

PDAN 4-525

47704

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS, INC.

SOLOMON ISLANDS DEVELOPMENT BY THE PEOPLE AT THE VILLAGE LEVEL
PROGRAM

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT

AND EVALUATION

1 JULY 1985 - 30 JUNE 1986



CONTENTS

I. SUMMARY

- A. How the Program Is Organized
- B. The Year
- C. Recommendations
- D. Thanks

II. THE PROBLEMS BEING ADDRESSED

III. BASELINE DATA UPDATE

- A. Program Impact
- B. National Statistics
- C. Conclusions from Baseline Data

IV. WORK-TO-DATE

- A. Program Status
- B. Methodology
- C. Time Frames
- D. Assumptions
- E. Goals & Expectations

V. EVALUATION

VI. RESOURCES NARRATIVE

VII. BUDGET

APPENDIX A. PROJECTS SUMMARY AS OF 30/6/86, INCLUDING STATUS SUMMARY, COMPONENT SUMMARY, FOCUS SUMMARY

APPENDIX B. CYCLONE NAMU REPORT FROM S. I. NATIONAL DISASTER COUNCIL

APPENDIX C. FIELD OFFICE AUDIT REPORT (For 1 Dec 83 - 31 May 86)

APPENDIX D. PROJECT EVALUATION AND ACTIVITY REPORTS RECEIVED

I. SUMMARY

It is now July, 1986. This evaluative annual report is based on a program year which ended on 30 June, 1986. Most of the work in preparing this report was in compiling and analyzing data on the large number of projects supported by the program. This data was compiled--as it has been since the program began--because we felt it essential for an effective self-evaluation. Self-evaluation is a necessary component of the program because outside and/or tri-partite evaluations are few and far between.

A. How The Program Is Organized

The "Community Self-Help Program", officially titled the "Solomon Islands Development by the People at the Village Level" program, is an eight year program which supports village level self-help development activity in the areas of sanitation and primary health, crop diversification and marketing and training for women, rural development catalysts and out-of-school youth. Primary support for this program comes from an Operational Program Grant (OPG) from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), with major inputs also coming from the Solomons' national and provincial governments (9%), rural villagers themselves (16%), IHAP (22%) and others (17%).

In addition to supporting village-level self-help development activities, this program aims to strengthen local programming capabilities for such development, starting at the provincial level, to include planning, implementation, financial accounting, technical assistance and evaluation.

Projects supported under this program are developed by village-level groups or their supporters in consultation with extension workers, field officers and/or other experts (e.g. carpenters, Development Bank staff, health educators, boat builders) and IHAP. Once a written project plan and explanation are developed, these are submitted to the province concerned. If the province finds the project fits both their development plans and the program, they recommend it to IHAP, usually through the SIG's Provincial Development Unit (PDU). IHAP/SI reviews the projects which it receives and within three weeks to three months (depending on staff leaves, project complexities, budget, etc.) is usually able to assist approved projects. Projects not approved are sent back to the requesting group (for redesign or scrapping) or referred to other donors for consideration.

In an exchange of letters at the beginning of this program year, IHAP and the Ministry of Home Affairs, approved a revision of the review process used in past years. This revision provides for post-implementation review by the PDU and permits a much faster approval process. In most cases, however, IHAP still seeks pre-implementation review by the PDU, because the PDU is often better sited for a disinterested review than provincial, FVO and/or IHAP reviewers, who frequently have been in direct contact with involved communities.

This system of project identification, selection, review and implementation takes from as little as a week to as much as a year or more, depending upon technical viability, reference checks, etc. Project completion, which should occur within one to three years, has on a few occasions taken four years.

B. The Year

The sixth year of IHAP's "Community Self-Help Program" was extremely active as IHAP provided over US\$ 225,000 in assistance for 186 village-level, self-help, training and material assistance projects. This represents an increase during the past year of 32 projects, and raised the total of program assistance to date to over US\$ 1,500,000.

These 186 projects include 50 health/sanitation projects, 54 crop diversification-marketing projects, 13 income generation projects and 68 projects for the training and/or involvement of women, out-of-school youth and PCV counterparts. Approximately 15 projects have failed or were cancelled. Projects supported under the program affected over 123,000 people throughout the Solomons--an increase of 28,000 over the previous year--by support for development efforts chosen by the villagers themselves. An additional 130,000 people have been affected by the five material support projects, meaning that the program has benefited all of the Solomon Islands.

In dollar terms the program is well above projections with total cash and in-kind inputs committed to date totaling well over US\$2,129,000. Although commitments and expenditures of OPG funds have been slower than originally projected, this past year saw us more or less catch up to programmed targets. By April 30, 1986, after the completion of 97% of the program's scheduled time frames, approximately 99.7% of Community Self-Help Program funds were committed.

Provincial participation in the program continued strong in Malaita and Isabel provinces; Western Province increased its participation (see Appendix A).

The past year saw the end of increases in program funds in Solomon Islands Dollar terms. While the US Dollar (the currency of the program's major source of funds, USAID's OPG) continued its rise against the SI\$ (at the end of the year US\$0.60 = SI\$1.00), decreases in USAID support for the program have offset US\$ gains. This is expected to get worse in the next year as the effects of USAID's reducing its budget for NGOs by over 60% become felt.

Beginning in the fifth program year, IHAP, in consultation with USAID/SPRDO and the Ministry of Home Affairs, developed a proposal for a two year wrap-up of this program. In this "final phase", which was approved this past year by MHA and IHAP and forwarded to USAID/SPRDO, the program concept initiated in the Solomon Islands Development by the People at the Village Level I

program would remain basically the same. However, to overcome problems identified during the first four years of the program and to better address the problem of creating provincial systems for self-help development, the wrap-up phase would:

- strengthen quality criteria for project selection,
- focus on specific geographical areas,
- increase training in support of community self-help projects and programming through additions of short-term (two years) staff and finance,
- make self-help tools more flexible by adding loans and loan guarantees alongside grants,
- formalize efforts to strengthen local private and voluntary (non-governmental) organizations, and
- continue the shortened processing time between request and implementation for most projects.

During the past year, program activity continued to be fragmented as a result of 1) the PDU's insecure staffing, organization, etc.; 2) time lost to necessary IHAP technical assistance staff leaves; and 3) USAID's inability to confirm or suggest changes in the proposal for the final two years of this program. The resulting strains limited our responses and forward planning.

On top of these difficulties, in late February we were informed that USAID's assistance for PVO activities in the South Pacific were being cut from \$3.5 million to less than \$1.3 million, effective immediately. This 63% reduction in funding will require a major re-design effort, because the seventh and eighth years of this program were designed with a sizable technical assistance/training element as well as an increase in direct small project funds.

The year ended on a very sad note that will likely have an added disruptive element to our forward programming. From 18 to 20 May, Cyclone Namu--not terribly strong as cyclones go--pounded the central part of the nation. Flooding, which resulted from its extremely slow traverse of the country took well over a hundred lives, destroyed over 5,000 homes and many, many low-lying gardens. More details on the cyclone are given in Appendix B. In response to the loss of housing, USAID/SPRDO and USAID/OFDA have asked the Solomon Islands Government if a housing rehabilitation program could be implemented under IHAP's management. At the end of the program year, the SIG was expected to give the approval for such a program, but the final decision might not be available until mid-July, with implementation to begin in late September.

C. Recommendations

This report and the small project evaluation exercises we were able to undertake this past year all indicate that we must look closely at the following issues, irregardless of the delays in achieving a satisfactory wrap-up proposal, if we are to make the program more effective and relevant.

1. The future of a Self-Help Program depends on how effective government's policies on rural development will be. At present the link between policy making process and effective translation of these into project design and implementation is negligible. The Self-Help Program is implemented in coordination with PDU, Province and Community, a linkage that has frequently been without a clear policy framework. We recommend that the PDU system be strengthened and that it receive additional staff.

2. The extension staff of the government in the rural areas are short-trained and short-staffed. Many projects are not followed up and are deprived of the support required during the implementation period. Project appraisals at the Provincial level often lack the technical details required to make meaningful decisions. A project may be feasible but may not succeed as a result. Plans to establish a system of priorities to projects using performance data available from the previous years must be implemented as soon as possible. The resultant selection criteria need to be issued in place of existing, coupled with a redesigned system of appraisal.

3. Co-financing of projects with the Development Bank of Solomon Island should be increased.

4. A loan system as recommended in past years should be examined and a pilot scheme introduced. Loan administration costs and difficulties should be carefully weighed against the merits of having such a scheme.

5. A Community Self-Help Assistance Program must continue as it fills a vital area of the National Development process. For reasons of national income in what is basically a subsistence society, national development programs give priority to large, joint-venture efforts to help cover the costs of imports used in development.

D. Thanks

IHAP, on behalf of the rural villagers who have been helped under the program, extends a special thanks to the United States Agency for International Development and United States Peace Corps for their prominent and significant contributions to this program. The large number of other organizations and individuals who have contributed to the program, and those private firms which discount materials bought for the program also deserve thanks. To them, some of whom are listed below, go our warm and sincere thanks.

--Area, Provincial and National Governments of the Solomon Islands

--The Australian High Commission, Honiara

--The Norman Kirk Memorial Trust and the New Zealand High Commissioner, Honiara

--Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance (VOCA)

--The Asia Foundation

--The Central Bank of the Solomon Islands
 --The Kick Family, Honiara
 --The National Council of Women
 --DBSI, Auki & Kirakira --AWA (NZ), Ltd., Suva
 --Bowmans, Honiara --PBE, Ltd., Honiara
 --World YWCA, Nadi --LKP Hardware, Honiara
 --Bergengren CUTC, Suva --HSBC, Honiara
 --YWCA/Solomons --Aruligho Fiberglas
 --Guadalcanal Electric --Yam & Co

II. PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PROJECT

A. National Development Plans

Since this Program was written in January of 1979, number of events have occurred. The 1975-1979 National Development Plan was completed. A Draft 1980-1984 National Development Plan was prepared, and set aside with the change of governments in 1981. In replacement, a Plan of Action, 1981-1984 was drawn up. This Plan was superceded by a ational Development Plan, 1985-9, completed in late 1985 following the 1984 national election. All of these papers continue the objectives quoted in the original OPG document: Decentralization, self reliance, distributed development and local participation.

As articulated in its National Development Plan, 1985-1989, the Solomon Islands Government (SIG) is committed to undertake a broad range of activities designed to stimulate the process of development in the rural areas. Prominent among the SIG's development goals are the increase of productive employment opportunities to improve the living standard of the poor, reduction of income disparities, and sustained economic growth. The SIG identifies a broader government role and greater use of the private sector as necessary for achieving its development goals.

The SIG has sought to decentralize development planning and implementation responsibilities to local levels, primarily provincial. This approach has put increasing pressure on limited national and local government resources, both human and financial, thus highlighting the greater potential role of the private sector in providing valuable technical as well as financial assistance. The National Development Plan recognizes these constraints: "The national development strategy, therefore, has three elements:

- (a) increased investment in the development of human and natural resources and the supporting social and economic infrastructure;
- (b) providing an environment conducive to increased private sector investment and an active government involvement in strategic areas of the economy; and
- (c) encouragement of people and communities to participate more directly in their development especially through commu-

nity self-help." (Pages 10-11)

This last strategy directly reflects the successes of earlier self-help assistance efforts, as well as the drawbacks of the more standard large development grant project or program.

B. Program Responses to National Development Plans

All project activities being implemented under this program adhere to the decentralization objective. In no case has IHAP, the PDU or the Ministry of Home Affairs attempted to introduce a project into a given community, although there have been changes in proposed methodologies as a result of intensive discussions with involved communities or local organizations to define feasible project methodology.

Project selection, always a difficult task, has been carried out by the Provincial Assemblies, their administrative and extension divisions or by village level organizations. Reviews conducted by IHAF and the PDU have avoided reversing local decisions except as they conflict with program guidelines or with the probable success of a project. In such cases, efforts are made to redirect local efforts to fit program guidelines.

The "self-reliance" objective has been somewhat problematical, but the program has responded adequately: While all of the projects have originated from villagers' expressed desires, much of the implementation of these projects is beyond villagers' capacity. Therefore, as intended by the program's complementing an existing project selection and implementation system, there has been significant involvement of provincial and/or Ministry extension staff, local non-governmental organizations and Peace Corps and other Volunteers for technical and management support.

"Distributed development" is one of the least tangible objectives cited in the OPG document. Project efforts under this Program are well distributed within provinces. However, between provinces there is a wide range in the number of projects implemented (see Appendix A). This range reflects primarily each province's interest in and capacity for managing small-scale community self-help efforts. Similar variations in capacity or interest has also been reported by the PDU for its larger-scale, province-initiated projects. These data imply that village-level self-help is not being ignored by the provinces. Rather, provincial policy-making, planning, and programming capacity lags behind desires.

After a slow start, now at least a fourth of the program's projects have highlighted women in development processes. The slow start, reported throughout the program, resulted in intensified efforts to define and to program projects that enhance the roles of women in development processes. IHAP has continued its support for the YWCA (AI-101-114) in the past year and has also been available to the nascent National Council of Women to assist in their efforts for rural women (AI-101-84 and -93)

"Local participation" has been extremely well addressed: All of the projects being implemented under this program are 100% Solomon Islander owned. One-seventh of them assist local business ventures. Higher assistance for local companies and co-operatives has not been a program target because existing channels of assistance (primarily the DBSI), are usually more than adequate. Additionally, most such projects should ideally receive loans rather than the grants called for in the program.

The primary exception to the low level of assistance for companies and co-ops are the Land Purchase Co-operatives (LPCs), which are comprised of rural villagers and set up to buy and redevelop plantations on 'alienated' land--land sold, usually by direct ancestors of the co-op's members, to expatriates generations ago. Indications are that grants or subsidies can be extremely valuable in helping LPCs meet their needs and expectations.

On top of this, some potential small entrepreneurs need more help and training than banks--including the Development Bank--can give. In response to a request from the Ministry of Trade, Commerce and Industry, IHAP is assisting with the establishment of small mechanical workshops by providing scholarships and other support (AI-101-89).

Slowly then, steps are being made for the "systematic and comprehensive involvement at the village level of villagers in their own development as active participants ...". Manpower and skill shortages hamper faster progress. By using and encouraging village level self-help groups through existing and developing structures, IHAP is assisting in skills development in the most basic sense: All of the projects approved so far employ experiential and/or formal training. **This is not enough of course.** As an expansion of these training efforts, we hope to undertake a two year "wrap-up" with sufficient trainers to develop additional training in project planning, as well as efforts to continue the training of rural development catalysts.

III. BASELINE DATA

A. Program Impact

These past six years of experience provide enough 'hard' data to describe the program and its involvement in the areas which were chosen as its special foci. Since the program was designed to fill in gaps between existing programs, such data was difficult to collate and present initially, as the boundaries between the various categories were not clear. This lack of clarity made the program's impacts even more difficult to gauge: A program with such a wide range of subject matter, combined with a very wide geographical reach is difficult to measure! Our major donor, USAID/SPRDO, has recognized this difficulty, first by citing our data compilations in their evaluation guidelines, and later by approving US\$3,000 for microcomputer purchasing.

Baseline data collection has been incomplete for many of the projects implemented to date. While such data is not totally unavailable, it is very difficult to obtain. Our project activities have been directed toward very low/zero income earning people. Most of the communities we have worked with have few literate members; there are no health records, no crop records, and usually no birth/death records except those related orally amongst the communities. Many people do not even know when they were born and they associate an event in their memory with some major event like the "Bell Massacre" in East Kwaio in 1927.

Our efforts to collect baseline data have consisted of: one, reviews of 1970 and 1976 National Censuses; two, reviews of special censuses (such as the village resource survey) and statistical reports prepared by the SIG's Government Statistician; three, reviews of provincial resource reports prepared by the SIG's Central Planning Office in 1979; and, most importantly, interviews and written communications with community groups to obtain their "stori". We have not prompted the community's "stori" with a standard request form. We want the community to tell, as best they can, their own story in their own words. (Too, with a program dealing with a wide variety of projects, a standard form might generate more inaccuracies or omissions than a narrative.)

The community's story provides the basic data for proposal review and assessment: It must provide some indication of the level of village organization, the community's ability to undertake self-help labor, the economic level of the community in cash and/or non-cash terms, the potential for adaptability, resources at hand, management/technical skills for project operation, and more. This information is not easily quantifiable, nor has it been collatable in any systematic fashion, yet we keep reviewing project files looking for common, quantifiable, data.

A description of the program can be obtained from summations of all the quantifiable data collected for each project as long as the reader notes that there is quite a bit more impact from the program but that we lack other quantifiable ways of measuring that impact and that such data compilations do not take account of other organizations' community self-help programming. Summarized in the following paragraphs are data presented in Appendix A of quantifiable project data as of 30 June 1986.

106 general village-level self-help projects have been assisted under the program. These projects benefited approximately 80,000 people. IHAP's OPG support for these projects amounted to over US\$450,000--two fifths of the projects' estimated total value.

38 Peace Corps Volunteer counterpart communities' self-help initiatives were also assisted. These projects benefited nearly 30,000 people and received IHAP OPG support of nearly US\$121,000, or less than three-fifths of the projects' estimated total value of US\$224,000.

20 women in development (WID) projects were assisted, benefiting over 11,500 women. IHAP's OPG funds provided nearly three fifths of the projects' estimated total value (US\$117,000 out of \$212,000).

16 rural development (RD) catalysts training efforts were undertaken, providing over 11,000 rural leaders with both formal and experiential training. IHAP's OPG inputs to these efforts was less than half their total value (US\$75,711 out of \$157,352), the balance of support has come from rural villagers, the Peace Corps, Guadalcanal Province, the SIDT, etc.

