機関であり、ローカルスタッフも含めた6000人の職員が、108ヶ国にある事務所で活動を展開している。その活動の中心は、人材育成にあるが、これは教育、研修分野にとどまらず、保健、公共行政、金融、経営、中小企業育成、更に環境分野にも及ぶ。BCの活動資金については、英国政府補助金及び自己資金で賄われ、英国政府開発援助プロジェクトの実施及び管理が主体である。これに加えて、国連諸機関及び世界銀行、アジア開発銀行等の国際金融機関、EC等の開発プロジェクト実施業務を請け負っている。現在、関わっているプロジェクトは300～400に及び、世界各国におけるプロジェクトの実施に際し、国境を超えて様々な機関との国際的なネットワークと協力体制を構築している。

### BCにおけるプロジェクトサイクル

BCにおける基本的なプロジェクトサイクルは、発掘、審査、実施計画、実施管理、進展監視、評価の段階に分けられる。プロジェクトサイクルの各段階において常に考慮すべき点は、費用、質(内容)、時間というプロジェクトの3大要因の相関関係である。

BCの新規プロジェクト及び活動に対して英国政府補助金を申請し、認可を受けるには、プロジェクトの技術面での実施可能性、社会的影響、経済及び財政分析、女性への影響、制度基盤、環境への影響、Good Government 等の主要な審査項目に明確に対応しうる精微な実施計画を要する。

加えて、全ての政府補助金の請願にはロジカルフレームワークを用いてプロジェクトの論理的な枠組みを明確にすることが必要とされる。具体的には、ロジャルフレームを用いて、プロジェクトの目的、その目的達成に必要なインプット、

そして期待されるアウトプットを示して、これらのそれぞれの項目に対する達成度を可能な限り数量的に表す指標を提示する。ここで、プロジェクト実施にかかる基本的なリスク、様々な想定も明確にする。これは、ドナーとプロジェクト受益者が計画段階において、実施に際するリスクに対して共通の認識を持ち、成功を確実にするために双方が取り組むための共通の基盤を形成するためには、きわめて重要なことである。

しかし、上述の、いわゆる”ブループリント”アプローチとよばれるプロジェクトサイクルの計画段階に重点を置くアプローチは、社会開発分野、及び人材育成プロジェクトのように、人間が中心となるプロジェクトには適さない場合が多い。常に変化する人間を対象にしたプロジェクトに対してより柔軟に対応するために”プロセスアプローチ”が試みられている。プロセスアプローチとは、全体的な目的を設定し、進行状況を予め定めた指標毎に点検し、実施過程のなかで学習しながら方策を改良していく方法である。この方法は、柔軟な体制で実施に取り組むことができるので、特に、社会開発プロジェクトには適しているといえよう。

#### 社会開発分野の援助における新たなアプローチ

プロセスアプローチと同様に、より柔軟に社会開発分野に取り組むための新たな試みとしては、プロジェクト型援助からプログラム型援助への回帰の試みがある。特に、初等教育におけるプロジェクト型援助においては、プロジェクトがもたらすマイナス面が、プラス面を大幅に上まわる事態がしばしばある。また、プロジェクト期間の短いなかで多くを達成しようとするると困難が生じる。もちろん、プロジェクト型援助にも多くの利点があるので、早急にプロジェクト型援助から別の方法へと切り換えるということではなく、様々なタイプの援助アプローチをバランスよく活用していくことが非常に重要である。

アンドラブラディシュのプロジェクトで達成された教育”供給”側への援助の成功 —教師教育の改善、基本的な教材提供の確保等— は、いかに”需要者”



側である人々（貧困層の子供、女性等）への教育の普及に取り組んでいくべきかという問題を導いている（具体例であるインドのアンドラプラディシュの大型教育プロジェクトの詳細な説明については本文参照）。この“需要者”を主眼としたアプローチとして、需要者に対して、学校に通うということへの財政的、或はその他のインセンティブを用意する、地域社会と教育とのつながりを促進させるため、地域のNGOを含む他の援助機関との連携を強化する等様々な方法を今後とも研究し、且つ取り組んでいかねばならない。教育分野も含めた社会開発分野の援助においては、過去の経験を援助機関の間で共有し、互いに学びつつ改善に努めたいと思う。

### 費用負担の問題

援助の諸問題の根底にあるものは、費用の負担をどうするかということである。具体的にいえば、政府は、国民全てに対して、全レベルにおいての教育を無償で提供することはできるが、それが全国民に対しての平等を保証しているとはいえない。これについては、以下のような途上国の基本的政策への問題が考えられる。

- ・比較的裕福な人々に高等教育の費用負担を促すにはどうすればよいか？
- ・途上国において奨学金システムは（特に回収面において）効率的に機能できるか？
- ・中等教育段階において教科書の配給は教育質的向上に欠かせないが、生徒の大部分が教科書を買うお金がない状況で教材ローンのための回転資金を設立することは可能か？
- ・貧困のために学校出席が阻まれている子供達の出席を促進するために、資金提供、食料、制服提供等、学校に行かせるためのインセンティブを与えるべきか？その財源は？

#### 援助機関による研修分野における一般課題

BCは毎年20,000人（うち16,000人を英国内で研修）以上を対象に様々な研修を実施しており、海外において何らかの形でBCが関わっている研修を受けている人々は数千人におよぶ。このうち約8,000人が英国政府による技術協力活動の一環として研修を受けている。BCは研修分野における経験を通して以下の改革に取り組んでいる。

- ・プロジェクト関連の研修の増大
- ・適切な研修を提供するために、研修の選択をする段階で受益者（研修生とその雇用者等）の参加を求める。
- ・第二国、第三国での研修を増加させ、費用対効果の向上を図る。
- ・目的達成のために各種研修の効果的な組み合わせをする。
- ・研修目的及び各研修生の研修ニーズに対する研修実施機関のよりよい理解を促すために契約を明確にする。
- ・研修終了後のその効果の評価体制を強化する。

加えて、海外での研修をより効果的なものにするために、語学やコミュニケーションを学習する語学センターを多くの途上国に設置し、それぞれの業務に対応した形での語学力を学べるよう工夫している。また、家族のいる研修生、女性の研修生の参加を促すため様々な面で努力している。

今後、具体的に（日本の援助機関と）BCの経験を有効的に分かちあえる分野としては以下のものが考えられる。

- ・研修分野：研修プログラムの企画運営。第二国、第三国研修を促進するにあたって、各国が保有する研修設備のデータベース開発等での協力。

- ・人材育成プロジェクトの運営実施：過去20年以上にわたり英日両国が重点的に投資してきた人材育成プロジェクトは労働市場においてその費用対効果をもたらしたか。双方の経験から何が学べるか？
- ・今後、日本の援助機関とBCの連携を促進するには、どこの機関とどのような分野で行っていくべきか？
- ・社会開発援助における費用の財源体制はいかにあるべきか。
- ・援助プロジェクトにおけるコンサルタント：ローカルコンサルタントの活用と途上国の能力形成について

(以上は、ケンプ氏の講演内容部分のみの要約であるが、講演後の聴講者を交えたQ&Aセッションに関しては、次に続く講演録に含まれている。)



Thursday, 21st July, 1994

**IMPLEMENTING HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT  
PROJECTS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

Lecturer: Dr.Neil Kemp  
The British Council, UK

**MODERATOR**

Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to our today's international seminar at the Institute for International Cooperation. I am attached to the Research and Development Division of IFIC, JICA. It is my great pleasure to introduce Dr.Neil Kemp, who will give us today's lecture on Implementing Human Resource Development Projects in developing countries.

Before asking Dr. Kemp to start his lecture, let me give you a brief introduction about Dr. Kemp and the British Council. Dr. Kemp is Head of Operations of the British Council in Manchester. Since he received his doctorate degree in Analytical Chemistry from the University of Wales, Dr.Kemp has held a number of international postings in the British Council and thus accumulated wide-ranging professional experience in many countries. I understand that he is especially interested in the following two areas, which are planning and management of social and human resources development projects in developing countries; and costs, efficiency and effectiveness of investments in technical and vocational education and training in developing countries. Presently, his managerial responsibility involves the British Council's 350 projects in 60 developing countries which also involve more than 16,000 trainees. Clients of the British Council vary from the British Government or government in developing countries to major international organizations such as World Bank, European Community, Asian Development Bank, African Development Bank and so forth.

Talking about The British Council, I am sure that Dr.Kemp will tell us in detail about the organization later in his lecture, it is a non-profit making public body which is mainly funded by the British Government. The aim of the British Council is to promote an enduring understanding and appreciation of Britain in other countries through cultural, educational and technical co-operation.

Now, let me ask Dr. Kemp to start his lecture, and please give him a warm welcome.

**DR. NEIL KEMP**

Thank you for a most warm welcome. Good afternoon Ladies and Gentlemen. I am extremely pleased to be here with you on my first ever visit to Japan. I've been here for two days and I haven't even started to see anything of Japan. I am extremely pleased to be here because I know that the Japanese aid program has been developing very fast. I have seen it at work in a number of countries particularly in South-East Asia. And I know that there is much that we should be sharing in terms of our understanding of aid and development, so that between us all we can come up with a much more effective and efficient means of delivering aid and aid projects.

I have provided a brief translation of my lecture in case people may find that easier, but I will read my lecture in English and with a number of overhead transparencies. In this short lecture, I would like to cover some of the issues that we in Britain have found to be important in the planning and the implementation of projects and activities in such areas as education, health, industrial training, public administration and management and extending into areas like small and medium enterprises development. I would like to put to you some of the evolving issues that currently preoccupy us and then I'd like to seek suggestions from you concerning where and how it might be useful for us to work together in the future so that we might improve the impact of our respective investments.

First of all I would like to introduce in a little more detail the British Council and explain our interests and why we are involved in this work. I think many of you will have probably seen something of our operation overseas, particularly our language schools and the libraries, which are our most visible manifestations. However in the background to this, and accounting for almost half of our US \$700 million per annum turnover, is our work related to development and in developing countries. We have offices in 108 countries and employ more than 6000 staff globally; these are a mix of nationals from all the countries in which we work. For example, we employ about 400 Indians in

India, and this is repeated in many countries. We are not a government department, that is a Ministry, but we are a non-profit making public body and we receive the majority of our funding from the British government. About currently just over 55% of our funds comes as a direct British government funding.

Our primary focus tends to be human resource development, not just education and training, but also in other areas such as health, public administration, finance and management, small and medium enterprises development and some work on the environment and related areas. We manage the training of over 20,000 people each year from the developing world, some 16,000 of these in Britain. To support our overall aims we use our own money (part of our government grant), but we also manage British government aid programs and projects and we are contracted by organizations such as the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, the UN Agencies, the European Community etc.. We implement development projects overseas on their behalf, in a whole range of countries including countries like Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, as well as throughout Asia, Latin America, Africa etc.. We are currently involved in the implementation of between 300 and 400 projects overseas and these require us to build consortia and networks of organizations to implement across national boundaries. For example, in Indonesia we will work on projects with local Indonesian consultancies, British consultancies and maybe European consultancies, to run a development project in Indonesia. In Europe we bring together consortia of different European organizations, to deliver European community aid. So we are not confined to Britain, we in fact seek partners to implement projects across national boundaries. More and more the partners we seek are in institutions in developing countries, because it is their long-term viability which is our overall goal. So if we can involve them in implementing projects then it enhances that long-term viability.