6 material assistance (GIK or Gift-in-Kind) projects provided assistance to at least 180,000 Solomon Islanders through the provision of medicines, medical texts, hospital supplies, medical instruments, etc. for rural medical centers and hospitals. IHAP's inputs for this component (not from the OPG) amounted to some US\$448,364; SIG and other participants local warehousing, inventorying and distribution costs were worth an additional US\$9,000 or so.

B. National Statistics

Recent data on the Solomons indicate that of the larger countries in the region, only Vanuatu and the Solomons have an annual population growth rate over 2.5%, and that the Solomons' fertility rate is the highest in the region at 7.3. More Solomon Islanders are under age 15 (47.9%) than any other state in the South Pacific, and the nation's dependency ratio, at 105.2, is higher than any of the larger nations' (c.f. Vanuatu at 94.4, PNG at 80.7 and Fiji at 77.3).

In economic terms, the Solomons is primarily a subsistence economy with large joint-venture oil palm, fishing and timber firms dominating the cash economy. Copra, the income staple of the rural village population, is a major export earner in years when copra prices are average to high. Cyclone Namu, in mid-May, seriously aggravated all of these cash-producing sectors--at a time when prices for all these commodities were quite low. The Solomons is still heavily into a non-cash economy and the damage by the cyclone to the copra industry will seriously affect the rural villager's ability to augment his subsistence income with cash. In terms of GDP/GNP per capita, the Solomons ranks well below the other Melanesian countries in the South Pacific and is even below the one South Pacific country officially labelled as a "Least Developed Nation" (Western Samoa). Per capita government expenditures are on a par with these data. In US\$ terms (based on CBSI and World Bank reports), the Solomons has experienced a serious (≈50%) drop in per capita GDP over the past six years.

Accentuating these data are data on literacy and life expectancy in the Solomons. Literacy is estimated to be around 40% (the last official figure was 9% in 1970). Life expectancy, for men and women, is 54 years.

C. Conclusions from Baseline Data

All of these data point to a growing need to increase the skills and understanding of rural villagers. By itself, the cash economy cannot generate enough government and other revenue to cater for a faster rate of expansion of schools and infrastructure. Therefore, it is felt, bringing the rural villager more actively into the development effort is the best way to both increase development activity and to minimize pressure "to do any kind something" from villagers who otherwise are left to a passive, observer, role.

IV. WORK-TO-DATE

A. Program Status

In dollar terms the program is well above projections with total cash and in-kind inputs committed to date totaling over US\$2,129,000. Although commitments and expenditures of OPG funds started slower than originally projected, this past year saw us continue in line with programmed targets. By April 30, 1986 (with 97% of the program's scheduled time frames completed), 99.7% of Community Self-Help Program funds were committed.

Weaknesses in project administration and scarce management skills within the extension divisions (noted in earlier reports) continued to hamper really effective programming. Extension staff will often warmly and enthusiastically endorse project requests when they are first made. Afterwards, they are frequently transferred or forget about the project under the press of new work. As a result of this difficulty, we continue to try and ensure that the relevant technical division endorses the project and includes it as part of their work schedule. Also, because of significant time lost to technical assistance staff leaves during the past year, we were unable to program any new training efforts to address the skills shortages that underlie this problem. Such training is a top priority in the sidelined proposal for the two next years.

Increased insistence on the participation of rural area council and technical field/extension staff participation in decision making has helped improve project documentation. (While their participation was envisaged in the OPG document, it has not been a requirement for the program.)

Appended to this report summaries of project activities under this program. Appendix A summarizes each project's budget, focus, beneficiaries, province and status; Appendix D contains activities summaries with summaries from reports by local contract evaluators, Mr. Nestor Bele and Mr. Kamilo Teke.

Project management and administration have continued to be satisfactory in the four provinces noted in previous reports, and the Western Province has shown increasing interest in the program during the past year. Two other provinces continue to express

limited interest in the scheme, and one province (the "eighth province" is Honiara, which has sizable areas of 'rural' settlements) is just beginning to develop ways for the scheme to help its village-level people.

In accordance with program aims to strengthen local self-help programming capabilities, IHAP continued its encouragement and assistance--began in late 1981--for a Solomon Islands PVO forum which might augment the capabilities of the Solomons' two dozen or so established PVOs (this forum began operating in 1984 and is called the Development Services Exchange). In addition, we completed our large primary health extension and training project in East Guadalcanal (AI-101-76) which enabled Birao Highlands villagers to better plan and maintain a basic health (i.e. not medical) service. Requiring an estimated \$46,000 in assistance, this project provided two IHAP trainers, equipment, etc. to train 9 Village Health Aids and 1,050 area residents.

We helped the Solomon Islands Credit Union League to prepare its development plan and draft national credit union legislation and advised the League Board on organization and management (AI-101-82). In recognition of the contributions which credit unions might make towards rural financial services as well as to self-help development, the Board of the Central Bank of the Solomon Islands chose to support their development by providing core funding for the League. This core funding will enable the League to expand its support services until expanding membership rolls can cover most of such costs.

During the year, we worked with a number of local PVO and provincial extension staff to increase their extension and small-project capabilities. Prominent among these were the Solomon Islands Development Trust (AI-101-92), the Solomon Islands Beekeepers Association (AI-101-5/34), and the United Church Women's Fellowship (AI-101-78 and -79) and the DIVIT Training Center for women (AI-101-88).

The largest single project begun in the past year (AI-101-97) assists the Ministry of Health and Medical Services' Health Education Division in the establishment of a national health education training materials center. This project follows our work with the Honiara Town Council (AI-101-5/27) to develop a video/videotapes training system for each of the town's clinics for health education programming--the first of its kind in the South Pacific.

The Bambanakira Community Development Council (BCDC) in South Guadalcanal saw its capabilities weaken as internal disputes interfered with several BCDC-supported small-scale self-help efforts. In response, villagers from Wanderer Bay (Kukuitolu) stepped in to try and manage the project, changing the focus to their community itself. This remote community did an amazing job in attempting this project, and despite not achieving perfection, the community learned many valuable lessons and succeeded in many of their sub-projects before Cyclone Namu disrupted everything.

B. Methodology

1. "To facilitate and support increased self-help development activity at the village level..." (OPG)

There can be no question that this program has provided much needed support for village level self-help development activity. This program, through its nationwide scope, flexibility and prompt response once a proposal is completed, has set an example for many villages of what their province can do for them. The only other sizable self-help program--run by World Vision--operates pretty much only in Malaita and Guadalcanal.

2. "To strengthen small-scale village development programming capacity..." (OPG)

While a streamlined, integrated system for small-scale village development programming capacity has not been produced, there is no doubt that, to date, this program has strengthened capacities in this regard at the provincial level and in many of the affected villages. Between the village and province, there has been only limited involvement with organizations such as the SIDT, the Bambanakra Community Development Council, the YWCA, etc.

The program's use of existing development-oriented local organizations for a task to which they are organizationally well situated and well-suited, but for which they lack funds (and concomitant programming emphasis), has resulted in the strengthening of their capacities. Such strengthening has been in relatively direct proportion to each organization's involvement in or commitment to the program.

3. "To strengthen the capability of indigenous staff in accomplishing village development through training and on-going support." (OPG)

This is a most difficult objective to measure. Efforts towards this have been continuous, from the initial program briefings held in each province, to sessions with extensions officers during their in-service training, to training for IHAP's local staff, to a full-fledged project management workshop, through the twelve RD Catalyst training projects and the planning training project started at the end of the ninth quarter. In addition, in-depth and cursory briefings on the program have been given at a minimum of once a day to visitors to IHAP/SI's office and/or persons in communities visited.

Aside from these efforts, the program's flexibility has allowed us to permit both our own and local organizations' indigenous staff to determine the most appropriate system specific to their situation (learning by doing). The most promising results of this have been in Malaita Province where the provincial staff and provincial administration have begun to define for themselves how a community self-help assistance program might function as

part of their overall provincial development strategy. The results in Malaita, while commendable, are as hampered by staff shortages as in other provinces.

4. "To bring economic benefit and opportunity to women; to involve women in the total development process." (OPG)

At least 25% of project efforts currently at implementation at least highlight women. Such projects include water supplies and village health aid posts (where women are the primary beneficiaries) as well as project "by and for women only".

5. "To pave the way for undertaking [after the program] a fully integrated, rural development scheme" (OPG)

Preliminary programming efforts indicate that such schemes may not be possible until after this program has been consolidated. These efforts also indicate that such a scheme, in one or more areas of the country, should coincide with a continuing nationwide program of assistance for small-scale community self-help efforts (this also reflects the political difficulties of concentrating on or appearing to favor one area). These efforts and the results from this program, indicate that small-scale self-help assistance programming is an appropriate sector for PVO/NGO activity.

C. Time Frames

Listed below are the sixth year time frames as laid out in the 1983 extension and modified based on the past two years' reports:

- "Based upon Fifth Year evaluation, incorporate changes and refinements indicated." See recommendations in the last two annual reports. Those recommendations are incorporated into these time frames.
- "Proceed to develop an integrated rural development scheme, if so indicated, as explored and programmed in prior years. Such a scheme is outside the scope of this OPG." However, if the opportunity presents, an in-depth pilot effort may be implemented under this program. Due to delays in finalizing and implementing the final phase of this program, it has not been possible to develop such a scheme ourselves.
- "Continue to investigate pilot provincial, sub-provincial, and/or PVO self-help development program. Continuing.
- "Continue in-service training of program staff employed by IHAP, in project administration, logistics, development, etc. and investigate formal training for same as work permits." Continuing.
- "Continue intensive efforts on 'mainstreaming' women in development; make 3 or more grants." Accomplished.

- "Repeat PCV Counterpart Training and Small Projects support; make about 10 grants." Fewer grants (7) were implemented this year than anticipated. This reflects availability of other program support.
- "Repeat small-scale self-help scheme; make about 20 grants." Completed.
- "Complete East Guadalcanal Inland Health Extension & Training Project; conduct final evaluation." Completed; awaiting author's release of final report.
- Evaluate effectiveness of projects, on a rolling basis and at program year end; especially evaluate major pilot programs leading to establishment of national village level self-help development systems to be carried forward at program end by the national and/or provincial government." During the year, if PCV "volunteer evaluators" are not available, other volunteers will be located. Increased participation by PDU and increased program staff have been identified as necessary for a final phase of the program which would stress institutionalization.
- "Issue Sixth Year Report." This is it.
- "Issue Final report after program has wound down. Still to come.

D. Assumptions

- National Government Participation--Continuing.
- Provincial Government Participation--Continuing, but could be stronger.
- National Support for Grassroots Catalysts--Continuing, primarily through PVOs.
- Evaluation of Support for Greater Roles For/By Women--Continuing, but reflecting more affirmative action by IHAP.

E. Goals and Expectations

Events over the past year continue to support the observation made in our ninth quarterly report that it appears that the end of a six year program may not see a "totally integrated approach to development" but the "ad hoc support cum systems development" approaches employed in this program will be continued. It is apparent also that probably more than one program or system might eventuate or be modified to replace the program. Such separate and diverse schemes, designed to meet the specific needs and capacities of a province, or part thereof, are likely to be more appropriate to the problem of assisting village-level self-help efforts than a national system might be.

V. EVALUATION

The first outside evaluation of this Program was completed in October, 1984, and the evaluator's report was presented to IHAP/SI in October, 1985. It supported program activities while recommending that technical assistance field staff be increased to better accomplish program-related training, and that increased involvement of Peace Corps Volunteers be sought. Both of these recommendations were incorporated in the proposed two year wrap-up program. In addition, IHAP has conducted a number of small project evaluations during the past year using volunteer local evaluators. Their abridged reports are included in Appendix D.

VI. RESOURCES NARRATIVE

A. OPG Support

In general, OPG support for the program was quite adequate. As noted earlier in this report, this adequacy was due to the continued strength of the US\$ against the SI\$, and is not expected to continue. Word from USAID/SPRDO in February indicated that their support will be cut by over 50% during the next year.

B. IHAP Support

Through a few small donations arranged by IHAP/SI and IHAP's GIK program, IHAP support for this Program has greatly exceeded budgeted amounts.

C. S.I. Counterpart Support

As noted in previous reports, estimates of the total value of individual projects are made based on a knowledge of the local resources involved and the administrative efforts needed to accomplish these projects. These estimates are reflected in this line item. Because it is difficult to assign these local inputs to a given program year, the value of local input shown against a program year represents the total local input of all projects being implemented, less any amount shown in earlier years.

XI. BUDGET (99.7% COMMITTED)

<u>ITEM/PURPOSE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>
SELF-HELP DEVELOPMENT	\$419,030
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	429,498
RURAL DEVELOPMENT CAT	66,670
EVALUATIONS	38,820
IHAP/NY BACKSTOPPING	153,478
<u>OPG TOTALS</u>	<u>\$1,107,496</u>
<u>IHAP SUPPORT TOTALS</u>	<u>448,364</u>
<u>SI COUNTERPART TOTALS</u>	<u>574,094</u>
<u>PROGRAM GRAND TOTALS</u>	<u>\$2,129,954</u>

International Human Assistance Programs, Inc.
Solomon Islands Development by the People at the Village Level Program

PROJECT SUMMARY REPORT-PART ONE (SI%)
For Period Ending 30/06/86

PROJ NUM	PROJECT	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE (SI%)	GRANT VALUE (SI%)	POP SERVED	GRANT PER CAP	PROJECT STATUS
PROVINCE: ALL								
0014	SICUL		1981 Training Course	\$ 10,365.	\$ 1,134.66	35	32.41	A
0065	Six Provinces		LUD Fencing Subsidy	13,233.	4,833.95	2,600	1.85	B
0070	Solomon Islands		Women & Money Course	7,270.	2,000.00	15	133.33	A
0073	Solomon Islands		Nutrition Workshop	4,580.	2,980.30	15	198.68	A
0077	Solomon Islands		WID Pre-School Trng	5,200.	2,800.00	3	933.33	B
0082	SICUL		1985-6 Trng Program	64,600.	15,000.00	5,500	2.72	C
0089	Gizo and Auki		Mechl Wkshp Fund	28,677.	16,487.00	2	8243.50	D
0092	SINT		Mobile Teams Trng #6	11,149.	4,257.00	35	121.62	A
0096	Honiara		NYC Workshop	4,100.	2,500.00	32	78.12	A
0097	Health Educ. Com'ee		A-V Resources Unit	92,200.	14,700.00	250,000	0.05	C
0102	Solomon Islands		Project Planning Crs	4,670.	3,669.56	18	203.86	A
0107	YWCA/SI		1983-84 Extn & Incom	7,000.	4,490.97	500	8.98	A
0114	YWCA/SI		1984-86 ProgDev/Extn	57,400.	35,000.00	1,000	35.00	B
0121	Honiara		LUD/LPC Conference	9,636.	2,136.80	50	42.73	A
0122	Banana & New Georgia		LPC Mgmt Training	9,500.	4,000.00	2	2000.00	E
0124	Honiara		Here 'n Save	38,500.	17,000.00	20,000	0.85	D
0503	Tambea Resort		PCV Cntrprt Workshop	1,273.	173.79	9	19.31	A
0504	Honiara		3rd CD/CE Workshop	8,237.	2,737.25	32	85.53	A
0508	Solomon Islands		PCV CP Ref Materials	4,048.	3,547.08	90	39.41	B
0550	SIDT		Mobile Team Start-up	99,000.	54,000.00	10,000	5.40	A
0801	MHMS		Hospital Equip #1	28,515.	0.00	180,000	0.00	A
0802	MHMS, St Josephs, HTI		Institutional Spices	56,041.	0.00	1,285	0.00	A
0803	MHMS		Medicines #1	29,860.	0.00	100,000	0.00	A
0804	MHMS		Medical Texts #1	33,158.	0.00	1,000	0.00	A
0805	MHMS		Hospital Equip #2	305,000.	0.00	180,000	0.00	A
5/30	St. Martin's RTC		Beekeeping Students	16,552.	9,952.34	12	829.36	A
5/34	SI Beekeepers Assn		1986 Trng & Equip	8,000.	3,500.00	36	97.22	B
Summary for Province: 27 Projects				\$ 957,784.	\$206,906.70	752,271	0.27	
PROVINCE: CEM								
0010	Taroniara, Small Gela		Youth Trng. Center	\$ 1,529.	\$ 1,200.00	35	34.28	B
0011	Mgongona, W. Rennell		Youth Cntr Building	1,529.	1,200.00	35	34.28	B
0012	Maraloun, W. Russells		Youth Center Bldg.	869.	600.00	35	17.14	B
0018	Balola, North Savo		Figgery	519.	1,500.00	6	250.00	F
0055	Mgongona, W. Rennell		Pilot Clinic Light'g	3,366.	3,086.88	880	3.50	A
0093	Rennell & Bellona		CPCM Trng & Orientn	934.	764.00	1,500	0.50	B
0119	Salesapa, Small Gela		Clinic Transport	9,455.	2,575.00	200	12.87	A
5/23	Tanagare, Gela		Plumbing Mntnce Trng	800.	374.59	516	0.72	A
Summary for Province: 8 Projects				\$ 19,061.	\$ 11,306.47	3,207	3.52	
PROVINCE: GUA								
0013	Grass Hill, G'cana'		Water Supply #2	\$ 4,115.	\$ 1,499.90	80	18.74	A
0017	Sautavati, G'cana'		Vegetable Farm Trng	1,611.	611.34	40	15.28	A
0024	Fox Bay, G'cana'		Youth Club House	1,055.	457.46	50	9.14	A