Now, in order to explain some of the issues relating to how we operate, I'd like to refer to the basic project cycle. I'm sure that this is something with which you are all familiar. Here we see the basic project cycle, the one that for 20 years most of us involved in development have been working through. Going through from identification, appraisal, planning of the implementation and then managing the implementation, through to evaluation, which we hope

might lead into identification of other activities. Within each of these steps, I like to think there are often other little project cycles. For example, when you're managing implementation you're monitoring progress, the lessons you learn feedback into how you manage the implementation. So there are feedback loops at every stage. I'm sure that many of you are familiar with that, particularly those of you who have been on the FASID training, which is very much based on this. Within any project we have to consider the interrelationship between the three key project variables. Just to remind you, the three fundamental project variables are cost, quality and time. And it is their interrelationship that we as development project managers have to consider at every stage. I will return in particular to the cost dimension in that relationship.

Over the last few years we have been putting much effort into the detailed planning of projects. Before any new investment is cleared for funding by the British government, we must provide evidence to the policy makers in the British government under a number of key criteria. These are the same as I understand it for the Japanese aid program.

- basic technical feasibility;
- the social impact;
- the economic and financial aspects (sometimes with a cost-benefit analysis);
- impact on women;
- institutional infrastructure;
- impact on environment;
- good government.

We have to answer all of these questions before we can submit a proposal. If we do not answer them the proposal is not looked at by the review committee. So it's mandatory for us to look at it.

In addition to this listing, for all funding submissions we must complete a 'logical frame'. This requires us to lay out, in a tabular format, the objectives, proposed inputs and expected outputs for the activity. Against each of these we must clearly provide indicators of achievement, which are preferably quantifiable. We are also required to specify the basic risks and assumptions associated with the project. This latter point is particularly important. Too often projects fail because donors and recipients have not jointly considered all



implications. If the two groups sit together and agree the underlying risks inherent in the project, and therefore what each side must contribute to ensure success, we at least start with the possibility of winning!

However, this strong emphasis on pre-implementation planning (the so-called 'blueprint' approach) is now being questioned, particularly for social development projects. Because if you're dealing with human resources development projects, the problem with such projects is that they involve people, and people are notoriously unpredictable! A more flexible 'process' approach is being attempted. In this we define the overall objectives, with 'milestones' to check on progress, and then learn and adapt our strategy during the process of implementation. It is not a rigid process. I stress that this is particularly so for social development projects. So I'd be very willing to learn from any of your experiences in doing this sort of social development project.

Another recent development has been to reconsider the more fundamental policy of delivering aid through 'projects'. In particular we continue to question whether there are more flexible ways in supporting social development areas a return to some form of 'programme' aid? Particularly in basic education the benefits of projectization can often be outweighed by the drawbacks. Problems are frequently encountered when we put pressure on the system through trying to achieve too much too fast. However, if we provide funding that is, in essence, a net addition to the recurrent education budget (as opposed to discrete and separate projectised activity) in some cases we have found this can help to encourage greater local ownership. This is very fundamental in basic education. Also it might be used as a lever to promote even more government investment in education.

I stress that we are not proposing a rapid move away from project aid (there are still many advantages associated with it) rather a very careful balance between the different funding approaches. I know JICA is always quoting to me that the Japanese approach is a differentiated approach to aid delivery, and maybe this can work well in some of these social development areas.

Turning to some specific examples, I would first like to refer to a large basic education project in Andhra Pradesh in India in which we are involved. It's a very large state in central India with a population of about 60 million. We are providing an investment of nearly US \$60 million, to bring about overall a

reduction in the drop-out rate. The problem is on 'Day 1 of Year 1' in Andhra Pradesh, probably 70%-80% of the children in the age-group start school. But by the end of the second week we've probably lost half of them. By the end of the year, you're lucky to have retained about 30%. So the drop-out is quite phenomenal.

So the first objective of this was to reduce drop-out. It was about a qualitative improvement in the existing system to stop drop-out. Not necessarily to bring in new children, but just to reduce drop-out of those that started. We did this through a number of areas.

- in-service teacher education: there are 190,000 primary school teachers in Andhra Pradesh, we are providing every one of them with some form of in-service education.

- school buildings: we are building schools. The school buildings are to Government of India standards. We use their norms on costs. So we're not going for high-cost imported structures. Local materials to match the local needs using local construction companies, with a little assistance from our buildings advisor, in terms of how you might lay out the school differently to make it a more interesting place for the children to come.

- provision of resource centres: Not a tremendous resource centre with microphones, OHPs, video. What we mean by a resource centre is one room attached to one in five schools, in which there is a cupboard for paper and pencils and the old-style duplicator with stencils. That is a resource centre. We will not spend more than about US\$50 on equipping that resource centre.

- improving the administrative and institutional infrastructure: In India education is a state government responsibility. The Federal Government in Delhi sends the money to the state. It is the state government's responsibility to deliver primary education.

- curriculum reform.

The main objective is to reduce pupil drop-out through the introduction of a qualitative improvement in the total system. This project has been ongoing for some 6 years now and by all criteria is certainly achieving its objectives. Working closely with the Indian authorities we have sought to ensure that:

- all interventions are low cost (e.g. materials for the teacher resource centres, that cover 5 schools, are only about US \$50);

- the state government is responsible for managing implementation;
- a pilot phase was used initially to trial possible approaches.

The project will probably last for 10 years. Perhaps the major learning experiences for all of us involved in the implementation has been to understand the full importance of a ) improving in-service teacher education and b) to ensure the provision of basic support materials (particularly paper and simple texts). It is exciting to visit some of the schools in Andhra Pradesh and see children working in small groups, exploring numbers, rather than sitting in lines chanting and repeating everything the teacher says. It's a major transformation. A good indicator of the success of all this is that the approach is now being adopted for use in a number of other Indian states. UNICEF has adopted it and is moving into Bihar using it. The Government of India itself is doing it in a number of states. They've asked aid organizations to do it in one or two other poorer states.

This success with the 'supply side' of educational provision leads us to ask questions about demand. In particular, how do we encourage the really disadvantaged groups to attend school? By these, I include women, children from poor rural households, slum dwellers etc. Should we provide financial or other incentives? Are there other means?

An approach that we have been investigating has been to encourage much closer involvement of the local community. Through this we seek to ensure that all are aware of the aims and benefits of education and thus become part of the decision process. This could also include local NGOs and links with other development organizations and their activities, for example in health education, non formal education or literacy initiatives. However, this more 'participatory' approach is never straightforward and can itself give rise to new problems: for example most people are not used to taking decisions on such major issues, they are more familiar with having systems 'delivered' to them by civil servants. There is much more work to be done in this area; we must all learn from each others experiences. Similar arguments will apply to other areas of social development, e.g. the provision of health care.

Underlying all these, of course, is the issue of cost. In education, this comes into sharp focus as we must balance the need to ensure equity of access for all children against the fact that, particularly in developing countries, there

is a high private rate of return for the individual at most levels. What I mean by that is the Government can provide education for all free, but should it? Because in developing countries particularly at the secondary and the post-secondary level, the individual who survives to that level gets a lot more money back out of the system. So there is a high private rate of return for the individual. This leads us into a number of basic policy issues, including, for example:

- How can we encourage the more wealthy to pay for their tertiary education?
- Can a student loans system work in developing countries? For example, will the cost of providing an infrastructure to recoup the loan, be more than the amount of money you are going to get back in a notoriously inefficient administrative system that exists in most developing countries.
- At the secondary level, the provision of text books is crucial to qualitative improvement in the system. Although the more wealthy secondary students can afford text books, the majority of students cannot even afford locally produced quality science and maths texts. So how do we get round this? Can we set up revolving funds for a books loan scheme?
- Is there an argument for providing financial or other incentives (food, uniforms etc.) for the disadvantaged to attend primary school? How are we going to get more of the young girls into school in Pakistan or Bangladesh? Should the more wealthy pay even for primary education?
- Whatever system of cost recovery is set up, can it succeed in the weak institutional infrastructure that is typical in most poor countries?
- Is the cost of formal technical education justified in terms of the way the labour market values the skill?

A number of studies that we have conducted concerning polytechnic provision in certain African countries (e.g. Kenya, Lesotho, Nigeria) seems to indicate that there can be a good economic return at the higher levels. However for basic craft training, there is serious doubt as to whether formal institution-based training is justifiable. Certainly all evidence points to a failing in schemes for vocational provision within the secondary school system. I say that as controversial statement, because I know JICA invests in secondary vocational schools. And I would like to hear any comments on that.

For example, in Kenya, I was concerned with the high number of

unemployed ex-students who had followed a welding technicians course at a local polytechnic. This was in spite of the fact that there were large car, lorry and bus assembly plants nearby. I checked with the personnel managers in these factories. They informed me that they recruited all their welders from the same village. They were illiterate, but their friends soon trained them on the job, resulting in a work force who worked well as a team, who required lower wages (compared to paying for someone with formal trade certification). Perhaps we should all have spent a little more time in assessing the operation of the local labour market and the demand for skills within it, before making large investments in expensive institution-based training.

I would now like to turn to the general issue of training provision by an aid agency. As I mentioned previously, the British Council manages the training of more than 16,000 people each year in Britain. There are also several thousand others overseas with whom we have some form of involvement in their training. A little over 8,000 of these are trained as part of the British government's technical assistance activities. Over the last few years we have made a number of key changes in our approach to managing such training, these include:

- a shift to project related training - the majority of trainees are now associated with larger projects or priority sector programmes (e.g. forestry) funded by the UK government or other donors;
- there must be greater involvement of the trainee and the employer in the selection of the most appropriate training;
- greater use of in-country and third country training. Training occurring in developing countries can often be more cost-effective, as well as serving to promote in-country institutions;
- better mixes of training (institution based, taught courses, on-the-job training, in-country, overseas etc.) should be planned to achieve objectives;
- clearer contracting with UK training and educational institutions to ensure that the training objectives and requirements of the individual trainee are well understood by all involved;
- greater emphasis on post-hoc evaluation, involving trainee and employer, typically 6 months after training has been completed.

The above implies a higher level professional involvement in the design of training in order to achieve more effective training outcomes.

We are also concerned with the other factors that are likely to effect the performance of trainees whilst overseas. Amongst these, language and communication skills are very important. Our approach is not just to ensure sufficient fluency in the English language, but also to assess how this will be applied in their work. For example, the speaking and writing skills needed of someone undertaking on-the-job training in refrigeration engineering, will be very different to those required by a systems analyst or a doctoral student in genetics. We have also reduced the costs of such training, without compromising effectiveness, through the greater use of our own in-country language centres. We have such centres in many developing countries and our staff are skilled in needs assessment.