PROJ NUM	PROJECT VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE (SI\$)	GRANT VALUE (SI\$)	POP SERVED	GRANT PER CAP	PROJECT STATUS
002K	Kindivoroa, Avuavu	Ferrocement H2O Tank	\$ 1,350.	\$ 500.00	65	7.69	A
002V	Veralava, Avuavu	Ferrocement H2O Tank	1,449.	589.30	80	7.36	A
0034	Porokokore, Marau	Shell Money Mir	0.	0.00	0	0.00	X
0035	Avuavu, Guadalcanal	Youth/Sports Center	15,250.	2,750.00	2,000	1.37	B
0040	Caesuna Primary Sch	Sanitation--Fencing	925.	247.50	112	2.20	A
0041	Tangarare, B'canal	Tovolea Women's Club	1,395.	244.90	30	8.16	A
0057	Ruavatu, B'canal	Vuresub LPC Fencing	15,778.	1,578.41	1,100	1.43	A
0060	Veradua Malago Guad	SSEC Women's Cattle	8,860.	4,800.00	2,000	2.40	B
0064	Maruobo, B'canal	Fishing Project	16,987.	1,867.75	50	37.75	B
0066	St. Martin's RTC	Dios & E.O.s Course	0.	0.00	0	0.00	E
0069	Marau, Guadalcanal	PHC Training	5,627.	5,220.47	1	5220.47	A
0074	Ruavatu, Guadalcanal	Vuresub LPC Water	1,180.	600.00	1,100	0.54	A
0075	Betivatu, B'canal	School Tools	1,390.	0.00	150	0.00	X
0076	Tetekangi District	Hlth Trng & Extn	56,406.	45,956.82	1,050	43.80	A
0080	Guadalcanal Province	Local Council's Wksp	11,211.	6,711.47	35	191.75	A
0084	Guadalcanal Province	GPCM Trng 1985-6	10,200.	5,000.00	20,000	0.25	B
0086	Galluata, B'canal	Sanitation Project	1,950.	1,050.00	62	16.93	C
0088	Visale, B'canal	DIVIT Extn Phase 1/1	3,726.	3,326.97	5	665.39	B
0100	Bo'o, Tolongo	BFA Storehouse	2,765.	2,200.00	1,050	2.09	C
0105	Honiara, Guadalcanal	Village Crafts, Ltd	32,575.	13,566.72	1,500	9.04	A
0113	Grass Hill, B'canal	Water Supply (03)	18,000.	16,090.00	100	160.00	B
0400	Solomon Islands	Planning Training	130,000.	80,000.00	150	533.33	A
0501	Tambea Resort	1st CD/CE Workshop	5,286.	1,887.28	9	209.69	A
0502	Honiara, Guadalcanal	2nd CD/CE Workshop	4,774.	1,274.00	15	84.93	A
0505	Babanakira, B'canal	Training a Trainer	9,233.	1,073.00	1	1073.00	A
0506	Babanakira, B'canal	Training BECD/TWIG	2,875.	2,293.15	12	191.09	A
0507	Kuvamiti, Tetekangi	Beast of Burden Trng	322.	45.00	3	15.00	A
0509	Avuavu, B'canal	4th CD/CE Workshop	12,291.	4,050.07	58	65.82	A
0511	Sumate, B'canal	WIG Sewing	527.	402.00	30	13.40	A
0512	Honiara, Guadalcanal	Prov Acctnts Trng	1,885.	185.80	4	46.45	A
0513	Sumate, B'canal	Pre-School Tchr Trng	190.	87.23	2	43.61	A
5/01	Babanakira, B'canal	Agriculture Workshop	1,812.	311.90	57	5.47	A
5/02	Babanakira, B'canal	Family Planning Cour	706.	85.00	1,100	0.07	A
5/03	Babanakira, B'canal	WIG Eochlet	1,329.	629.05	30	20.96	A
5/04	Marasa, B'canal	Copra/Cargo Shed	3,500.	2,276.60	500	4.55	A
5/05	Babanakira, B'canal	Adult Ed. Center	15,800.	10,072.75	3,500	2.87	A
5/06	Vatukalau, Arulighe	VIF Latrines	960.	260.00	150	1.73	A
5/09	Kuvamiti, B'canal	Tetekangi Cocoa Drie	1,055.	440.00	245	1.79	A
5/10	Magakiti, B'canal	Village Store	1,783.	82.25	85	9.43	F
5/11	Arulighe, B'canal	VHA Building	2,470.	85.00	710	1.13	A
5/12	Tari, B'canal	VIF Latrines	1,649.	849.86	150	5.66	B
5/16	Vatukalau, Arulighe	Water Supply	11,800.	6,000.00	150	40.00	F
5/17	Guadalcanal Province	In-Village DEM Cours	7,617.	3,092.86	145	21.33	A
5/19	Avuavu, B'canal	LHF Copra Buying Ft.	24,300.	13,300.00	1,250	10.64	A
5/20	Vatukalau, Arulighe	Grow-Box Gardening	7,627.	4,627.60	150	30.85	A
5/21	Arulighe, B'canal	VHA Autoclave	90.	78.00	710	0.10	A
5/25	Makaruka, B'canal	1984-85 Self-help Pr	7,284.	3,858.92	344	11.21	B
5/26	Siroa, B'canal	VHA Building	1,182.	593.12	250	2.37	A
5/28	Babanakira/WandererB	1984-86 Self-Help Pr	12,656.	7,756.75	3,500	2.21	B
5/29	Variana, B'canal	LPC Water Supply	7,239.	4,308.53	300	14.36	A
5/31	Bolavu, B'canal	Sanitation	3,224.	1,145.00	85	13.47	A
5/33	Paripao, B'canal	Sanitation	6,934.	2,934.51	500	5.86	A
5/35	Makaruka, B'canal	Sanitation	4,547.	1,730.00	241	7.17	B

PROJ NUM	PROJECT VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE (S18)	GRANT VALUE (S18)	PDP SERVED	GRANT PER CAP	PROJECT STATUS
5/36	Avuavu	Sanitation	\$ 1,510.	\$ 1,010.70	115	8.78	B
Summary for Province: 57 Projects			\$ 508,256.	\$ 273,104.94	45,211	6.04	

PROVINCE: MON

5/27	Honiara	Hlth Educ Video	\$ 30,771.	\$ 15,571.50	3,000	5.19	A
Summary for Province: 1 Projects			\$ 30,771.	\$ 15,571.50	3,000	5.19	

PROVINCE: ISA

0003	Tasia RTC, Isabel	Women's Trainer	\$ 8,744.	\$ 3,450.00	3,400	1.01	A
0006	Savekau, Marau	Horovatu Women's Clb	2,624.	1,324.21	60	22.07	A
0019	Kolotubi, Hograno	Adult Ed. Ctr.	5,734.	2,799.75	2,100	1.33	A
0029	Susubona, Hograno	School Tools	4,589.	1,963.90	104	18.88	B
0039	Buala, Tasia, etc.	Calculator Course	565.	165.30	35	4.72	A
0044	Nareabu, Maringe	Community Ed. Center	7,500.	4,413.97	260	16.97	A
0045	Haevo, Kaagha	Tambea LPC Redevelop	7,103.	2,103.15	1,000	2.10	A
0048	Jejevo, Buala	Mothers' Union RestH	12,925.	10,200.00	1,250	8.16	B
0050	Koisisi, Hograno	Market Road	6,750.	750.17	100	7.50	B
0053	Gove, Hograno	Bridge	3,470.	969.55	200	4.84	B
0058	Kaipito, Hograno	Cocoa Drier/Shed	6,500.	3,100.00	500	6.20	A
0062	Sepi, Bugotu	School Tools	2,708.	1,858.84	930	1.99	B
0071	Kolotubi, Hograno	Copra/Cocoa Shed	14,244.	4,433.82	211	21.01	B
0072	Kolowola, Hograno	Cocoa Project	12,314.	3,489.58	510	6.84	B
0099	Buala	Local Councils Trng	1,650.	1,200.00	85	14.11	B
0101	Papari, Samasodu	LPC Workboat	4,800.	3,747.79	359	10.43	A
0112	Muana, Hograno	Water Supply	10,077.	7,166.78	200	35.83	A
0510	Malu'u/Buala	Mini-hydro Trng	555.	219.44	1	219.44	A
5/14	Allardyce, Isabel	DBM Mntnce Course	1,296.	196.14	100	1.96	A
5/15	Allardyce, Isabel	Grow-Box Gardening	9,493.	5,217.13	220	23.71	A
5/24	Oie, Bugotu	Fishing/Marketing	8,663.	5,763.03	106	54.36	D
5/32	Gao-Bugotu	Community Education	403.	153.09	54	2.83	A
Summary for Province: 22 Projects			\$ 132,707.	\$ 64,685.64	11,785	5.48	

PROVINCE: MAK

0015	Arohane/Mwanibena	Women's Baking Cours	\$ 604.	\$ 261.91	38	6.89	A
0022	Nahepe, Wainoni	Cattle Project	1,045.	241.58	200	1.20	A
0026	Mwakorokoru, StarHrb	Youths Cocoa Project	600.	200.00	80	2.50	A
0028	Ahia, Ulawa	Cocoa Project	12,300.	3,950.00	245	16.12	C
0031	Managai, Wainoni	Joinery Shop	1,620.	918.23	100	9.18	A
0037	Muihaga, S Makira	Copra Drier & Shed	2,575.	1,367.92	450	3.03	A
0038	Manhuki Bauro Makira	Cattle Project	3,786.	1,786.59	100	17.86	B
0081	Mwaniwaro, Sta. Anna	Copra Drier	950.	560.00	35	16.00	B
0109	Manewiriwiri, Makira	Cattle Project	6,100.	3,995.00	100	39.95	B
0116	Hagaura, Arosi	Aitoro LFC Redevelop	15,000.	7,000.00	100	70.00	B
5/07	Kirakira	Fish Mkt Ice Machine	6,126.	2,650.00	500	5.30	A
5/08	Kirakira	Fish Mkt Freezer	9,300.	8,441.61	500	16.88	A

PROJ NUM	PROJECT VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE (SI\$)	GRANT VALUE (SI\$)	POP SERVED	GRANT PER CAP	PROJECT STATUS
5/13	Manewiriwiri, Makira	Roro Rural Joinery	\$ 2,000.	\$ 950.00	80	11.87	A
Summary for Province: 13 Projects			\$ 62,006.	\$ 32,322.84	2,528	12.78	

PROVINCE: MAL

0008	Manawai, E. Are'are	Aipuru Cattle Farn	\$ 6,575.	\$ 2,630.00	400	6.57	A
0009	Mana'atu, M. Malaita	Fishing Project	2,550.	1,999.36	10	199.93	A
0016	Dloburi, E. Kwaiio	Women's Poultry	3,044.	2,044.26	35	58.40	A
0021	Alite, Langalanga	Traditional canoe	3,950.	2,200.00	5	440.00	F
0023	Hure, Maramasike	Poultry Project	0.	0.00	0	0.00	X
0025	Buna North, Malaita	Fishing Project	3,960.	2,300.00	400	5.75	A
0027	Harisi, East Areare	Cattle Project	3,650.	1,900.00	200	9.50	B
0030	Kakara, Kwara'ae	Water Supply	4,181.	885.00	330	2.68	A
0032	Kwalakwala, Uru Hrbr	Women/Adult Literacy	14,100.	2,840.00	500	5.68	A
0036	Tarapaina, Raroisuu	Water Supply	8,150.	1,278.18	200	6.39	A
0042	Su'urahi, W. Areare	Water Supply	3,300.	634.00	140	4.52	D
0043	Takwa Marketing Ctr	Copra Shed Extension	2,961.	1,436.28	8,500	0.16	A
0046	Tolioroa, E. Fataleka	Water Supply	2,000.	373.00	70	5.32	A
0047	Harumou, E. Areare	SIDI Center Courses	9,600.	5,100.00	550	9.27	A
004A	Aimamara, S. Malaita	Water Supply	7,825.	1,475.00	225	6.55	A
004W	Maiaha, S. Malaita	Water Supply	4,860.	860.00	225	3.82	A
0051	Fiu, W. Kwara'ae	SIDI Workshops	9,751.	3,451.27	480	7.19	A
0054	Walande, S. Malaita	Subua Youth Constr.	4,924.	2,988.88	120	24.90	A
0056	Hatodea, Taubaita	Fishing Project	7,351.	3,351.45	300	11.17	B
0059	Dibola, W. Kwara'ae	Fishing Project	7,500.	4,300.00	150	28.66	B
0061	Anokelo, W. Kwara'ae	Water Supply	4,223.	938.32	472	1.98	A
0063	Walande, S. Malaita	Water Supply	10,850.	8,849.01	700	12.64	A
0067	U'o, S. Malaita	Cocoa Project	2,630.	630.00	100	6.30	C
0068	Aimomoko, E. Malaita	Cocoa Project	4,650.	3,100.00	104	29.80	C
0085	Mainoeno, W. Areare	Community Transport	2,220.	1,120.00	200	5.60	D
0091	Uluqa	Water Supply	6,000.	1,200.00	120	10.00	A
0094	Mafu LPC, Baunani	Copra Drier/Store	7,700.	2,700.00		0.00	E
0103	Sulufoloo, Malaita	Anoabu Marketing Ctr	8,425.	5,673.25	3,000	1.89	A
0106	Sulufou, Malaita	Water Supply	32,525.	7,072.33	300	23.57	B
0108	Nafinua, Malaita	Water Supply	15,000.	3,250.00	350	9.28	A
0115	Ato-Fuaga, Malaita	Fishing Project	8,300.	5,200.68	100	52.00	B
0118	Talakali, Auki	Women's Center	3,189.	1,689.42	35	48.26	A
0123	Nafinua, E. Kwara'ae	Clinic Radio	3,607.	857.79	1,400	0.61	A
0125	Areare Youth Council	S. Mala Garden Rehab	1,095.	195.21	13	15.01	A
020N	Mariapa, East Areare	Water Supply	6,737.	1,257.00	160	7.85	A
020R	Raeao, East Areare	Water Supply	13,391.	2,711.00	160	16.94	A
0514	Dala, Malaita	Shake & Shingle Prod	4,302.	3,701.96	3	1233.98	A
5/18	Nqarinasuru, E. Kwaiio	Women's Bakery	1,005.	105.60	60	1.76	A
5/22	Malaita Province	Fishing Trng/Survey	25.	0.00	0	0.00	X
Summary for Province: 39 Projects			\$ 246,106.	\$ 92,298.25	20,117	4.58	

PROVINCE: TEM

0001	Tahua, Duff Islands	VHA Building	\$ 3,668.	\$ 1,691.80	223	7.58	A
0049	Graciosa Bay, S/Cruz	Hlth Ed in Language	8,325.	1,925.40	5,600	0.34	B

PROJ NUM	PROJECT VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE (S16)	GRANT VALUE (S16)	PDP SERVED	GRANT PER CAP	PROJEC STATUS
0052	Balo, Graciosa Bay	BKF Brickmaking	\$ 7,200.	\$ 4,700.00	50	94.00	C
Summary for Province: 3 Projects			\$ 19,193.	\$ 8,317.20	5,873	1.41	
PROVINCE: MES							
0007	Dhne, Marovo	Community Educ. Cntr	\$ 1,999.	\$ 2,336.66	43	54.38	A
0033	Vakabo, Marovo	Maneke Women's Club	1,545.	693.50	150	4.62	A
0078	Vonunu, Vella Lavella	UCWF Regional Trng C	17,500.	9,500.00	3,984	2.38	C
0079	Munda, Western Prov	UCWF Circuit Trng Cr	17,500.	9,500.00	4,000	2.37	D
0083	Dovele, Vella Lavella	Clinic	20,100.	12,300.00	500	24.60	B
0097	St. Dominic's RIC	Ferrocement H2O Tank	3,000.	1,200.00	65	18.45	C
0090	Western Province	NYC Workshop	5,000.	2,100.00	20	105.00	A
0095	Vella Lavella	Community Education	2,000.	1,500.00	500	3.00	E
0098	Maravani, Vella	Tuluvaka Community	6,025.	4,000.00	50	80.00	E
0104	Kongulavata, Gizo	Water Supply	2,500.	2,000.00	0	0.00	F
0110	Susanuga, Choiseul	Community Center	20,000.	4,400.58	2,100	2.09	A
0111	Chuchulu, Marovo	Fishing/Fish Mktg	9,300.	7,505.70	32	234.86	A
0117	Tetepari, Western	LPC Bridges	5,000.	2,100.00	500	4.20	C
0120	Sobiro, Gatokae	Tools	0.	0.00	20	0.00	X
0515	Gizo	Journalism Trng	2,554.	34.00	1	34.00	A
0850	Goldie Hosp., Munda	Heart Surgery	26,500.	0.00	1	0.00	B
Summary for Province: 16 Projects			\$ 145,323.	\$ 59,181.42	11,948	4.94	
Summary for Report: 166 Projects			\$2,121,147.	\$762,682.56	855,958	0.89	

■ Project Status Codes as follow: A = completed; B,C,D = in progress; E = approved/not started; F = failed; and X = cancelled.