We have found that the effectiveness is as good. We get the same improvement in our objective tests, the equivalent of the TOEFL test, our own IELTS test, we get the same improvement over the same period of time. I was quite surprised to learn that, but it was true, because I had to objectively measure it. So we're quite pleased at the way that that's gone.

Another major problem is to welfare of trainees during their training. Within this families can be a source of great support or indeed cause the most difficulties. Trainees either bring their families with them, with the resulting problems of accommodation and costs, or they leave them behind and worry about their well-being in their absence!

As we are also attempting to increase the participation rate of women in training another dimension emerges. Their families will frequently pressurize them into not taking up overseas-based training, resulting in us either having to accept a male alternative or to seek out other approaches to training possibly developing special programmes in their own country.

As I am sure you are all aware, overseas training is a very emotive issue in most countries. I have just touched on a few issues here. I would be pleased to amplify further during the discussion period.

Finally, this leads me to give you a number of suggestions where I believe that we might usefully share our experiences.

Training: What can we learn from each other regarding the design and management of training programmes? What are the critical success factors? In view of our interest in increasing in-country and third-country training, could

we pool our resources to develop a database of appropriate training facilities in developing countries?

Implementation management of HRD Projects: What can we learn from each other, as well as from developing country organizations, concerning our experiences in areas such as technical and vocational education? Over the last 20 years both Britain and Japan have both invested extensively in these areas. Have we achieved an appropriate balance between costs and returns in the labour market?

World Bank and other MLA Contracts: The British Council implements projects jointly with US, European and developing country organizations, on behalf of the World Bank and other international funding agencies. Should we not be doing the same thing with Japanese institutions? If so, with whom and in what sectors?

Costs of Social Development: In view of the increasing emphasis on activities such as the provision of basic health care and education, we need to assess how these might be funded in a self-sustaining way. Should we be seeking to shift more of the costs of these developments to the consumer? What is the role of aid agencies in these very sensitive political areas in the countries concerned? Is there a scope for reviewing the different approaches to cost recovery in social development projects?

Management of Consultancies: Both Britain and Japan send several thousand of their nationals each year to developing countries to act as consultants and experts on aid projects. How can we improve their effectiveness? What lessons have we learnt in terms of improving selection and their management whilst in-country? Does their presence inhibit the growth of in-country organizations and expertise? Recent research from the World Bank suggests that we should reassess completely our approach to technical cooperation in Africa, if we are to have a greater impact on local capacity building. There's a big issue here and there are many political interests as well underpinning this. There are obviously many other issues of strong mutual interest and I would be very willing to explore them now or in separate discussions later.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity of thanking you for inviting

me here today. I look forward to the possibility of fruitful collaboration in the future. And I extend an invitation, if any of you are passing through Britain, or any country where we have an office, please do not hesitate to call in.

Thank you very much.



## DISCUSSION AND QUESTION & ANSWER SESSION

**MODERATOR:** Thank you for your interesting lecture, and thank you for your kind invitation as well. And now I would like to open the floor for the question and answer or discussion session. Dr. Kemp mentioned several issues so that we can create a good discussion here, and this also is a good opportunity to share our own experiences. So, if there are any questions or other related things to discuss, please raise your hand. Is there any question? Could you please use the microphone, and tell us your name and the organization you belong to as well?

**QUESTION:** Thank you very much, Dr. Kemp. I really enjoyed your presentation. I am currently working with the International Development Center of Japan, and formerly I was working with the UNDP Offices in Bangladesh and Uganda for two and a half years each, and I think that was the Dhaka Office that I was slightly familiar. Let me ask perhaps three questions.

Number 1 is the distinction between “project” and “programme”. And as you might be familiar, this issue, whether project aid is more effective than programme aid, or whatever the modality of assistance would be suitable to particular areas of cooperation; and I would appreciate it, if you can perhaps share with us your thoughts on how do you conceptualize “programme”. I don’t think, in my view, “programme” is not just a huge project, not just a simple accumulation of projects. But what will it really mean if we call it a “programme”?

And the second question is this promoting a local ownership of aid activities. I think it’s a very sound idea to promote local ownership when we carry out cooperation activities. But for donors, there are, I think, two key issues: One is accountability, and second one is transparency of how the funds are used. And donors are required to take some control of those development activities which tend to discourage developing ownership on the recipient side. So, in your experience, how do you try to seek the balance between those two? Because we are not completely a voluntary agency, and you know, we can’t say just give you money for whatever you want to use.

The third one is the educational project that you mentioned in India sounded very interesting, and I just wanted to ask;—I think you have mentioned

something like, if I remember correctly, 190,000 (one hundred and ninety thousand) teachers trained. And I think my question is simple: How many of them are still in the current job? Because it's very common that once they receive education, they leave the job. And that's very difficult for any of us to exert any control. Thank you very much.

**KEMP:** Thank you. Three fairly varied points — questions there.

The distinction between project and programme aid, in a way I see as a spectrum, where you can represent at the extremes a very discrete project with all that we understand a project to be in terms of set objectives, time-frame, cost, etc., and a programme being just a net addition to the government's recurrent funding, their national accounts that relate to that particular government department. I am suggesting that we need to somehow come more into the middle, where we are looking at additions that allow themselves for a degree of projectization, but still we are providing a net addition to the government's recurrent funding, because without it we are not supporting the infrastructure. And often the reason why basic education provision has not occurred, is because the infrastructure to deliver that basic education is not in place. So, unless you try to do something fundamental in terms of supporting the government infrastructure, you can't do it. So, it's somehow getting a mix of these in the intermediate level.

You know, correctly, programme aid can often be viewed as a cluster of projects. But I am asking for even for a little more than that. I am asking: Yes, we continue to look at projects, but we also look at how we can provide that additional support, and which can give us some leverage.

It's not a clear answer, because we are still trying to think our way through it. We are certain that pure project aid does not work in social development, because that there are some underlying fundamental issues that you will never get across. On the other hand, we don't like pure programme aid. So we are saying we have got to look at a way in the middle there. And that's what we are still trying to think our way through. We don't have an answer strictly.

Local ownership and accountability and transparency: Yes, that is always a problem when you are funding social development projects, because basically you are not paying yen in Japan for Japanese training and Japanese consultants. It's a net transfer of yen into local currency that you are dispersing in country.

And therefore, you are dependent on the local system, providing you with accounting how that money has been spent. And yes, we get into trouble. The British Government- we are answerable to the British Parliament, and within Parliament we have a very, very strong finance committee called the Public Accounts Committee. And they are reported to by a group called the National Audit Office. And the National Audit Office are a team of accountants, who will visit our projects anywhere in the world and demand to see the books. And they have absolute right for us, because we are part of the British Government.

What we ask of the recipient government is to provide some form of accounting. It will vary. There will be a degree of flexibility to it. But we cannot;—you know, when you are running a project like the Andhra Pradesh one, you cannot afford to check the order for every little bit of paper in every rural secondary school. You have got to accept the system.

What we do in Andhra Pradesh, for example, on the school buildings: So we are putting up two thousand schools. We will do a random sample, and visit those schools at different phases of them being built, because they are being built through the government system. And we will verify that the materials and the design is according to specification. If not, we chase up the government. But it's a real problem. The largest area of corruption is in building projects. It's the largest area of corruption in Britain, and I am sure it's the same in Japan, and it certainly is in developing countries. So you have to try and balance a realistic approach to getting auditable accounts that I can satisfy the National Auditor Office with the practicalities. It always is a difficult one. But if you are going to get involved in social development, you have got to accept that, because it's always going to be a net transfer into local currencies, the money spent locally.

The third area, 190,000 trained teachers: Well, actually, primary teachers in rural India, which is this one, is not the problem, compared to, say, skilled technicians in an urban centre. The typical primary teacher in urban India is a woman, with a family in the village, often untrained. So we have given them training, specific to teaching. The only other employment available to a woman in rural India is working in the fields. Their family is there. The pay is very low;— I mean, we are talking about 400 or 500 rupees a month, which is U.S.\$10 a month. I mean, it's very, very low, but it's a net addition, and it's a

much higher status job than working in the fields.

So, although we have not conducted any detailed studies on drop-out from this, I believe that the local situation is pretty powerful, and there is no indication that we are getting a huge net loss. Higher up the system, yes. But certainly at that basic level there is not the problem. Does that answer? Thanks.

**QUESTION:** I now belong to the Training Affairs Department in JICA, and I am in charge of planning and implementing training programme for participants from the African Continent.

And my question is related to the shift of the training programme that you have mentioned in the British Council. And you have mentioned that there is a bigger shift in project-related training with a greater association with priority sector programme.

And my first question is: How do you set up this priority sector programme? And also related to this question is: How do you like;—the main problem I see in this training programme is the combination with the labour market, absorption capacity in the related countries—developing countries. And in conducting these mainly technical training programmes, do you foresee the future labour market conditions in each area?

Or if you don't, how do you combine,—how do you try to combine the labour market and the training institutions in order to avoid 'diploma disease' or brain drain?

**KEMP:** That's correct. First one, in terms of priority sectors: First of all, project-related training is very specific training of, I think you would call it, "counterpart training". So, it's the counterparts involved in the projects that you are implementing under Japanese aid, who we are training as project-related training. It could be any area of our aid programme. It could be the capital aid programme, you know. For example, as related to what you are delivering through OECF. Or it could be other areas of Japanese assistance to that country, or in our case, the British Government's assistance to that country, that supports that other project activity. So, it's the training bit, as it were, of support to that activity.

But because there is also a need for key skills in key areas, and we have

identified from the British Government side half a dozen key sectors that we see are cross-cutting, they go across all development areas, and through our annual aid talks with those individual countries we will identify them as priorities. And the four or five of them are gender-related;—women, the environment, what we call “good government”.

But “good government” manifests itself in a responsible, open, and accountable public service. So, a lot of the training we do as public administration training, training of finance and audit staff, and the training of judiciary, the judges and the people associated with the legal system, we call “good government”. And we will sit down and agree with the government of the country that we do this. Indeed, even police training.

I saw a very interesting article the other day that suggested that we train police from the Gambia in third-country training in Nigeria. We are having a few doubts at the moment as to whether to support that. But that comes under this broader sector training. And as I mentioned in my talk earlier, things like the economic reform programmes in Ghana, as I think a lot of you know that Ghana has probably been the most successful in implementing its economic reform, since it was the first one in the mid-1980's. But we are still working with them in supporting the drive for that reform.

As to the sort of absorptive capacity for the labour market, all of these people are actually in employment. We are not providing net additions to the labour market through training, but rather, we are trying to make the individual more effective in that job. So we don't, in the particular area of this level of training, we don't need to do the detailed labour market studies, because it's not a net addition to the labour force.