International Human Assistance Programs, Inc.
 Solomon Islands Development by the People at the Village Level Program

PROJECT SUMMARY REPORT-PART TWO
 For Period Ending 30/06/86

PROJECT NUMBER	GRANT VALUE (\$!)	GRANT SPENT THIS MONTH	TOTAL GRANT EXPENDED	BALANCE GRANT AVAILABLE	GRANT AS PERCENT OF TOTAL VALUE	PROGRAM FOCUS/COMP
PROVINCE: ALL						
0014	\$ 1,134.66	\$ 0.00	\$ 1,134.66	0.00	10.7	4 /1
0065	4,833.95	0.00	4,833.95	0.00	36.5	7 /1
0070	2,000.00	0.00	2,000.00	0.00	27.5	9 /2
0073	2,980.30	0.00	2,980.30	0.00	65.0	9 /2
0077	2,800.00	0.00	560.00	2,240.00	53.8	9 /2
0082	15,000.00	0.00	8,490.31	6,509.69	23.2	3 /1
0089	16,487.00	0.00	16,487.00	0.00	57.4	3 /1
0092	4,257.00	0.00	4,257.00	0.00	38.1	4 /1
0096	2,500.00	0.00	2,500.00	0.00	60.9	4 /1
0097	14,700.00	8,341.24	14,144.30	555.70	15.9	0 /1
0102	3,669.56	0.00	3,669.56	0.00	78.5	4 /1
0107	4,490.97	0.00	4,490.97	0.00	64.1	5 /2
0114	35,000.00	43.25	29,706.57	5,293.43	60.9	5 /2
0121	2,136.80	0.00	2,136.80	0.00	22.1	4 /1
0122	4,000.00	3,821.87	3,821.87	178.13	42.1	4 /1
0124	17,000.00	83.00	83.00	16,917.00	44.1	9 /2
0503	173.79	0.00	173.79	0.00	13.6	4 /3
0504	2,737.25	0.00	2,737.25	0.00	33.2	4 /3
0508	3,547.08	0.00	3,547.08	0.00	87.6	4 /3
0550	54,000.00	0.00	54,000.00	0.00	54.5	4 /3
0801	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	2 /5
0802	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	2 /5
0803	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	2 /5
0804	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	2 /5
0805	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	2 /5
5730	9,952.34	0.00	9,952.34	0.00	60.1	8 /4
5734	3,500.00	0.00	2,934.91	565.09	43.7	8 /4
Summary for Province (27 Projects):						
	268,900.70	12,289.36	174,641.66	32,259.04	21.6	
PROVINCE: CEN						
0010	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 1,200.00	0.00	78.4	6 /1
0011	1,200.00	0.00	1,200.00	0.00	78.4	6 /1
0012	600.00	0.00	600.00	0.00	69.9	6 /1
0018	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00	0.00	289.0	7 /1
0055	3,086.88	0.00	3,086.88	0.00	91.6	2 /1
0093	764.00	0.00	759.27	4.73	81.7	5 /2
0119	2,575.00	0.00	2,575.00	0.00	27.2	2 /1
5723	374.59	0.00	374.59	0.00	46.8	4 /4
Summary for Province (8 Projects):						
	11,300.47	0.00	11,295.74	4.73	59.4	
PROVINCE: GUA						
0013	\$ 1,499.90	\$ 0.00	\$ 1,499.90	0.00	36.4	1 /1
0017	611.34	0.00	611.34	0.00	37.9	7 /1
0024	457.46	0.00	457.46	0.00	43.3	6 /1

PROJECT NUMBER	GRANT VALUE (SI\$)	GRANT SPENT THIS MONTH	TOTAL GRANT EXPENDED	BALANCE GRANT AVAILABLE	GRANT AS PERCENT OF TOTAL VALUE	PROGRAM FOCUS/COMP
002K	\$ 500.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 500.00	0.00	37.0	1 /4
002V	589.30	0.00	589.30	0.00	40.6	1 /4
0034	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	3 /1
0035	2,750.00	0.00	2,750.00	0.00	18.0	6 /1
0040	247.50	0.00	247.50	0.00	26.7	1 /1
0041	244.90	0.00	244.90	0.00	17.5	5 /2
0057	1,578.41	0.00	1,578.41	0.30	10.0	7 /1
0060	4,800.00	0.00	4,800.00	0.00	34.1	7 /2
0064	1,887.75	0.00	1,887.75	0.00	11.1	7 /1
0066	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	4 /1
0069	5,220.47	0.00	5,220.47	0.00	92.7	0 /1
0074	600.00	0.00	600.00	0.00	50.8	1 /1
0075	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	3 /1
0076	45,996.82	0.00	45,996.82	0.00	81.5	0 /1
0080	6,711.47	0.00	6,711.47	0.00	59.8	4 /1
0084	5,000.00	0.00	4,910.00	90.00	49.0	5 /2
0086	1,050.00	0.00	1,048.25	1.75	53.8	1 /1
0088	3,326.97	0.00	3,326.97	0.00	89.2	9 /2
0100	2,200.00	0.00	2,037.15	162.85	79.5	3 /1
0105	13,566.72	0.00	13,566.72	0.00	41.6	3 /1
0113	16,000.00	0.00	15,221.88	778.12	88.8	1 /1
0400	80,000.00	0.00	80,000.00	0.00	61.5	4 /1
0501	1,887.28	0.00	1,887.28	0.00	35.7	4 /3
0502	1,274.00	0.00	1,274.00	0.00	26.6	4 /3
0505	1,073.00	0.00	1,073.00	0.00	11.6	4 /3
0506	2,293.15	0.00	2,293.15	0.00	79.7	4 /3
0507	45.00	0.00	45.00	0.00	13.9	4 /3
0509	4,050.07	0.00	4,050.07	0.00	32.9	4 /3
0511	402.00	0.00	402.00	0.00	76.2	9 /3
0512	185.80	0.00	185.80	0.00	9.8	4 /3
0513	87.23	0.00	87.23	0.00	45.9	9 /3
5/01	311.90	0.00	311.90	0.00	17.2	4 /4
5/02	85.00	0.00	85.00	0.00	12.1	4 /4
5/03	629.05	0.00	629.05	0.00	47.3	9 /4
5/04	2,276.60	0.00	2,276.60	0.00	65.0	3 /4
5/05	10,072.73	0.00	10,072.73	0.00	63.7	6 /4
5/06	260.00	0.00	260.00	0.00	27.0	1 /4
5/09	440.00	0.00	440.00	0.00	41.7	8 /4
5/10	802.25	0.00	802.25	0.00	44.9	3 /4
5/11	805.00	0.00	805.00	0.00	32.5	2 /4
5/12	849.86	0.00	849.86	0.00	51.5	1 /4
5/16	6,000.00	0.00	6,000.00	0.00	50.8	1 /4
5/17	3,092.88	0.00	3,092.88	0.00	40.6	4 /4
5/19	13,300.00	0.00	12,300.00	0.00	54.7	8 /4
5/20	4,627.60	0.00	4,627.60	0.00	60.6	7 /4
5/21	78.00	0.00	78.00	0.00	86.6	2 /4
5/25	3,858.92	0.00	3,858.92	0.00	52.9	6 /4
5/26	593.12	0.00	593.12	0.00	50.1	2 /4
5/28	7,756.75	0.00	7,756.75	0.00	61.2	6 /4
5/29	4,308.53	0.00	4,308.53	0.00	59.5	1 /4
5/31	1,145.00	0.00	1,145.00	0.00	35.5	1 /4
5/33	2,934.51	0.00	2,934.51	0.00	42.3	1 /4
5/35	1,730.00	0.00	1,730.00	0.00	38.0	1 /4

PROJECT NUMBER	GRANT VALUE (SI\$)	GRANT SPENT THIS MONTH	TOTAL GRANT EXPENDED	BALANCE GRANT AVAILABLE	GRANT AS PERCENT OF TOTAL VALUE	PROGRAM FOCUS/COMP
5/36	\$ 1,010.70	\$ 0.00	\$ 1,010.70	0.00	66.9	1 /4

Summary for Province (57 Projects):						
	\$273,104.94	\$ 0.00	\$272,072.22	1,032.72	53.7	
PROVINCE: HON						
5/27	\$ 15,571.50	\$ 0.00	\$ 15,571.50	0.00	50.6	0 /4

Summary for Province (1 Projects):						
	\$ 15,571.50	\$ 0.00	\$ 15,571.50	0.00	50.6	
PROVINCE: ISA						
0003	\$ 3,450.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 3,450.00	0.00	39.4	9 /2
0006	1,324.21	0.00	1,324.21	0.00	50.4	5 /2
0019	2,799.75	0.00	2,799.75	0.00	48.8	6 /1
0029	1,963.90	0.00	1,963.90	0.00	42.7	3 /1
0039	165.30	0.00	165.30	0.00	29.2	4 /1
0044	4,413.97	0.00	4,413.97	0.00	58.8	6 /1
0045	2,103.15	0.00	2,103.15	0.00	29.6	7 /1
0048	10,200.00	245.22	10,126.30	73.70	78.4	3 /2
0050	750.17	0.00	750.17	0.00	11.1	8 /1
0053	969.55	0.00	969.55	0.00	27.9	8 /1
0058	3,100.00	0.00	3,100.00	0.00	47.6	8 /1
0062	1,858.84	0.00	1,858.84	0.00	68.6	3 /1
0071	4,433.82	0.00	4,433.82	0.00	31.1	8 /1
0072	3,489.58	0.00	3,489.58	0.00	28.3	7 /1
0099	1,200.00	0.00	1,178.18	21.82	72.7	4 /1
0101	3,741.79	0.00	3,747.79	0.00	78.0	8 /1
0112	7,166.78	0.00	7,166.78	0.00	71.1	1 /1
0510	219.44	0.00	219.44	0.00	39.5	4 /3
5/14	196.14	0.00	196.14	0.00	15.1	4 /4
5/15	5,217.13	0.00	5,217.13	0.00	54.9	7 /4
5/24	5,763.03	0.00	5,763.03	0.00	66.5	8 /4
5/32	152.09	0.00	152.09	0.00	37.9	6 /4

Summary for Province (22 Projects):						
	64,685.64	245.22	64,590.12	95.52	48.7	
PROVINCE: MAI						
0015	\$ 261.91	\$ 0.00	\$ 261.91	0.00	12.3	4 /2
0022	241.58	0.00	241.58	0.00	23.1	7 /1
0026	200.00	0.00	200.00	0.00	33.3	7 /1
0028	3,950.00	0.00	1,234.13	2,715.87	32.1	7 /1
0031	918.23	0.00	918.23	0.00	56.6	3 /1
0037	1,367.92	0.00	1,367.92	0.00	53.1	8 /1
0038	1,786.59	0.00	1,786.59	0.00	47.1	7 /1
0081	560.00	0.00	560.00	0.00	58.9	8 /1
0109	3,995.00	0.00	3,995.00	0.00	65.4	7 /1
0116	7,000.00	0.00	6,226.15	773.85	46.6	7 /1
5/07	2,650.00	0.00	2,650.00	0.00	43.2	3 /4
5/08	8,441.61	0.00	8,441.61	0.00	90.7	3 /4

PROJECT NUMBER	GRANT VALUE (\$)	GRANT SPENT THIS MONTH	TOTAL GRANT EXPENDED	BALANCE AVAILABLE	GRANT AS PERCENT OF TOTAL VALUE	PROGRAM FOCUS/COMP
5/13	\$ 950.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 950.00	0.00	47.5	3 /4
Summary for Province (13 Projects):						
	\$ 32,322.84	\$ 0.00	\$ 28,833.12	3,489.72	52.1	
PROVINCE: MAL						
0008	\$ 2,630.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 2,630.00	0.00	40.0	7 /1
0009	1,999.36	0.00	1,999.36	0.00	78.4	7 /1
0016	2,044.26	0.00	2,044.26	0.00	67.1	7 /2
0021	2,200.00	0.00	2,200.00	0.00	55.6	3 /1
0023	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	7 /1
0025	2,300.00	0.00	2,300.00	0.00	58.0	7 /1
0027	1,900.00	0.00	1,900.00	0.00	52.0	7 /1
0030	885.00	0.00	885.00	0.00	21.1	1 /1
0032	2,840.00	0.00	2,840.00	0.00	20.1	9 /1
0036	1,278.18	0.00	1,200.00	78.18	15.6	1 /1
0042	634.00	0.00	600.00	34.00	19.2	1 /1
0043	1,436.28	0.00	1,436.28	0.00	48.5	3 /1
0046	373.00	0.00	373.00	0.00	18.6	1 /1
0047	5,100.00	0.00	5,100.00	0.00	53.1	4 /1
0048	1,475.00	0.00	1,475.00	0.00	18.8	1 /1
0049	860.00	0.00	860.00	0.00	17.6	1 /1
0051	3,451.27	0.00	3,451.27	0.00	35.3	4 /1
0054	2,988.88	0.00	2,988.88	0.00	60.7	3 /1
0056	3,351.45	0.00	3,351.45	0.00	45.5	7 /1
0059	4,200.00	0.00	1,667.17	2,632.83	57.3	7 /1
0061	938.32	0.00	900.00	38.32	22.2	1 /1
0063	8,849.01	0.00	8,849.01	0.00	81.5	1 /1
0067	630.00	0.00	371.41	258.59	23.9	7 /1
0068	3,100.00	0.00	1,758.80	1,341.20	66.6	7 /1
0085	1,120.00	0.00	1,420.00	300.00	50.4	3 /1
0091	1,200.00	0.00	1,200.00	0.00	20.0	1 /1
0094	2,700.00	0.00	0.00	2,700.00	35.0	8 /1
0107	5,673.25	0.00	5,673.25	0.00	67.3	3 /1
0106	7,072.33	0.00	4,000.00	3,072.33	21.7	1 /1
0108	3,250.00	0.00	3,250.00	0.00	21.6	1 /1
0115	5,200.68	0.00	5,200.68	0.00	62.6	7 /1
0118	1,689.42	0.00	1,689.42	0.00	52.9	5 /2
0123	857.79	151.20	857.79	0.00	23.7	2 /1
0125	195.21	195.21	195.21	0.00	17.8	8 /1
020N	1,257.00	0.00	1,127.00	130.00	18.6	1 /1
020F	2,711.00	0.00	2,473.00	238.00	20.2	1 /1
0514	3,701.96	0.00	3,701.96	0.00	86.0	4 /3
5/18	105.60	0.00	105.60	0.00	10.5	3 /4
5/22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	4 /4
Summary for Province (39 Projects):						
	92,298.25	44.01	82,074.80	10,223.45	37.5	
PROVINCE: TEM						
0001	\$ 1,691.80	\$ 0.00	\$ 1,691.80	0.00	46.1	2 /1
0049	1,925.40	0.00	1,925.40	0.00	23.1	0 /1

15

PROJECT NUMBER	GRANT VALUE (SI\$)	GRANT SPENT THIS MONTH	TOTAL GRANT EXPENDED	BALANCE AVAILABLE	GRANT AS PERCENT OF TOTAL VALUE	PROGRAM FOCUS/COMP
0052	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 59.56	\$ 6,726.96	2,026.96	65.2	3 /1

Summary for Province (3 Projects):						
	\$ 8,317.20	\$ 59.56	\$ 10,344.16	2,026.96	43.3	
PROVINCE: WES						
0007	\$ 2,338.66	\$ 0.00	\$ 2,338.66	0.00	38.9	6 /1
0033	693.50	0.00	693.50	0.00	44.8	5 /2
0078	9,500.00	0.00	1,852.29	7,647.71	54.2	9 /2
0079	9,500.00	0.00	1,352.36	8,147.64	54.2	9 /2
0083	12,300.00	1,597.12	11,876.62	423.38	61.1	2 /1
0087	1,200.00	0.00	700.00	500.00	40.0	1 /1
0090	2,100.00	0.00	2,100.00	0.00	42.0	4 /1
0095	1,500.00	0.00	0.00	1,500.00	53.5	4 /1
0098	4,000.00	0.00	0.00	4,000.00	66.3	7 /1
0104	2,000.00	0.00	2,000.00	0.00	80.0	1 /1
0110	4,400.56	0.00	4,400.56	0.00	22.0	6 /1
0111	7,515.70	0.00	7,515.70	0.00	80.8	7 /1
0117	2,100.00	0.00	1,288.09	811.91	42.0	8 /1
0120	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	3 /1
0515	34.00	0.00	34.00	0.00	1.3	4 /3
0850	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	2 /5

Summary for Province (16 Projects):						
	59,182.42	1,597.12	36,151.78	23,030.64	40.7	
Summary for Report (106 Projects):						
	763,683.96	14,235.27	695,575.10	68,108.86	36.0	

International Human Assistance Programs, Inc.
Solomon Islands Development by the People at the Village Level Program

PROJECT SUMMARY REPORT--PART THREE (SI\$)
For Period Ending 30/06/86

PROJECT NUMBER	SBD TOTAL	SBD GRANT	VIL INPUT	PRIV INPUT	PROV/SIG	OTHER GOVT	OTHER IHAP	PEACE CORPS
PROVINCE: ALL								
0014	\$ 10365.	1134.66	0.00	9230.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0065	13233.	4833.95	7175.00	0.00	1225.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0070	7270.	2000.00	0.00	270.00	1000.00	4000.00	0.00	0.00
0073	4580.	2980.30	200.00	1400.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0077	5200.	2800.00	600.00	800.00	1000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0082	64600.	15000.00	1150.00	28250.00	100.00	100.00	20000.00	0.00
0089	28697.	16487.00	4610.00	7600.00
0092	11149.	4257.00	0.00	3100.00	0.00	3792.86	0.00	0.00
0096	4100.	2500.00	50.00	750.00	50.00	750.00	0.00	0.00
0097	92200.	14700.00	0.00	0.00	2500.00	75000.00	0.00	0.00
0102	4670.	3669.56	0.00	0.00	1000.44	0.00	0.00	0.00
0107	7000.	4490.97	109.03	2400.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0114	57400.	35000.00	0.00	2400.00	0.00	20000.00	0.00	0.00
0121	9636.	2136.80	5000.00	500.00	2000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0122	9500.	4000.00	3500.00	0.00	1000.00	0.00	1000.00	0.00
0124	38500.	17000.00	8000.00	8000.00	500.00	500.00	0.00	4500.00
0503	1273.	173.79	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	1000.00
0504	8237.	2737.25	0.00	0.00	3500.00	0.00	0.00	2000.00
0508	4048.	3547.08	400.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
0550	99000.	54000.00	18000.00	5000.00	0.00	22000.00	0.00	0.00
0801	28515.	0.00	0.00	0.00	2662.00	0.00	25853.00	0.00
0802	56041.	0.00	0.00	0.00	500.00	0.00	55541.00	0.00
0803	29860.	0.00	905.00	0.00	2180.00	0.00	26775.00	0.00
0804	33158.	0.00	0.00	0.00	1763.00	0.00	31395.00	0.00
0805	305000.	0.00	0.00	1000.00	4000.00	0.00	300000.00	0.00
5/30	16552.	9952.34	2000.00	2500.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	2000.00
5/34	8000.	3500.00	300.00	2100.00	.	.	.	2100.00
TOTALS FOR PROVINCE (Project Count = 27)								
	957784.	206900.70	51999.	75300.	25180.	126142.	460564.	11700.
PROVINCE: CEN								
0010	\$ 1529.	1200.00	300.00	0.00	29.95	0.00	0.00	0.00
0011	1529.	1200.00	300.00	0.00	29.95	0.00	0.00	0.00
0012	869.	600.00	250.00	0.00	19.95	0.00	0.00	0.00
0018	519.	1500.00	-1000.00	0.00	19.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0055	3366.	3086.88	130.00	0.00	150.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0093	934.	764.00	120.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0119	9455.	2575.00	3680.00	0.00	3200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5/23	800.	374.59	25.41	0.00	370.00	0.00	0.00	30.00
TOTALS FOR PROVINCE (Project Count = 8)								
	19001.	11300.47	3805.	50.	3816.	0.	0.	30.
PROVINCE: BUA								
0013	\$ 4115.	1499.90	2150.00	165.10	300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0017	1611.	611.34	899.66	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0024	1055.	457.46	496.54	0.00	101.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