Where we have that problem is going back earlier. It's where you are developing, say, technical training institutions, or universities, where the output from those colleges are going to be net additions; they are going to be new entries to the labour market. And therefore, the detailed labour market studies that you suggest must be done if we are going to ensure that our investment is appropriate. But you have to sit down before you start and say: “Does this represent a net addition to the labour force, or is this in-service training?”, albeit at a very high level. Does that answer your question? Thank you.

**QUESTION:** You say that vocational training in the secondary school system is not so advisable. I understand from your speech in that way. But I think some vocational experience or some vocational training, when the people is very young, is very useful, particularly in developing countries. They can understand and they can know what is “skilled work” in the future. So, I think just teaching reading and mathematics for young people may not be a good practice in these developing countries.

**KEMP:** Thanks. I am very happy to respond.

I think we need to distinguish between what is vocational training and what is good general education. I believe that we should be taught many more things in school in Britain, —I am sure in Japan as well as developing countries,— which you might call “vocational skills”;—simple things like changing an electric plug, how to handle electronics materials that are part of your every day life.

Now, I would class that, and handling even some simple materials in a workshop;— how to handle wood, how to do simple maintenance on a car. Because this is part of our general life. Like it or not, the motor car, the electric current and electronics goods are going to be with us for all our life. So we do need to have basic skills;—every one of us, to handle this.

I would argue that that is general education, and should be provided everywhere in the world. And it’s legitimate that that’s done at secondary school.

What I mean by “vocational education” and “vocational training” is about providing a skill that is marketable in the labour market when you finish your time at that institution;—might be secondary school. All indications, and I mean I must have read, many many studies are that, providing this in the secondary school system is not as efficient or as effective as providing it either in a specialist vocational institution in which you just concentrate on the vocational skill, or indeed, on the job.

If it’s the simple craft level skill, like welding, for someone who leaves school at 16, to train them in a combination of a workshop, where they can learn to handle the materials, a little bit about the theory of welding, and then the practice on the job, is much more efficient than trying to develop all those facilities in a school where they have already got a pretty full curriculum,

anyway. It's high cost, and in developing countries getting teaching staff who have the technical background is almost impossible.

And you come into collision course with the system, because, there is one salary-scale for teachers in most education systems. I am sure it's the same in Japan, the same in Britain, the same in Kenya, the same in India.

If you want someone who is a good technical teacher, who comes in from industry, they are not normally a graduate. So they are on the very lowest of the teaching scales. So they are not going to come in from the industry. So, all you get are some fairly weak individuals, because they are the only ones that are willing to come there.

So, it's high cost. In general, parents prefer their children to have a more academic education, because in developing countries, if they have got to 16, in secondary school, they are from the elite, relatively speaking, and they want to go on to university. Secondly, these technical skills are;—you know, they are not going to get their hands dirty. So, there are a whole range of mismatches there.

I think if you want to look to see the best description of it, the World Bank's senior economist, a guy by the name of George Psacharopoulos, has done a very detailed study of vocational training in Colombia and Tanzania. And I think that that is probably the most detailed study that looks at the whole issue of provision of vocational training in secondary schools. But it comes back to the initial question about differentiating between what we want as a general education that's desirable for all and vocational skills, that is, about skills formation for employment.

It's a very emotive subject. I agree with you. And I know that in Japan, here you have secondary technical schools. And there is a big debate amongst professional educationalists, that is: Are the secondary vocational schools in Japan successful or not? There is one half that says they are, and there is another half that says they are not. And it's quite an interesting debate, because it's happening here at the moment. Okay.

**QUESTION:** Thank you. I am working for JICA upstairs in this building.

Just two quick questions I would like to check.

First of them: You mentioned a conference, and one of the goals of the conference was universal basic education for all by the year 2000. I wanted to

just check again which conference that was, and maybe if you could give us a few more details about that conference.

And the other question was concerning a point you raised concerning Sri Lanka, and in-country training. And you said that you have done some objective testing comparing the results, from the viewpoint of in-country in Sri Lanka or in the U.K. And you'd found basically the results;—there was pretty good correlation in the results.

So, maybe you could tell us a little bit more about that objective testing that you did, because I am also thinking, you know, in JICA's case, we actually invite eight thousand people a year—each year to Japan, and maybe we could also learn from your experience, and that particular test. I think you said it was the IELTS tests?

**KEMP:** IELTS test, yeah. Okay, thank you that's very straightforward.

First of all, the conference I was referring to was the "World Conference on Education for All" held in Jom Tien in Thailand in March 1990. It has been very well written up. UNICEF have presented a very detailed report on it. But I think you will find copies around here, because it's pretty famous. And UNICEF has also sponsored the production of a follow-up book that goes over the issues about the provision of basic education for all, and what this means in shifts in donor policy. And that's, —I've forgotten the name of it, but it was written by an English guy called Chris Colclough —C-O-L-C-L-O-U-G-H. And Chris was commissioned by UNICEF to write the book on looking at how that could be implemented as policy. So, that's the first one.

The second one, our IELTS tests. "I-E-L-T-S" stands for International English Language Testing Service.

And we run this, it's our own standard test: Just as the Americans have their TOEFL test, the British have their IELTS test. And before people can go on a particular level of training, they have got to have attained a particular score. Obviously it's highest for taught postgraduate courses relative to some more straightforward basic training courses.

How did we succeed in Sri Lanka in achieving the same test score in England? Basically, we have a very good training institute there. We take in the trainees for two or three hours a day. We have English teachers, British teachers;— we exploit the local labour market and pay them very little,



recruiting them locally and not as foreign experts from Britain at some enormous costs. So, it costs us much lower amounts of money to do it. And of course, the cost of living in Sri Lanka is very low; and if people are living at home, because they are nearby.