PROJECT NUMBER	SBD TOTAL	SBD GRANT	VIL INPUT	PRIV INPUT	PROV/SIG	OTHER GOVT	OTHER IHAP	PEACE CORPS
002K	\$ 1350.	500.00	350.00	0.00	250.00	0.00	0.00	250.00
002V	1449.	589.30	360.00	0.00	250.00	0.00	0.00	250.00
0034	0.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.	.	.
0035	15250.	2750.00	5200.00	6300.00	1000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0040	925.	247.50	677.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0041	1395.	244.90	650.10	0.00	300.00	200.00	0.00	0.00
0057	15778.	1578.41	9000.00	0.00	5200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0060	8860.	4800.00	4060.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0064	16987.	1887.75	15000.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0066	0.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0069	5627.	5220.47	0.00	0.00	407.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0074	1180.	600.00	480.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0075	1390.	0.00	1390.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0076	56406.	45996.82	7501.00	0.00	2259.00	10.00	540.00	100.00
0080	11211.	6711.47	0.00	0.00	4000.00	0.00	0.00	500.00
0084	10200.	5000.00	200.00	2500.00	2500.00	.	.	.
0086	1950.	1050.00	500.00	.	200.00	200.00	.	.
0088	3726.	3326.97	100.00	300.00
0100	2765.	2200.00	550.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0105	32575.	13566.72	0.00	0.00	19008.28	0.00	0.00	0.00
0113	18000.	16000.00	2000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0400	130000.	80000.00	0.00	0.00	15000.00	20000.00	0.00	15000.00
0501	5286.	1887.28	0.00	0.00	140.00	0.00	0.00	3259.00
0502	4774.	1274.00	0.00	0.00	1500.00	0.00	0.00	2000.00
0505	9233.	1073.00	2400.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5760.00
0506	2875.	2293.15	150.00	0.00	106.00	0.00	0.00	325.85
0507	322.	45.00	32.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	145.00
0509	12291.	4050.07	0.00	0.00	3586.00	0.00	0.00	4655.00
0511	527.	402.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
0512	1885.	185.80	0.00	0.00	200.00	0.00	0.00	1500.00
0513	190.	87.23	2.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
5/01	1812.	311.90	1000.00	0.00	250.00	0.00	0.00	250.10
5/02	700.	85.00	480.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	110.00
5/03	1329.	629.05	300.95	0.00	99.00	0.00	0.00	300.00
5/04	3500.	2276.60	800.40	0.00	250.00	0.00	0.00	173.00
5/05	15800.	10072.73	3400.27	0.00	2000.00	0.00	0.00	327.00
5/06	960.	260.00	540.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	160.00
5/09	1055.	440.00	215.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	300.00
5/10	1783.	802.25	500.00	0.00	280.00	0.00	0.00	200.75
5/11	2470.	805.00	385.00	0.00	530.00	0.00	0.00	750.00
5/12	1649.	849.86	650.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	150.00
5/16	11800.	6000.00	4000.00	0.00	800.00	0.00	0.00	1000.00
5/17	7617.	3092.88	695.00	0.00	730.00	2750.00	200.00	150.00
5/19	24300.	13300.00	5900.00	0.00	2300.00	0.00	0.00	2800.00
5/20	7627.	4627.60	2750.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	250.00
5/21	90.	78.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.00
5/25	7284.	3858.92	2398.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1027.00
5/26	1182.	593.12	386.88	0.00	192.00	0.00	0.00	10.00
5/28	12656.	7756.75	2500.00	0.00	400.00	0.00	0.00	2000.00
5/29	7239.	4308.53	2470.47	0.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	400.00
5/31	3224.	1145.00	1479.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	600.00
5/33	6934.	2934.51	2400.00	1600.00
5/35	4547.	1730.00	1617.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1200.00

PROJECT NUMBER	SBD TOTAL	SBD GRANT	VIL INPUT	PRIV INPUT	PROV/SIG	OTHER GOVT	OTHER IHAP	PEACE CORPS
5/36	\$ 1510.	1010.70	500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

TOTALS FOR PROVINCE (Project Count = 57)
 \$ 508256. \$ 273104.94 \$ 89537. \$ 9365. \$ 64638. \$ 23160. \$ 740. \$ 47713.

PROVINCE: HON	5/27							
	\$ 30771.	15571.50	0.00	0.00	3200.00	0.00	0.00	12000.00

TOTALS FOR PROVINCE (Project Count = 1)
 \$ 30771. \$ 15571.50 \$ 0. \$ 0. \$ 3200. \$ 0. \$ 0. \$ 12000.

PROVINCE: ISA								
0003	\$ 8744.	3450.00	494.00	2400.00	400.00	2000.00	0.00	0.00
0006	2624.	1374.21	1100.00	0.00	74.79	125.00	0.00	0.00
0019	5734.	2799.75	2800.25	34.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0029	4589.	1963.90	2600.10	0.60	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0039	565.	165.30	24.70	0.00	175.00	0.00	0.00	200.00
0044	7500.	4413.97	1625.03	0.00	111.00	500.00	0.00	850.00
0045	7103.	2103.15	4579.85	0.00	420.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0048	12925.	10200.00	400.00	2000.00	125.00	0.00	100.00	100.00
0050	6750.	750.17	6000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0053	3470.	969.55	2500.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0058	6500.	3100.00	3400.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0062	2708.	1858.84	850.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0071	14244.	4433.82	9700.00	0.00	111.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0072	12314.	3487.58	8000.00	0.00	825.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0099	1650.	1200.00	50.00	0.00	150.00	0.00	0.00	250.00
0101	4800.	3747.79	950.00	0.00	102.21	0.00	0.00	0.00
0112	10077.	7166.78	2800.22	0.00	110.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0510	555.	219.44	0.00	0.00	35.00	0.00	0.00	300.56
5/14	1296.	196.14	500.00	0.00	300.00	150.00	0.00	150.00
5/15	9493.	5217.13	4000.87	0.00	125.00	0.00	0.00	150.00
5/24	8663.	5763.03	720.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2180.00
5/32	403.	153.09	50.00	0.00	200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

TOTALS FOR PROVINCE (Project Count = 22)
 132707. 64685.64 53142. 4434. 3388. 2775. 100. 4180.

PROVINCE: MAK								
0015	\$ 604.	261.91	232.09	0.00	110.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0022	1045.	241.58	575.42	0.00	228.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0026	600.	200.00	400.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0028	12300.	3950.00	8000.00	0.00	350.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0031	1620.	918.23	600.00	0.00	101.77	0.00	0.00	0.00
0037	2575.	1367.92	1157.08	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0038	3786.	1786.59	1825.00	0.00	175.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0081	950.	560.00	390.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0109	6100.	3995.00	1875.00	0.00	230.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0116	15000.	7000.00	7000.00	0.00	1000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5/07	6126.	2650.00	3000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	476.00
5/08	9300.	8441.61	600.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	258.39

29

PROJECT NUMBER	SBD TOTAL	SBD GRANT	VIL INPUT	PRIV INPUT	PROV/SIB	OTHER GOVT	OTHER INAP	PEACE CORPS
5/13	\$ 2000.	950.00	800.00	0.00	150.00	0.00	0.00	100.00

TOTALS FOR PROVINCE (Project Count = 13)
 \$ 62006. \$ 32322.84 \$ 26454. \$ 0. \$ 2394. \$ 0. \$ 0. \$ 834.

PROVINCE: MAL

0008	\$ 6575.	2630.00	2645.00	800.00	500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0009	2550.	1999.36	500.64	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0016	3044.	2044.26	700.00	0.00	300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0021	3950.	2200.00	1500.00	0.00	250.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0023	0.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	.	.	.
0025	3960.	2300.00	1160.00	0.00	500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0027	3650.	1900.00	1300.00	0.00	450.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0030	4181.	885.00	642.00	0.00	2654.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0032	14100.	2840.00	10700.00	560.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0036	8150.	1278.18	1404.00	0.00	5468.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0042	3300.	634.00	666.00	0.00	2000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0043	2961.	1436.28	1500.00	0.00	24.72	0.00	0.00	0.00
0046	2000.	373.00	508.00	0.00	1119.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0047	9600.	5100.00	2950.00	1550.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
004A	7825.	1475.00	850.00	0.00	5500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
004W	4860.	860.00	700.00	0.00	3300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0051	9751.	3451.27	1800.00	4500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0054	4924.	2986.68	1924.12	11.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0056	7351.	3351.45	3600.00	0.00	400.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0059	7500.	4300.00	3000.00	0.00	200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0061	4223.	938.32	500.00	0.00	2785.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0063	10850.	8849.01	1200.99	0.00	800.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0067	2630.	630.00	2000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0068	4650.	3100.00	1500.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0085	2220.	1120.00	1100.00
0091	6000.	1200.00	800.00	0.00	4000.00	.	.	.
0094	7700.	2700.00	4250.00	0.00	750.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0103	8425.	5673.25	2500.00	0.00	251.75	0.00	0.00	0.00
0106	32525.	7072.33	3536.67	0.00	21916.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0108	15000.	3250.00	2002.00	0.00	9748.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0115	8300.	5200.68	2500.00	0.00	600.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0118	3189.	1689.42	1500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0123	3607.	857.79	250.00	2500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0125	1095.	195.21	850.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
020N	6737.	1257.00	1080.00	0.00	4400.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
020R	13391.	2711.00	1980.00	0.00	8700.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0514	4302.	3701.96	100.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500.00
5/18	1005.	105.60	649.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	250.00
5/22	25.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00

TOTALS FOR PROVINCE (Project Count = 39)
 246106. 92298.25 66346. 9921. 76765. 0. 0. 775.

PROVINCE: IEM

0001	\$ 3668.	1691.80	1597.00	0.00	380.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0049	8325.	1925.40	1000.00	600.00	260.00	4540.00	0.00	0.00

PROJECT

NUMBER	SBD TOTAL	SBD GRANT	VIL INPUT	PRIV INPUT	PROV/SIG	OTHER GOVT	OTHER IHAP	PEACE CORPS
0052	\$ 7200.	4700.00	1595.00	0.00	850.00	0.00	0.00	55.00

TOTALS FOR PROVINCE (Project Count = 3)

\$ 19193.	\$ 8317.20	\$ 4192.	\$ 600.	\$ 1490.	\$ 4540.	\$ 0.	\$ 55.
-----------	------------	----------	---------	----------	----------	-------	--------

PROVINCE:WES

0007	\$ 5999.	2338.66	3661.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0033	1545.	693.50	701.50	0.00	150.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0078	17500.	9500.00	8000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0079	17500.	9500.00	8000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0083	20100.	12300.00	7800.00
0087	3000.	1200.00	1200.00	600.00
0090	5000.	2100.00	25.00	2100.00	775.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0095	2800.	1500.00	750.00	250.00	300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0098	6025.	4000.00	2000.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0104	2500.	2000.00	50.00	0.00	450.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0110	20000.	4400.56	5000.00	0.00	0.00	10599.44	0.00	0.00
0111	9300.	7515.70	1784.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0117	5000.	2100.00	2250.00	0.00	650.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0120	0.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0515	2554.	34.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	2500.00
0850	26500.	0.00	2000.00	24000.00	0.00	0.00	500.00	0.00

TOTALS FOR PROVINCE (Project Count = 16)

145323.	59182.42	43221.	26950.	2370.	10599.	500.	2500.
---------	----------	--------	--------	-------	--------	------	-------

TOTALS FOR REPORT (Project Count = 186)

2121174.79	763683.96	338711.53	126620.54	183247.81	167217.30	461904.00	79789.65
Donor's %age total:	36.0	15.9	5.9	8.6	7.8	21.7	3.7

International Human Assistance Programs, Inc.
 Solomon Islands Development by the People at the Village Level

Projects Summary by Project Status (SI)
 For Period Ending: 30/06/81

STATUS = A
 PROJ TOTAL USAID OTHER
 NUMBER VILLAGE PROJECT NAME VALUE GRANT IHAF
 TOTALS FOR STATUS (114 PROJECTS): \$ 1268332. 453674.39 440304.00

TOTAL IHAF INPUTS: 892978.39

STATUS = B
 PROJ TOTAL USAID OTHER
 NUMBER VILLAGE PROJECT NAME VALUE GRANT IHAF
 TOTALS FOR STATUS (40 PROJECTS): \$ 392148. 176673.29 600.00

TOTAL IHAF INPUTS: 177273.29

STATUS = C
 PROJ TOTAL USAID OTHER
 NUMBER VILLAGE PROJECT NAME VALUE GRANT IHAF
 TOTALS FOR STATUS (11 PROJECTS): \$ 212795. 58176.00 20000.00

TOTAL IHAF INPUTS: 78120.00

STATUS = D
 PROJ TOTAL USAID OTHER
 NUMBER VILLAGE PROJECT NAME VALUE GRANT IHAF
 TOTALS FOR STATUS (6 PROJECTS): \$ 98687. 50504.00 0.00

TOTAL IHAF INPUTS: 50504.00

STATUS = E
 PROJ TOTAL USAID OTHER
 NUMBER VILLAGE PROJECT NAME VALUE GRANT IHAF
 TOTALS FOR STATUS (5 PROJECTS): \$ 26025. 12000.00 10000.00

TOTAL IHAF INPUTS: 12000.00

STATUS = F
 PROJ TOTAL USAID OTHER
 NUMBER VILLAGE PROJECT NAME VALUE GRANT IHAF
 TOTALS FOR STATUS (5 PROJECTS): \$ 20551. 12000.00 0.00

TOTAL IHAF INPUTS: 12000.00

STATUS = X
 PROJ TOTAL USAID OTHER
 NUMBER VILLAGE PROJECT NAME VALUE GRANT IHAF

TOTALS FOR STATUS (5 PROJECTS):	\$ 1415.	0.00	0.00
	TOTAL IHAF INFUTS:	0.00	
TOTALS FOR REPORT (186 PROJECTS):	\$ 2121147.	763683.96	461904.00
	TOTAL IHAF INFUTS:	1225587.96	

International Human Assistance Programs, Inc.
Solomon Islands Development by the People at the Village Level

Projects Summary by Program Component (SI\$)
For Period Ending: 30/06/86

COMPONENT # 1 (SEE NOTE)

PROJ NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE	USAID GRANT	OTHER IHAF
TOTALS FOR COMPONENT (106 PROJECTS):			\$ 1047680.	449569.74	21540.00

TOTAL IHAF INFUTS: 471509.74

COMPONENT # 2 (SEE NOTE)

PROJ NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE	USAID GRANT	OTHER IHAF
TOTALS FOR COMPONENT (20 PROJECTS):			\$ 212740.	117070.44	100.00

TOTAL IHAF INFUTS: 117170.44

COMPONENT # 3 (SEE NOTE)

PROJ NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE	USAID GRANT	OTHER IHAF
TOTALS FOR COMPONENT (16 PROJECTS):			\$ 157352.	75711.05	0.00

TOTAL IHAF INFUTS: 75711.05

COMPONENT # 4 (SEE NOTE)

PROJ NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE	USAID GRANT	OTHER IHAF
TOTALS FOR COMPONENT (38 PROJECTS):			\$ 224301.	120922.73	200.00

TOTAL IHAF INFUTS: 121122.73

COMPONENT # 5 (SEE NOTE)

PROJ NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE	USAID GRANT	OTHER IHAF
TOTALS FOR COMPONENT (6 PROJECTS):			\$ 479074.	0.00	440064.00

TOTAL IHAF INFUTS: 440064.00

TOTALS FOR PROGRAM (186 PROJECTS):			\$ 2121147.	767692.96	461904.00
------------------------------------	--	--	-------------	-----------	-----------

TOTAL IHAF INFUTS: 1075567.96

NOTE: COMPONENT 1 = Self-Help Development Fund (General); COMPONENT 2 = Women In Development (WID); COMPONENT 3 = Rural Development Catalysts Training; COMPONENT 4 = FGV Counterpart Self-Help Development; and COMPONENT 5 = Material Assistance.