And we did find that the improvement after three months in the IELTS score for the trainees in Sri Lanka was comparable with the same three months period for the same score range in Britain. And in fact, we take other students. We take our trainees from the Maldives. We bring them to Sri Lanka as well for training. And there is the one in Dhaka that's now being developed in Bangladesh.

In fact, we offer it as a service for many foreign aid agencies to train their staff now. The UN, in fact, uses it all the time for anyone who is going for English language-based training or English medium training anywhere in the world; we tend to offer it.

And it has worked. And it's, as I say, it's cheaper; the trainees are near their homes, so they are happy because they have got their families. And often you might;— you know, although it sounds good that they are going to Britain and they are going to be studying English in Britain, what they often do is a group of Sri Lankans will go and live together in the same house, and they will, you know;— although we finish it off by one or two months in Britain so they can learn about how to live in Britain, and the communication skills for living in Britain, that the basic training, though, we can start off overseas. We've found it works.

**QUESTION:** I am working in the Fisheries Cooperation Department.

And I would like to know a little more about how you send consultants and experts to developing countries:— How do you recruit them, and how do you verify their qualities?

**KEMP:** Hmmm, very difficult one. We are just going through a tremendous failure with two consultants in Sri Lanka at the moment. You know, I have to say, we are sending maybe three or four thousand a year; so the failure in two or three occasionally is not too bad.

First of all, the first criterion for recruitment has got to be their technical competence in the subject area. The second is their ability to apply that in a developing country. And then comes other things like language skills, etc..

The most effective we have found are the ones who already have had some contact with the project; often know the people in the country concerned with the project. So it's not, as we call it, a shotgun marriage, you know, of the British consultant and the Indian project director, or the Nigerian project director. It's really the two have often known each other. Very frequently, it's because the person studied in Britain. I mean it is as simple as that. They have gone back;—twenty years ago they might have studied in Britain; now they are a key official in the Ministry of Health. And they say: "Oh, we'd like Britain to assist us in the development of this primary health care system", and they put a formal request in, because they know it. I am sure that's how a lot of your aid happens. So, there is often people will know each other.

But, as you try to target things more tightly, that becomes less so, and the management of consultants becomes more and more difficult. What we do is go through a fairly rigorous defining of the terms of reference with overseas. Our office overseas spends a lot of time with the overseas institution in working out what the terms of reference for the consultancy should be.

When we recruit the consultant, we look into their ability to meet those terms of reference in detail. We then brief them in detail before they come out; provide them with a lot of briefing material, and we give a fairly tight contract, a tight contractual specification, which has penalties: if they don't perform, they won't get paid. And we have their payment schedule, so that we can withhold payment. They don't get paid until they have completed satisfactorily. So we have got that financial grip on them.

And then, when they are in country, our field manager in our office in country, will monitor their progress against those objectives and agreeing them with the in-country institution or project manager.

There are two golden rules that we try to stick to. The first is that no consultant's findings should come as a surprise to the host institution. What that means is: the consultant should have been working so close with the recipient organization in country that his thinking is infiltrating into their thinking. So, he is testing his ideas against them, so that what he proposes in the end, they have gone along with all the time, and they have mutually agreed that this is appropriate. I mean, that's the ideal scene, you know.

We don't want a consultant locking themselves in their hotel room, because

it's nicely air-conditioned, and writing away without reference to the in-country organization. You have got to monitor their progress.

We also try to ensure that their final report is drafted in-country before they go, and that it is agreed with the recipient organization before they go. I strongly believe that any consultant report written in-country to the environment, both the physical as well as the human environment in which they are working, is much better than when they get back to Britain or to Japan; they have got their in-tray waiting for them; they have got their wife and children or husband and children putting pressure on them, and a month later they still haven't written their report. Fund them to spend that extra few days in-country, and agree it in-country before they leave. I mean, it's the ideal, but it often doesn't happen.

I was explaining to Michael earlier how one project we were looking at in India was to set up a blood transfusion- it's a blood bank for an area of India, because they have a major problem in blood banking and testing, particularly with AIDS and hepatitis. So, we were looking at, using a model that has worked very successfully in Britain for Scotland.

Scotland has its own sort of blood transfusion self-contained system. And the head of that, a very dynamic individual, tremendous, lots of ideas;— we brought him out as a consultant to start work on this. And him and the Indian counterpart just didn't get on. He had his view, the Indian counterpart had his view, and the two of them wouldn't meet. And it was our one that should have met the Indian one, I have to say. So in the end we said: "Well, we can't fund this project. Sorry." We had to apologize to India. We said: "Look. You know, this is;—we think this is the best approach we have got." He is our lead consultant. And he is obviously not suited to working in this environment. So we aborted the project. Very sad, because it was a really good project. So, does that give you a flavour of a few things?

**MODERATOR:** Are there any other questions?

Well, then, I would like to close the session although it's a bit earlier than the scheduled closing. Thank you very much.. Dr.Kemp, are there anything that you would like to add to your lecture?

**KEMP:** No. Thank you for a stimulating set of questions. Really excellent.

And all I can add is that if you are overseas, please go into our offices and ask even more of the same, and we will do the same, you know; it will be useful that we could just sit down and spend time with you, away on a one to one basis, learning of your experiences, because I am sure you have all got exactly the same range of different experiences as I have put to you now. Thank you.

**MODERATOR:** Thank you very much for your effort to drop by and give us a wonderful lecture, and I hope you enjoy the rest of your stay in Japan. Thank you.

**KEMP:** Thank you very much. Thank you.

[ADJOURNED]



JICA