International Human Assistance Programs, Inc.
Solomon Islands Development by the People at the Village Level

Projects Summary by Program Focus (SI\$)
For Period Ending: 30/06/86

FOCUS = 0 (SEE NOTE)			TOTAL	USAID	OTHER
PROJ			VALUE	GRANT	INAF
NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME			
TOTALS FOR FOCUS (5 PROJECTS):			\$ 193329.	83414.19	540.00
			TOTAL INAF INPUTS: 83954.19		
FOCUS = 1 (SEE NOTE)			TOTAL	USAID	OTHER
PROJ			VALUE	GRANT	INAF
NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME			
TOTALS FOR FOCUS (31 PROJECTS):			\$ 201451.	79874.92	0.00
			TOTAL INAF INPUTS: 79874.92		
FOCUS = 2 (SEE NOTE)			TOTAL	USAID	OTHER
PROJ			VALUE	GRANT	INAF
NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME			
TOTALS FOR FOCUS (14 PROJECTS):			\$ 523012.	21987.59	44004.00
			TOTAL INAF INPUTS: 462051.59		
FOCUS = 3 (SEE NOTE)			TOTAL	USAID	OTHER
PROJ			VALUE	GRANT	INAF
NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME			
TOTALS FOR FOCUS (23 PROJECTS):			\$ 205262.	9539.16	20100.00
			TOTAL INAF INPUTS: 115639.16		
FOCUS = 4 (SEE NOTE)			TOTAL	USAID	OTHER
PROJ			VALUE	GRANT	INAF
NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME			
TOTALS FOR FOCUS (36 PROJECTS):			\$ 389486.	197470.30	1200.00
			TOTAL INAF INPUTS: 198670.30		
FOCUS = 5 (SEE NOTE)			TOTAL	USAID	OTHER
PROJ			VALUE	GRANT	INAF
NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME			
TOTALS FOR FOCUS (6 PROJECTS):			\$ 84202.	49207.00	0.00
			TOTAL INAF INPUTS: 49207.00		
FOCUS = 6 (SEE NOTE)			TOTAL	USAID	OTHER
PROJ			VALUE	GRANT	INAF
NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME			
TOTALS FOR FOCUS (13 PROJECTS):			\$ 95600.	42001.89	0.00
			TOTAL INAF INPUTS: 42001.89		

FOCUS = 7 (SEE NOTE)

PROJ NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE	USAID GRANT	OTHER IHAP
TOTALS FOR FOCUS (29 PROJECTS):			\$ 197891.	86793.53	0.00

TOTAL IHAP INPUTS: 86793.53

FOCUS = 8 (SEE NOTE)

PROJ NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE	USAID GRANT	OTHER IHAP
TOTALS FOR FOCUS (15 PROJECTS):			\$ 111654.	52879.83	0.00

TOTAL IHAP INPUTS: 52879.83

FOCUS = 9 (SEE NOTE)

PROJ NUMBER	VILLAGE	PROJECT NAME	TOTAL VALUE	USAID GRANT	OTHER IHAP
TOTALS FOR FOCUS (12 PROJECTS):			\$ 119166.	54515.55	0.00

TOTAL IHAP INPUTS: 54515.55

TOTALS FOR REPORT (186 PROJECTS): \$ 2121147. 763683.96 461904.00

TOTAL IHAP INPUTS: 1225587.96

NOTE: FOCUS 0 = Health Education; FOCUS 1 = Water Supply/Sanitation; FOCUS 2 = Health Facilities; FOCUS 3 = Business/Financial/Marketing; FOCUS 4 = Training Projects n.e.c.; FOCUS 5 = Women's Projects not elsewhere classified (n.e.c.); FOCUS 6 = Community Education; FOCUS 7 = Agriculture/crop diversification; FOCUS 8 = Agric/crop infrastructure; FOCUS 9 = Women's Training



INTERNATIONAL HUMAN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS, INC.

HONIARA BRANCH

REPORT OF THE AUDITORS

1ST DECEMBER 1983 TO 31ST MAY 1986

We have examined the following books and records of International Human Assistance Programs, Inc., Honiara branch, for the period from 1st December 1983 to 31st May 1986:

- a) Schedule 1 - monthly summaries of receipts and expenditure;
- b) Schedule 2 - monthly disbursement records;
- c) Schedule 3 - monthly petty cash disbursements;
- d) Schedule 4 - monthly bank reconciliations.

2. We have only been able to sight photocopies of original documentation supporting these receipts and payments, as the originals have been forwarded to New York head office.

3. Certain records relating to the Honiara branch are maintained outside Solomon Islands, which give rise to further accounting entries. We have examined neither these records nor the accounting entries, and consequently do not express an opinion on them.

4. Subject to the matters set out in paragraphs 1 to 3 and in our letter dated 16th July 1986 to the Country Representative, a copy of which is attached to this report, based upon the results of our audit procedures we report as follows:

- a) the company has adhered to United States Government regulations with respect to those funds granted to the company by the United States Agency for International Development;
- b) we have evaluated the effectiveness of the branch's systems of internal accounting and bookkeeping controls, as required by generally accepted auditing and accounting standards.

.... /2.



- c) our audit tests revealed that transactions have been executed in accordance with management's authorisation and have been properly recorded for monthly reporting purposes to New York head office;
- d) the branch has complied with the terms of the grant agreement with respect to the use of donor funds.

Coopers Lybrand

23rd July 1986

COOPERS & LYBRAND
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS

JOINT AID DONORS' MEETING FOR REHABILITATION PROGRAMMES
FOLLOWING CYCLONE NAMU

Text of Speech by
Chairman, National Disaster Council

Cyclone Namu which swept through the Country a month ago is the first disaster in Solomon Islands where there has been such a heavy loss of life and such extensive damage to buildings, roads, livestock, gardens, and commercial crops.

Cyclone Namu hit the Island of Sikaiana, north-east of Malaita on Sunday May 18th, leaving the population of about 350 without shelter, food and water.

Moving very slowly and savagely to the south west, with wind gusts reaching 100 knots, it swept across East and South Malaita. It tore roofs off houses, knocked down trees and damaged vast tracts of forests and plantations. Moving further south, the cyclone hit Ulawa, causing widespread damage to houses, and to both food and commercial crops.

By mid-morning on Monday May 19th, Cyclone Namu was affecting the eastern end of Guadalcanal and the west of Makira. Makira suffered moderate damage.

In Guadalcanal, damage caused by landslides, floods and strong winds was widespread. Flooding resulting from heavy rains wrecked the Ngalimbiu, Mbalasuna and Poha bridges and devastated the SIPL headquarters at Ngalimbiu.

On Tuesday 20th May, the cyclone hovered over the islands of Bellona and Rennell, though only Bellona was badly affected.

EMERGENCY PHASE

In order to deal with the immediate problems caused by Cyclone Namu in a co-ordinated and effective manner, the National Disaster Council declared an emergency phase of operations from 19th May to 9th June, 1986.

The Immediate Problems

Immediate main problems were identified as:

- Emergency feeding
- Provision of shelter
- Maintenance of emergency medical and health standards
- Provision of Water Supply

Associated problems included:

- Access to disaster areas
- Difficulty of obtaining information
- Procurement of necessary relief commodities and equipment
- Distribution of relief items to disaster areas
- Rehabilitation of power supply communications, etc. (where applicable)

International Assistance

The scale of the disaster obviously required international assistance to supplement national resources. This assistance broadly took the form of:

- Supplies (food, etc.)
- Personnel (specialist teams, etc.)
- Movement and distribution facilities (aircraft, shipping, etc.)
- Specialist equipment (water purification plants, etc.)
- Financial Assistance

General

After some initial organisational problems and shortages in counter-disaster resources, the requirements of the Emergency Phase appears to have been met reasonably effectively.

Operations during this phase are usually complex and difficult to co-ordinate. Thus, as in this case, some short-comings tend to be inevitable.

RECOVERY PHASE

To ensure that the rehabilitation and reconstruction requirements, resulting from Cyclone Namu, are effectively met by the formulation and implementation by a series of clearly defined and co-ordinated programs, the council established a Technical Advisory Team which comprises of a Chairman, and committee members all of whom are under schemes from the relevant Ministries.

Main Requirements

To ensure an accurate assessment of cyclone damage. To formulate rehabilitation and reconstruction programs.

Main Components of Phase

Housing

- Repair
- Replacement/re-building
- Relocation of victims (if necessary).

Agriculture

- Food crops (gardens)
- Cash crops (cocoa, coconut, oil palms)
- Livestock

Medical and Health

- General health care
- Prevention of post-disaster illness (epidemic)
- Water supply and sanitation programs.

Civil Works and Infrastructure

- Roads, bridges, wharves, airfields, etc.
- Government buildings, schools, clinics, etc.

Information

To be effective, recovery programs need adequate and accurate information and accordingly the TAT mounted a ground survey program commencing 11th June, 1986 and I am happy to report that 90% of the information collected, collated and evaluated are being presented at this meeting.

Interim Recovery Action

In view of time constraint, the Council initiated certain recovery action in worst affected areas by:

- Providing some leaf materials for building
- Providing tools, etc. for buildings and for gardens
- Continuing food assistance, where required.

Also to re-establish food production for the devastated areas and access to food in four months' time when relief food stocks cease, the Council through the Ministry of Agriculture and Provinces are co-ordinating the planting of large areas of land for sweet potatoes, with some cassava and other root crops. This project will also be used to produce planting materials for other areas affected by the cyclone. The first harvest of one of this project was opened last Friday at King George VI School.

THE REHABILITATION SURVEY - BACKGROUND

I would now like to lead on to discuss the rehabilitation survey and its findings in a little more detail.

In the first 10 days after the cyclone, many Provincial Governments, central Government departments, non-governmental organisations and churches undertook surveys of cyclone damage.

The results of these surveys were, in many cases, of great value and provided a basis for rapid intervention by Government to alleviate situations of acute suffering. However, it became clear to NDC and to Malaita and Guadalcanal Provincial Governments that the information collected was not sufficiently detailed to use as a basis for planning rehabilitation needs.

Because of this it was decided that NDC together with the Provincial Governments in the two worst affected Provinces - Guadalcanal and Malaita - would undertake a Systematic and Structured Survey of the cyclone affected areas of the two provinces.

Planning of the rehabilitation survey started on June 1 and implementation began in Guadalcanal on 14 June and Malaita a week later. The Guadalcanal field surveys are almost complete and about 90% of the data has been analysed. Malaita data has almost all been collected and about 25% of it has been analysed.

The survey has involved the virtual full-time work of eight professional officers - two from the Provinces, five from the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands and the Rural Statistician from the Ministry of Finance. Field Supervisors and enumerators numbered about 100 and were drawn from Provincial Agriculture Departments, Statistics staff, and non-governmental organisations. Many of those from NGOs worked as volunteers.

The data was coded and analysed jointly by the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Agriculture. Some of the professional staff employed to work on the survey were ODA staff serving with the SIG. One was funded by ADAB who also kindly provided funds to purchase a micro-computer. The UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) provided the services of a consultant computer data analyst for three weeks. All in all, it was an excellent example of co-operative effort between different departments and agencies.

The results I will present next are preliminary but, we feel reasonably accurate, estimates of the damage. A full report will be written up soon.

THE REHABILITATION SURVEY - RESULTS

The two maps we have handed out describe some of the damage caused.

In Malaita, the most severe damage was caused by the very high winds that battered Sikaiana and southern part of the Province. There was extensive wind damage to houses and coconuts and flood damage in many of the river valleys. In Sikaiana and many parts of Small Malaita hardly a house was left standing.

Preliminary estimates from the rehabilitation survey are that some 47% of the housing stock was completely damaged and 45% of coconut palms and 30% of cocoa trees were destroyed or severely damaged. About 65% of gardens were completely damaged.

Most of the damage in Malaita occurred in the three-quarters of the island south of a line from Dala to Atori though there was some damage north of this line too.

In Guadalcanal the worst damage was due to very severe flooding on the Guadalcanal Plains and in the Mbab-nakira area in the southwest of the island coupled with extensive landslips in the high bush areas between the Lungga valley in the west and Lees Lake in the east. High winds in the Marau area and along the Weather Coast caused coconut and housing damage.

On the Guadalcanal Plains extensive flooding caused by the very heavy rainfall in the hills coupled with landslips and the bursting of log dams in the rivers caused havoc. Villages were washed away, plantations and smallholder cash crops damaged and gardens ruined. Three major bridges on the Ngalimbiu, Mbalisuna and Poha rivers were destroyed and much of the housing and offices at the SIPL Oil Palm Plantation were severely damaged. Damage on the Plains alone will amount to more than \$10 million.

Landslips in the hills necessitated the evacuation of the Suta and Horohana valleys and caused extensive damage to gardens throughout the High Bush. In the Lees Lake area where a massive landslide has blocked the outflow from the Lake, villages have had to be moved to avoid rising lake waters. Other villages have had to relocate because landslips have ruined all their garden land.

Fallen trees in the High Bush areas of Guadalcanal and Malaita have made it difficult for villagers to reach the coast to get supplies and to move around the area.

In the valleys along the Weather Coast, villages and gardens have been devastated by river flooding and coconut plantings damaged by high winds.

Overall in Guadalcanal, some 70% of gardens have been destroyed; 25-30% cash crops completely or very seriously damaged; 18% of pigs, 13% of cattle and 41% of chickens lost. About 23% of housing was completely destroyed and, as in Malaita, 35-40% of village copra and cocoa driers and some 65% of cattle and pig projects severely damaged.

In Guadalcanal and Malaita over \$8 million of damage was done to clinics, schools, bridges and village water supplies.

THE REHABILITATION SURVEY - IMPLICATIONS

The extensive garden damage - 65% in Malaita and 70% in Guadalcanal - will necessitate the supply of food to the majority of villages in both Provinces for the next six months or so.

In the first four to six weeks most people's main concern was with housing and despite the extensive damage to gardens new gardens were not planted. In some places shortage of planting material and tools have delayed new planting further.

By now, in areas where planting is possible, most people are beginning to plant. However, even if they use the fastest growing sweet potato varieties it will be three to four months before they can start harvesting. In those areas where yams and taro are the main crops, growing periods are longer and gardens will not be producing for 6-8 months.

NDC estimates that Guadalcanal will need about 1200 tonnes of rice over the next six months and Malaita 2300 tonnes.

In addition to food, about 350 villages in the two provinces have requested vegetative planting material and seed and some 15,000 agricultural and other tools have been asked for. Even in villages where tools were not actually lost in the cyclone, more tools are needed in order to cut down the extensive areas of bush needed for new gardens.

TURNING NOW TO THE EXTENSIVE DAMAGE TO HOUSING

I noted earlier that approximately 23% of houses in Guadalcanal and 47% in Malaita (a total of over 30,000 houses) were completely damaged by the cyclone. Despite this, many people in rural areas have been able to rebuild their houses. Often this has only been done in a make-shift way, but the result is that there is an immediate pressing need for the equivalent of only about:

- 6500 sago leaf roofs
- 18500 sago leaf outside walls
- 1700 betel nut floors
- 2500 tents

However, over the longer term, continuing help with sago palm and tents/tarpaulins is likely to be needed. Sago palms were also severely damaged by wind and flooding and will take 2-5 years to start to produce leaf again. Villagers were able to "rescue" some sago palm after the cyclone, but this will not be possible in the future as roofs and walls come up for repair.

Rehabilitation of the main two cash crops - coconuts and cocoa will also be needed and one of the projects that will be discussed this afternoon will deal with that. It should perhaps be noted that the estimates of cash crop damage from the survey seem quite high. There is no doubt that in many areas there was very serious damage to coconut and cocoa, but equally in many areas serious damage was limited. It may be that farmers, with the history of the old coconut planting subsidy which Government operated have perhaps exaggerated their likely losses somewhat. Anyway, even if subsequent work shows these estimates to be slightly inflated, there is no doubt that serious damage has occurred and that rehabilitation in many areas will be needed.

The livestock industry will also need attention. The national nucleus breeding herd will need to be redeveloped and extensive work will be needed to rehabilitate LDA and smallholder cattle projects. In the smallholder sector about 700 small projects such as cattle fences, stockyard, pastures, and pig fences will have to be rebuilt and some 4000 pigs and 17000 chickens will be needed if smallholder livestock numbers are to attain previous levels.

Last but not least, mention should be made of rural water supplies. In about 25% of villages in Malaita and some 35% in Guadalcanal water supplies for drinking and cooking were disrupted by the cyclone. Overall about half of the systems disrupted are in need of repairs which the villagers cannot do for themselves. Sometimes the rivers which people use are clogged with rotting trees and vegetation and all that is needed is a chainsaw. In other cases piped systems and well have been damaged and need fundamental repairs. Often

tin roof and tank systems are needed.

The repair of water supply systems for drinking and cooking will be a major focus of our rehabilitation efforts.

I hope I have highlighted for you some of the areas in which rehabilitation is needed.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that the portfolio projects we will discuss later in the day has not been designed to rehabilitate the country overnight. An ambitious programme such as that is, quite frankly, beyond our capacity.

No, the package of projects we propose has been designed as being a realistic programme which it is within the capacity of the various line agencies and departments in Solomon Islands to implement successfully. It will form the basis on which future rehabilitation and development projects can build.

116

APPENDIX D

REPORTS ON ACTIVE OR EVALUATED PROJECTS

Part One: Self-Help Development Fund

A. PCV Counterpart Projects

AI-101-5/2 IHRU-5/5 (Evaluator's report): On 12 May 1986, I visited the Bambanakira Community Development Council's projects. The idea for a Council like the BCDC to integrate people from two different Wards was not initiated by the people themselves and the Council finally failed. The projects themselves had varying degrees of success. The Adult Education Center (AI-101-5/5) and the Marasa Cargo Shed (AI-101-5/4) were both completed and used by members of the community up to the date of my visit. Although by this visit the buildings--especially the AEC--were overgrown by bushes and some parts were damaged because of neglect after the Council collapsed.

The aims and objectives of all projects under the umbrella of Bambanakira Community Development Committee were good. The people of the area did not fully understand the aims and objectives of the Council itself, therefore they did not adequately commit themselves, their times and resources to facilitate its continuation. Another contributing factor was leadership amongst the people of the area. The people of the area clearly felt that they haven't got proper leadership. Briefly the failures of these projects mainly due to the following: inadequate leadership given the communities' traditions of bigman or chiefly rule and an inadequate understanding of a democratic institution like the BCDC, inadequate educational partnership.

AI-101-5/6 (Evaluator's Report): During discussions concerning the various projects undertaken by the Vatukalau villagers, including this particular project, I was told that this project is one of the best projects, one which served all families of the villages. Up to this visit, all of the VIP Latrines are working well and people were happy and grateful for the assistance. This is a good and successful project. The people totally appreciated its existence and was grateful for those who worked to organize and provide funds for the project.

AI-101-5/10 (Evaluator's Report on project written off in 1983): Despite the Mangakiki Community's interest in developing and running a trade store at their village, that interest did not prove itself to be very strong. The Mangakiki Community Trade Store no longer exists, and the community does not intend to revive it. Despite the fact that the store was built in a suitable location where enough people are around and despite having a good income and steady cash flow, the store did not last very long.

From my observations, I saw two factors contributing to this lack of success: 1) jealousy among the people themselves, and 2) leadership in the community is weak. Both factors are common in Melanesia, particularly when people dislike the person selected

APPENDIX D

to manage a project. From information provided this year (some three and a half years after the project failed), some members of the community started to complain about the project after a few months of operation. Immediately, a meeting was arranged by the management in an attempt to discuss and hopefully remedy the problems, but no members turned up for the meeting. As a result, the community divided and the opponents to this store started to form new village trade store. People became careless of this one, and started asking for credit, etc. These pressures eventually resulted in the termination of the operation.

AI-101-5/11 (Evaluator's Report): The people involved in this project were those resettled after the 1977 earthquake. They are subsistence farmers and are currently developing coconut and cocoa projects on the dry grassland of Aruligo. The three resettlement villages have more than 400 people. Before this Village Health Aid Station was undertaken, the people had two options: One, go to the Clinic at Visale, 10 miles west of Aruligo, or Two, take a market truck to Central Hospital in Honiara.

This project was successfully completed and is in operation up to date. The service provided has been tremendous and not only serves Chorabau, Nduindui and Vatukalau, but four other villages (Mataruka, New Mala, Nalikasiu and Bareho) and two plantations (Aruligo and Doma) with about 300 people. The people have worked together well. The project achieved its aims and objectives and everybody seems to be happy about the project.

At present one person is looking after the Aid Post, which is scheduled to be open 3-4 times a week for 2-3 morning hours. The Village Health Aid is also on-call for any emergencies when the post is closed. The village leaders have made an agreement for paying the VHA: Every family who uses the Aid Post will pay \$3.00 a year, there are approximately 100 families in the area. Leaders were very concerned about the future of the building. In the past, sago palm was available free from Aruligo plantation, but that now Aruligo Plantation does not have enough for its own use and has stopped letting others have it. Because of this, the leaders were thinking of requesting help to buy roofing iron in order to solve that problem.

AI-101-5/12 (Evaluator's Report): On 13 May 1986, I visited Teri Bible School and met with the leader of the VIF latrine project, Mr. Napthali Rasele and the headmaster. Members of the Bambanaira Community Development Council (BCDC), the faculty and school committee members have done well on this project. Seven VIF latrines have been installed and are still in good condition. Completion has been delayed by a dispute on the land which the school is located. The project achieved its aim of providing latrines for the school.

AI-101-5/16: (Evaluator's Report): The conditions to be followed for the actual construction of this project were that the community would provide labor, Aruligo Catholic Mission would provide the its Workshop free and the World Health Organization

APPENDIX D

Environmental Health Program would provide its Advisor as well as the technical supervisor for the construction.

Although initially the villagers were full of enthusiasm for this project, when actual construction was to start, the Peace Corps Volunteer facilitator and co-ordinator met with many problems in respect to the village laborers. Despite of all those struggles, the project was accomplished. The Arusha Windmill was not constructed because detailed wind surveys after funding approval showed it to be impractical. Instead, a diesel engine was bought, installed and operated to pump water up to the main distributing tank for distribution to the village. The water source is a spring located about 2 km. in the bush and piped to a point below the village which is reached by walking a steep, 300ft long path down a hill which is 100ft high.

Although the objective of this project was to solve water shortages and walking a long distance to fetch water, to date the two problems have not been solved. Water shortages are still experienced by the villagers and walking down the steep hill continues. Recommendations: A supplementary distributing water tank of a size similar to or twice as big as the current one should be built. The system should again be re-examined by technicians to make it work. It is a good project, highly commended and highly appreciated by the community. Yet, it was not very successful.

AI-101-5/17: This project provided in-village training in small engine operation and maintenance in Guadalcanal. It was begun by PCV Bill Benson, but due to his early termination, the courses were conducted over sixteen months by a UNV from Burma, Mr. U. Maung Nu, a mechanics teacher at the SICHE (Honiara Technical Institute). The project was completed in March.

AI-101-5/22 (Evaluator's Report): Vatukalau is a resettlement village. After five years of intensive gardening, compounded by limited land and little rainfall, the soil is nearly depleted. The villagers' gardens are no longer producing as much as they used to. Of course, if there were a large quantity of land available, the villagers could continue their traditional slash and burn practices of moving to new places, clearing them, burning off the debris and ground cover and then making good crops in the ashes for a year or two.

This project was initiated to ameliorate the above problems. Despite a successful demonstration at the beginning of the project which showed the great profits to be made from grow boxes, the project did not really succeed. Village leaders now claim that the project was not successful because nobody really taught the villagers the proper way of doing it. This claim is made despite a successful half-acre demonstration plot that generated over \$16,000 in net income and which trained a number of people. The leaders now say that they think the idea is good, but that proper demonstration is needed; they say that only a few people, not the whole community, have tried. Slowly, everyone else gave

up and went back to their traditional way of gardening.

The successful first effort was severely limited because of the problems with the community's water supply (see project AI-101-5/16); jealousies over the water being used for economic gain spilled over to this project.

AI-101-5/22: This project was cancelled on PCV Steve Clabuesch's transfer.

AI-101-5/24: The Ole Village marketing project hit some snags early in the year when reports were received that one of the brothers involved had sold the work boat and pocketed the money. To date, however, no police or other reports have been obtained to confirm these reports.

AI-101-5/27: The Health Education Video Project was transferred in February to the Honiara Town Council (HTC). All six clinics are not yet served by the project because construction is not complete on the units' cabinets. Assistance for this project came from the Norman Kirk Memorial Trust as well as from IHAP's USAID grant. If the project continues to be as effectively as the first two years indicated, we expect the system to be fully operational by the end of 1986.

AI-101-5/28: The Bambanakira Community Development council in South Guadalcanal saw its capabilities weaken as internal disputes interfered with several BCDC-supported small scale self-help efforts. In response, villagers from Wanderer Bay (Kukul-tolu) stepped in to try and manage the project, changing the focus to their community itself. This remote community did an amazing job in attempting this project, and despite not achieving perfection, the community learned many valuable lessons while succeeding in most of their sub-projects before Cyclone Namu destroyed things.

AI-101-5/29 and -5/34: These two projects helped to expand the pilot beekeeping effort begun a number of years ago by a Marist priest at St. Joseph's Secondary School. The first project attempted to integrate teaching beekeeping at a rural training center and to initiate a local organization in support of beekeepers. The second project helped the SI Beekeepers' Association in support of over a dozen village and rural training center beekeeping projects.

AI-101-5/33: The Paripao Ward VIP Latrine project was successfully completed in March under the expert guidance of PCVs Wallace and Elaine Goode. A follow-up project for a water supply to some of the communities served by the Latrine project was approved for funding from USAID's Accelerated Impact Program.

B. General Village Level Projects

AI-101-17: The Sautavati Vegetable Garden Training project ended in July, 1984. The clan led by Romano Vaolo continues to learn

APPENDIX D

quite a bit about growing and marketing vegetables. They are settling down now to a few crops for which the market is reasonable and which can survive travel from Tangarara.

(Evaluator's Report): I visited the project on 16 May 1986, just as Cyclone Namu was starting and met the project leader, Mr. Vaolo. After touring the project area, I was shown the tool shed and saw that the tools IHAF gave were used and kept in good condition, although some had obviously reached the end of their life. The aims and objective of the project are good--that is to diversify cash income in order to assist the people of the area to develop their lands. At the beginning, the project aimed to involve the whole community, but, as time went on, it converted into a single family project. The reason for this was not clearly explained to me, but it seems to be simply that too many individuals within the project would like to be a leader for themselves.

Since the project converted to a family activity, no major problems have occurred (no land dispute or similar sort of problem). The only problem is that the community seems not to have budgeted for tool replacement. When I visited, the family was working on a new seedling nursery and ground preparation was also going ahead. At the same time, the family is working toward a farm extension, probably in cocoa. This project should be encouraged elsewhere, so that other families may see and try to do the same. Maybe this will also create an incentive in them to apply the same development in their lands.

AI-101-18 (Evaluator's Report): Balola village, with 42 people, is the lead village for the project; nearby Tanakidi, Tinovika, etc. were to participate. The population involved is estimated at 150. North Savo's economy is basic subsistence farming with copra providing most cash income. Because Savo is volcanic, there is potential for other cash crops, especially citrus and vegetables, but people have not been encouraged to diversify their farms to increase their source of income. There are no big rivers on the island; wells and rain provide fresh water. Only one village has a piped water supply; it was financed by the provincial government with some local contributions.

It was apparent that the Balola piggery project suffered numerous setbacks during the past few years. Much of the hardware (tanks, corrugated iron roofing, etc.) is lying idle and unused. Substantive development has been negligible. There was an apparent lack of effort by the project leader, Mr. Ataban Tonzepo, and it appeared that villages mentioned in the proposal as beneficiaries/participants, have shown either a lack of continued interest or were simply not part of the project team. When I visited, the total swine herd contained a boar, three sows and three piglets.

Discussions with the project leader confirmed that, one, funds advanced were used on things other than the project; and two, for the last couple of years, Mr. Tonzepo has occupied

APPENDIX D

himself with planting six hectares of cocoa, part of which is now bearing. This was done in response to high cocoa prices about two years ago and was in itself not a bad idea as it also addresses the income problem outlined in the project proposal. However, it does not explain why no one tried to get the project redirected towards cocoa or to fully account for funds advanced. Mr. Tonzepo says that now every effort will be made to concentrate on the piggery project now that cocoa planting is completed. (When planning the cocoa, he didn't appreciate that he had a fixed labor force that was inadequate for both efforts).

Mr. Tonzepo is a very hard-working man, sometimes a bit over ambitious, who tends to downplay the hard realities of project management. Provincial extension officers will need to be involved should this project be revitalized. A small commercial piggery of this nature, raising 90-100 pigs/year cannot afford to be left in isolation.

AI-101-22 (Evaluator's Report): On Friday, 1 November, I visited the Nahepe Cattle Project and was met by the Rev. J. Gapu (initiator of the Project), Simon (Project leader) and several other villagers. Rev. Gapu has been a prominent leader in the Nahepe area for quite a while. According to him, the project has never been established and never came into being as planned. The 200 acres selected for the project was instead divided among some villagers and these people have carried out individual development projects. Rev. Gapu's report was confirmed by Mr. Simon.

It seems that the project was not implemented as planned because, in part, the province failed to explain that the grant assistance was given to them in materials. The tools provided to assist the project, according to both Rev. Gapu and Mr. Simon, were returned to the Provincial Agriculture Division at Kirakira. In following up this report, I was unable to establish that the tools were with the Agriculture Section in Kirakira. This evaluator has one recommendation to make: that better preparation of the project by field officers, the province and the community (including more information on self-help assistance programs) might have overcome some of the problem.

AI-101-23 (Evaluator's Report): The intentions of the Hure (Masina) Poultry project were to bring revenue to the members, to provide meat for local consumption and to foster the spirit of self-reliance among the members of the community. The community has land available, but is faced with financial difficulties to purchase materials for construction of fencing and buildings. This community does not have any notable source of income. The community tried coconut and cocoa but did not achieve good results for the soil is not suitable for those crops without supplementation. No work was done on this project because Malaita Province's Principal Agriculture Officer would not endorse the project because of a shortage of feed. This project has been cancelled due to the Principal Agriculture Officer's stand.

AI-101-24 (Evaluator's Report): On 15-16 May 1986 I visited the

APPENDIX D

Fox Bay Youth project and met with the youth as well as elders and village leaders. Mr. William Kavigao, the project leader, was not available. During the meeting, I learned that the Youth Club is no longer in operation. It has been out of action for the past two years. It was also revealed that Mr. Kavigao was not a good leader, that he was unable or unwilling to supervise the group, and at the same time the club's money was misused.

The Club Center Building was completed and used for a short time; after that the building was just idle and some villagers are using it as a copra storehouse. It was clear from the meeting that the major problem was only leadership. The project leader failed to even give encouragement to the members. The meeting noted that he left club members to work by themselves and traveled frequently to Honiara and spent club money for his own.

All tools provided disappeared and nobody knows where they are and what happened with them. The three sewing machines were kept in good condition by a village leader. Everyone at the meeting expressed their disappointment and made it clear that they would not like to revive the project until the person repays all money been mis-spent and/or misused.

AI-101-26 (Evaluator's Report): The Mwakorukoru youth club cocoa project was started in 1980. The young people always give a good turn out for the project. Two acres of cocoa are established and producing, but lack of a drier/fermentary has caused some discouragement. Another problem is a disease is found to be causing damage to some of the trees. The community has been advised to see Agriculture Division at Namunga Station to help combat it. However, the project leader and village chief have decided to proceed with a two acre extension which should now be completed.

It is the community's intention to cover 20 acres with cocoa by the end of 1987. This project, with the surrounding cocoa smallholders, is large enough to warrant a drier/fermentary, and I recommend highly that this be approved for implementation.

AI-101-28: The Ahia Cocoa Project suffered delays in 1983-4, first because the final conditions of the SI\$10,000 DBSI loan were not available for several months, then because the village's cocoa expert, Mr. Michael Poropaina, needing a cash income, left to work as an extension officer with the Province's Agriculture Division. In response to the village's and DBSI's requests, Michael returned to the village around mid-1984. Despite these and earlier delays, the cocoa already planted was beginning to bear fruit and the project was amended to include a cocoa fermentary.

(Evaluator's Report): A site visit to Ahia was not possible at the time due to shipping schedules. This report is based upon file reviews and interviews with Provincial, Agriculture and other staff in Kirakira. Much of the scheduled work has been completed and the work now is reported to be in satisfactory progress.

APPENDIX D

The project, after its revision, has become one of the best cocoa projects in Makira Province, according to those interviewed. The community has established nine acres of cocoa which is now producing and has constructed a drier/fermentary and completed its first dry cocoa shipment. The value of that shipment was SI\$500. The community has cleared and is planting another eight res. They are well on their way towards their target of 40 acres of cocoa.

The two project owning tribes' support is strong and should remain so, and they should be able to maintain progress and complete development of the project. If so, manpower shouldn't be a problem. The project leader, with the assistance of the Agriculture Field Assistant, has drawn up a work schedule in such a way that it has provision for absence for illness and customary obligations, so the foundation of life been provided for.

AI-101-36 (Evaluator's Report): Up to this visit, the problem is still the same as in the project paper: lack of good source or adequate supply of water near Tarapaina, Hepea and Rararo villages. An additional problem is the extra \$2,000 required for pipes, because a new, more distant source, will be used; the old source is blocked by land disputes.

This water project was surveyed with the help of villagers. The community unanimously agreed that this is their priority task this year, and last year the community raised a total of \$574 through various fundraising activities. Actual work on the project started in February. If there were no obstacles along the way, this project was expected to be completed in April. (Work in progress at time of visit.)

The source is more than one kilometer from the villages and supplies a gravity-fed water system of twenty standpipes and showers. Construction was being supervised by the Provincial water supply section, with the community contributing labor and locally available materials. This serves 200 people in 27 households. People will definitely be very happy as they have been undergoing hardship for many years in the past. This is definitely a good project for it provides a tremendous service to the villages, a school and a clinic. At this point, it is difficult to judge how much water or rate of flow the source will provide. This will be judged four to six months after the completion of the project.

AI-101-37: (Evaluator's Report): This project was most needed because unpredictable conditions on the south (weathercoast) of Makira mean irregular shipping and when ships do call landings can be suddenly impossible; outgoing copra is frequently wetted by such sudden storms, thus lowering copra quality. The only immediate problem left with this project, is the "incompleteness" of the copra shed. This might be easily solved with 16 pieces of 18' corrugated galvanized iron in order to complete the walling of the building.

APPENDIX D

The project has been established; the copra drier is completed and in use; everything is complete on the copra/cargo shed except for the small portion of wall. According to Mr. Onesimus Kavunavi, project leader, and Mr. Benson Piringi, teacher at a nearby school, this project is a good one and people are happy about it. The people worked together well and have basically achieved both buildings. It will certainly minimize the problems cited in the project document (keeping cargo and copra dry and secure from bad weather).

AI-101-38 (Evaluator's Report): The aim of this project is to address the families core needs such as lack of cash income. This is a qualifiedly good project. At the start of the project, the people of Manehuki village were co-operative and participated well. For unknown reasons people started to drift away, so manpower was cut and the performances has lagged. But, according to project leaders the problem of manpower will be solved if the village leaders improve their management schedules.

20 acres of pasture has been developed and is fully stocked. Fencing is complete and well maintained. A good stockyard has been built. Paddocks are divided into 4 and rotation grazing is applied. The first sale of cattle has taken place bringing in SI\$7,500. Out of this, the community deposited \$5,500 in the bank; \$2,000 was invested in the community's trade store. I believe that these people will continue to develop this project, for they have already demonstrated the ability up to now.

This is a good project and is already benefiting the shareholders. The leaders are mature and have natural leadership qualities. Income generated by project is well kept (although I could not determine how much income had been generated) and well utilized into other ways, in which the money can be further increased. Here was an uncommon sign of reasonably good financial management.

AI-101-52: This project to assist the BNP (Balo, Nepa and Palo villages) Blockmaking Business suffered more delays during the past year, primarily due to shortages of materials and the local block machine manufacturer's slow response (almost six months) to the project's order. PCV Sondra Rose expects to see the project operating before she departs in September, 1986.

AI-101-54: (Evaluator's Report): The Subua Youth Construction project is centered at Walande Village, a one hectare artificial island with a population near one thousand and with about one hundred houses. Children go to school at Jordan school, which is 0.2 km away on the main island; Tawaro clinic is about 1 km away, also on the mainland.

The Subua Youth group concentrates on building construction and gardening on the mainland. The young people have organized themselves well: The boys are fully engaged in building houses in the village, the girls in gardening. They build leaf houses

APPENDIX D

for the people, and they encourage young people not to drift to Honiara but to make themselves useful to the community. The group built as planned a very good building for their recreation place and office which also contained a small store to serve members. The building was also used for training courses in agriculture, fishery, women's club, etc. Other youth activities are also organized regularly.

Subua Youth Club is perhaps one of the best youth organizations in the whole of South Malaita. It is well organized and managed. The group expected to start building their financial base by mid-1986, when some buildings they are working on were to be completed. Cyclone Namu upset this considerably--almost all of Walande's homes were knocked down by wind and waves.

This project is highly commended. The Subua Youth activities not only benefit their members but the community as a whole, especially those who have new houses built. Because of the Youth activities, the people will always enjoy and appreciate the fresh atmosphere, the benefits from their works by a responsible group, and income the youth have earned through building houses for the people, and it does create a good circulation of finance in the villages.

AI-101-63 (Evaluator's Report): The Walande water supply serves villagers on the island and at Tawaro, the Area Council's Headquarters on Small Malaita (Maramasike) Island. The community did as planned for the project, contributing the labor, etc. required of them for the project. Because of their good work, the project was completed within schedule. It is now one year old, and provides good service to the people of Walande village. The community saves much by having this water supply, and they expressed complete satisfaction over the project. Despite this joy and satisfaction, problems have been experienced within one year's operation. Most of these are related to maintenance, and are addressed on a catch-as-catch-can basis when skilled plumbers from Honiara are vacationing with their families in Walande.

This project is a good and successful one. Its aims and objectives are been achieved. I am satisfied with what I have heard and seen about the project. The community appreciates the existence of this water supply, and I believe the community will continue to be responsible, care for and maintain it.

AI-101-64 (Evaluator's Report): On 24 June 1986, I visited the Marumbo Fishing and Marketing project and met with Mr. Stanley Joel, project manager. This project was initiated by Mr. Joel in 1981. His family and five others formed a community project and started together with fundraising, and through their effort raised money to buy a canoe and outboard engine. Before project initiation, it was discussed with other villages of west Guadalcanal. Initially, the project worked very well; all members were very cooperative; the manager and the financial manager, Mr. Raymond Kapini, made a good fishing schedule, 3 days per week. Catches were always good and they were making money, about

APPENDIX D

SI\$360/week and approximately \$1,440 in a month. This went on for about 3 years, up to July, 1985, when the financial management was under suspicion by members of the community.

The matter became noticeable and other members started to demand payment for their work and so some money been taken away by the financial manager with some other members of the community. From there onward the rate of performance and working slowed down and eventually the group led by Raymond Kapini ceased to participate in the project. The Marumbo Fishing and Marketing project is still in operation, but is no longer a clan project. It has been converted into a family (line) development project under the supervision of Mr. Joel. Now only 15 adults are involved in the operation of the project, but they still keep the schedule of 3 days per week and get good catches most of the time. Fish are marketed to Tambea Tourist Resort, Visale Mission Station and other villages along the main road as far east as Aruligo.

Equipment in the group's possession now includes one 18' fiberglass canoe, one 18 Horsepower Tohatsu outboard motor and two Eskies. The present management is good and is trying very hard to improve operations. Profits from the project are reportedly partially reinvested in the project, while part will be used for community development purposes, for instance--to improve housing, accommodated school fees etc...

One result of personal conflicts over financial management was that that no one felt responsible for reporting to extension officers about the project. I requested the management to report regularly to IHAP and the Province about the project's operation.

AI-101-67 (Evaluator's Report): The O'o Cocoa project is sited right in the middle of small Malaita, about two hours by motor canoe from Afio provincial substation to Sivapo, plus two hours walk inland and uphill. The project aims to generate money for the group. In spite of difficulties the community is determined to establish twenty acres of cocoa.

This community has no income to purchase tools to work with in their cocoa project. So they sought assistance, but so far no tools have reached them. Tools shipped by IHAP seem to have been lost along the way.

Under the leadership of Mr. Paul Pupui, the community has performed well. So far, although they haven't got enough tools, they have cleared 8 acres of land and planted it with cocoa. Two of these acres are bearing. This is indeed a great achievement to such a community and must be congratulated. Agriculture Extension Officers from Afio visited this project four times in 1984. That was the last visit of Agriculture Officers in this particular project. The community is determined to stay on schedule and hopes to establish another 4 to 5 acres by the end of this year 1986.

APPENDIX D

These people should be encouraged in their activities, since they have been applying self reliance principles. Apart from the tools discussed above I highly recommended that they should be assisted with a cocoa drier/fermentary before full production takes place in order to avoid wastage and discouragement.

AI-101-79 (Evaluator's Report): The UCWF organization, which has about 200 village-level groups and a total membership of around 4,000, has a regional president who is the head of the UCWF in the Solomons. The UCWF covers ten 'circuits' and each of the circuits' office bearers are also elected during the yearly regional conference.

Each village-level affiliate designs its own programs based on the UCWF's "four square" program. However, village level programs are rather limited in scope because of their leaders limited training. For this reason, the UCWF began to build its regional training center at Munda.

The UCWF Training Center at Munda remains incomplete through either lack of funds or the unavailability of labor. I was not able to meet the Training Coordinator during this visit, however in a brief discussion with United Church officials, it was confirmed that the UCWF is very active in promoting women's affairs in the Western Province with a promising future. The UCWF and the UC should be commended for this effort and should be a model for other provinces in the country to follow.

AI-101-81 (Evaluator's Report): Mwaniwaro's need for good copra drier is indubitable. These people have good bearing trees but lack facilities to process and sell their nuts. Although manpower was available to build this drier, it was delayed due to the fact that local materials are not easily obtained on Santa Catalina; most local materials must be obtained from Makira (San Cristobal). Another factor has been the family responsibilities which traditionally take place after someone's death and burial. The copra drier was completed by the end of November, 1985, and production started in December, 1985.

This is good and successful project, yet there are elements of dispute within the project management. I'm not certain what will happen with the project in the near future, but I have heard many versions from the people of the area. An early follow-up evaluation is recommended.

AI-101-104 (Evaluator's Report): Nusabaruku Island is a hundred yards off the western end of Gizo Harbor. It became home to Gilbertese (Nei Kiribati) settlers about twenty years ago. Now home to about 10% of Gizo's Nei Kiribati, Nusabaruku is overcrowded; typhoid broke out briefly in 1983. Most of Nusabaruku's growth results from migration to Gizo's bright lights from mostly boggy Wagina, a 7,000 hectare island south of Choiseul. Migrants have either shared (or borrowed from absent owners) housing from the Nusabaruku people or built their own housing.

APPENDIX D

Other Gilbertese settlements around Gizo, notably Logha, Titiana and New Manra, have experienced migration pressures also, but they have more land and other resources to absorb migration.

Nusabaruku requested Provincial help several years ago for a water supply. Provincial inaction, generally because of problems with the main Gizo water supply and because of a lack of capacity at Nusabaruku for adequate sanitary facilities, delayed extending service to Nusabaruku. In late 1981, an expanded Gizo supply was started on its two-three year break-in period. Extension of the Gizo supply during this period was not recommended because debris behind the dam was severely taxing filtering/treating capacity.

To help the villagers with their water supply/sanitation problems, to relieve overcrowding and to protect neighboring residents from health dangers, the Province worked to find an answer. The solution chosen was to relocate the Nei Kiribati to Crown land on Kongulavata Bay on the north side of Gizo Island. The village would be on the coast about six kilometers from Gizo near the "bottom" of the four-kilometer long, 750 meter wide, Bay. The site is about 50 hectares in size, with room for about 77 houses plus gardens. The Nusabaruku villagers would get first priority for house sites at the new village. Other Nei Kiribati from Wagina, Titiana, New Manra, Logha, etc. would also be given sites at Kongulavata. The stickler was that those moving would have to give up any rights they have to land in their old places.

The site is about a hundred meters from a water source. Because most of the surrounding land is steep water can be gravity fed to the village. Some villagers began clearing for their new homes but others were reluctant to move, claiming that they have no tools, and that they don't want to move. In general the villagers were looking ahead albeit with reluctance to the new home and were thinking of community projects that cannot really be planned until the new village is actually settled.

So far, no resettlement has taken place. From discussions with Provincial officials and inhabitants of Nusabaruku, there are conflicting reports as to why the project has come to a standstill. Provincial authorities claim that they have made persistent efforts to convince the inhabitants of Nusabaruku to move to Kongulavata and only then will they provide the necessary amenities to the new settlers. Nusabaruku people, however, have reservations about the relocation move. First, a good number of them find work at Gizo; it is easier for them to commute to work each day from where they are than from Kongulavata, 6 kilometers away, with no bus service. Poor sanitation may be a problem, but a serious outbreak is not a daily phenomenon; as long as the villagers mentally assign this to the remote future, continuing to live there seems harmless. Furthermore, they believe claims have been made by the original landowners for the government to return Kongulavata land, and that if they move their tenure at Kongulavata becomes very insecure.

APPENDIX D

In my opinion the Nei Kiribati are asking legitimate questions. It is up to the Province to work with the Nei Kiribati to devise a workable relocation plan. The construction of the water supply is a secondary issue. No one should forget the inherent cultural element in play (i.e. "wantok system") which people value even at the expense of epidemics and death.

AI-101-109 (Evaluator's Report): This project is very close to Manewiriwiri. It has about 100 acres suitable for pasture and cattle raising; it also has access to the main road linked up to Kirakira. At the start, the villagers worked together very well. As time went on, togetherness decreased, creating manpower shortages.

Naturally, when too much emphasis is placed on group activities, it results in neglect of family. It must happen this way: Families need to keep up with their subsistence gardening, etc. They need, frequently, to see some benefit to encourage them to continue work in the project. It is highly recommended that communities arrange for some kind of payment to be given to families which work on such projects.

In spite the problems of manpower, the project has made satisfactory achievement. To date, the community has fully developed 36 acres, fenced and stocked. A good stockyard has been built, along with a water supply for the cattle both by rain catchment and by gravity fed pipeline. This year seven head were shipped/sold to LDA and one was locally marketed. Fewer steers are ready for shipment. The community is now preparing to purchase 15 steers to replace the ones sold. According to Agriculture surveyors, the project should cover 51 acres. The Community has expressed the desire to develop another 15 acres by next year.

AI-101-110 (Evaluator's Report): Sasamuga extends for six miles on the southern side of Choiseul, and is home to about 700 people. The Community Education Center is attached to the school where 110 people are taught by six teachers. The church is adjacent to the school. A road extends along the coast for about 15 miles.

The designers of this project saw many direct and side benefits arising, including, a) The immediate benefit to the local community of an Assembly Hall of durable, low-maintenance materials; b) the continued existence of a large hall as a meeting place for the larger district; c) the opportunity for the different groups to live together, working for a common goal, sharing traditions, and learning from each other's traditional values and new skills; d) Future employment for the local people especially school leavers who gained considerable experience from working with qualified tradesmen; and, e) The future revenue generating and job creation that will follow, by way of block making and their sale.

APPENDIX D

The hall as a project is only a small component of the many activities carried out by the Sasamunga Community. In monetary terms it is not a very significant contribution, in comparing it with the total volume of assistance received by this community over the last five years and likely to continue for at least two to three years more. My assessment of the physical assets in stock including buildings, suggest a total value of external funding above SI\$100,000 dollars. The Choiseul Community Development Program (CCDP) with its headquarters at Sasamunga puts Sasamunga in an ideal situation to receive external assistance for community activities. It is clear therefore that where there is an existing 'grassroot' organization with clear and distinct aims, and signs of good management, external assistance can be used successfully.

The Community Self-Help Program grant for the hall was expended pretty much as planned. The building is complete but for three meters of ceiling space which is meant to have been completed by the community. The hall is used frequently, the latest being a tour by the theater group from Choiseul Bay Provincial Secondary School.

The Sasamunga Community is definitely making some headway in fostering community development, not only through its physical operations, but also in its effort to maintain close cohesiveness and a sense of fraternal loyalty to each other, through these various community activities.

61-101-116 (Evaluator's Report): This project is an integrated cattle and coconut one. I met with the project leader, Mr. George, and members of the community and the Agriculture Field Assistant at the Aringana sub-station. What seems to be a problem, may not be a continuous one, because it might be overcome through the alertness of the project leader: The slowness in receiving materials ordered from Honiara. Perhaps one may say this problem came about because of the continuous shipping difficulties in the Province. Despite the fact that minor problems do exist, this project has done very well. Progress is within schedule. Up to end of October, 1985, 14 acres of pasture was established. Fencing of more than half of this was completed. 19 head of cattle were shipped out during the first week of November, earning approximately SI\$5,700. This amount reduced most of ADAL's debt to DBSI. Within the same week, the association received 15 head for fattening--a morale boost because the new steers belong entirely to them. A 100/150 head stock yard was completed by mid-December.

Also very encouraging: The first replanted coconuts have flowered. A new copra drier was completed before Christmas. The Association has replanted 35 acres of coconut and has no plans to plant more. 12.35 acres of this replanted coconut area is now under well maintained pasture and fully fenced. ADAL is now in the process of clearing up another 24 acres of land to be planted with improved pasture.

APPENDIX D

AI-101-117 (Evaluator's Report): 720-hectare Tetepari Plantation on Tetepari island contains around 360 ha. of old palms and is generally heavily overgrown. It is operated by the Touo Tetepari Land Purchase Co-operative Society (TTLPCS) under a temporary occupation license. TTLPCS wants a fixed-term lease of the plantation, and as an earnest of this desire have replanted about 20 hectares of coconuts and planted 1 hectare of cocoa. At present, copra is first carried to the shore and then taken to the dryer by canoe. TTLPCS bought a small ship to carry their copra to Noro because Tetepari lacks regular shipping. However this was soon resold to a private businessman, and transport difficulties continue.

There are no permanent residents on Tetepari. TTLPCS's 245 members claim descendance from the original landowners. Members come to the island to work for set periods. A village has been planned for the plantation and included as a requirement if the Society wishes to borrow from the Development Bank to purchase the plantation.

At present, the size of the plantation is the biggest hindrance to copra production and development. This project was part of plans to re-open an old road system and cut some new roads, totaling about 12 kilometers. Nearly 4 km has been brushed out and simple ramps constructed over minor ditches. A tractor and trailer were on loan from the Land Use Development Division. However, the creeks that cross the roadway need to be bridged with logs and planks on stone-filled Gabion wire boxes.

The Development Bank, in consultation with LUD and the Province, seems to assume management of the finances and related development as a "given". However this is where things can go wrong; the community's original enthusiasm may be genuine but doesn't survive because of pressures of subsistence farming and personal cash crops. Insufficient attention is given during appraisal work to the opportunity cost of subsistence labor. The goals and expectations of this project must be seen in the total context of the overall aim of the TTLPCS: It was expected that the construction of the bridges would be part of an overall rehabilitation program but given labor limitations, this, in my view, is a formidable exercise, perhaps over-ambitious.

The decision to divide the plantation into three blocks, each managed a church group represented in the TTLPCS (United, Combined Fellowship and Seventh Day) has aggravated matters by requiring more managers than are available. LUD, in consultation with the Development Bank, are considering a temporary suspension on further advances to the group until the entire project is reviewed. Meanwhile the bridges have yet to be built.

AI-101-121 and -122: Our continuing efforts (see projects AI-101-5/29, -45, -57, -65, -74, -94, -101, -116 and -117) in support of Land Purchase Cooperatives and the Land Use Development Division of the Ministry of Agriculture included two related training projects. The first brought the manager of the IHAP-

APPENDIX D

supported Vanuatu Plantation Support Association (PSA) to Honiara to participate in an LUD-sponsored workshop for LFC management. This was followed by sending two LFC managers to the PSA-supported Plantation Training Center for a ten month course. These two projects should provide excellent data for the LFCs and LUD for their possible future programming.

Section Three: Women In Development (WID) Projects

AI-101-48: The Isabel Mothers' Union rest house came near to completion this year with the installation of the last bits of equipment (water heater, etc.) called for under the project. After a "breaking in" period, we expect to wrap up this project and look for other ways we might help the Mothers' Union.

AI-101-60: The Guadalcanal SSEC Women's Band Cattle Project sold its first cattle this past year, and is continuing. Cyclone Namu caused flooding of the nearby Lungga River, destroying some of the pasture used for this project, but it is still too early to assess the impact of this damage.

AI-101-84 and -93: These two projects support the National Council of Women's plans to train and establish Women's Councils in Guadalcanal and Central provinces, respectively. The projects supported travel and per diem costs for the training and extension efforts of volunteer women leaders.