

PD-ABC-464  
10/2/01

**MID-TERM EVALUATION  
OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT**

**(OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00)**

**Between Lutheran World Relief  
and  
the Agency For International Development**

PD-ABC-464  
70-55

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
BUREAU FOR FOOD FOR PEACE AND VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE  
OFFICE OF PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY COOPERATION

MID-TERM EVALUATION OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT  
(OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00)  
WITH LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF (LWR)

Evaluation team:

James W. Rugh  
Independent Evaluator

Jeff Whisenant  
LWR Executive Assistant

Dr. J. Robert Busche  
Retired LWR Senior Advisor on Policy and Program Development

August - November 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. SUMMARY . . . . .	1
2. BACKGROUND . . . . .	5
3. EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK . . . . .	5
4. PRINCIPAL FINDINGS . . . . .	6
4.1. Partner selection: . . . . .	6
4.2. Resource and Facilitator: . . . . .	9
4.3. Partner Agreements: . . . . .	13
4.4. Monitoring and evaluation . . . . .	14
4.5. Is LWR able to strengthen local organizations and communities? . . . . .	18
4.6. Is LWR's program laying the groundwork for sustainable development once the grant is completed? . . . . .	19
4.7. Is LWR able to support, complement and influence host country governments whenever possible? . . . . .	21
4.8. Comparing LWR to other NGOs: . . . . .	22
5. EVALUATION ISSUES . . . . .	24
5.1. LWR's relationship to the Matching Grant . . . . .	24
5.2. LWR staffing structure in West Africa . . . . .	24
5.3. LWR partners in India . . . . .	26
5.4. Over-all staff-project relationships . . . . .	27
6. RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	28
6.1. Criteria for selecting partners . . . . .	28
6.2. LWR structure in West Africa . . . . .	28
6.3. LWR partners in India . . . . .	29
6.4. Promoting evaluation methodologies . . . . .	29
6.5. Promoting sustainable development . . . . .	29
6.6. Financial reporting form . . . . .	30
6.7. Objective #3 re. host governments . . . . .	30
6.8. Number of projects included in MG-III . . . . .	30
6.9. Reporting to A.I.D. . . . .	30
7. ASSESSMENT OF GRANT ACTIVITIES . . . . .	31
7.1. Four principal issues addressed by this evaluation: . . . . .	31
7.2. Answers to five basic questions: . . . . .	32
8. ANNEXES . . . . .	37
8.1. Glossary of Acronyms Used	
8.2. Places Visited and People Interviewed	
8.3. Perspective on Types and Numbers of Projects LWR Works With	
8.4. LWR Projects Supported by Matching Grant III	
8.5. Evaluation Scope of Work	
8.6. Definition of types of partners: Intermediary and Grassroots Agencies	
8.7. Questionnaire used	
8.8. Review of Responses to Questionnaire from Andean Area	

- 8.9. LWR Projects System Manual
- 8.10. Selected Bibliography

## 1. SUMMARY

1.1. Cooperative Agreement #OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00 between the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation in the Bureau of Food and Voluntary Assistance of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID/FVA/PVC), on one hand, and Lutheran World Relief (LWR), on the other hand, calls for a five-year grant covering the period of September 1, 1988 to August 31, 1993. The terms of that agreement call for a mid-term evaluation of this Matching Grant ("MG-III").

1.2. It was decided between USAID/FVA/PVC and LWR that this evaluation should include visits to three of the countries where there are projects covered by this Matching Grant: Niger, Burkina Faso, and India.

1.3. The first phase of this evaluation involved a visit to Niger and Burkina Faso by two members of the evaluation team, Jim Rugh (independent evaluator of rural development programs) and Jeff Whisenant (LWR Executive Assistant). The second phase involved a visit to projects in India by Jim Rugh and Dr. J. Robert Busche (retired LWR Senior Advisor on Policy and Program Development). LWR's partners in other countries covered by this Matching Grant were asked to respond to a questionnaire which had been sent to them. This report includes a synthesis of the findings by the evaluation team through direct visits to project holders in Niger, Burkina Faso and India, and a compilation of the questionnaires received from Senegal, Kenya, the Philippines, Peru, Bolivia and Ecuador.

1.4. This Matching Grant has three basic purposes or objectives:

1) To support poor communities in their efforts to meet their own needs as Lutheran World Relief partners as they share in the proposal design, implementation, evaluation, and promotion of development projects;

2) To support the evolution and strengthening of indigenous organizations and development networks capable of, and committed to, continuing development facilitation beyond the grant period; and

3) To support, complement and influence host country governments whenever possible.

1.5. On the basis of visits to ten project sites in three countries, discussions with partner agency staff and others, and through responses to questionnaires from 18 other partners in six countries, it is clear to the evaluation team that LWR is quite capable of meeting all of these objectives.

1.6. There are two qualifications:

1.6.1. Several LWR staff persons questioned whether "influencing" host country governments is really an objective of LWR. Evidently the wording was changed in the process of the preparation of the MG-III proposal. Although the

evaluators did find examples of how LWR has influenced the policies of governments (i.e. dry season garden wells in Niger), "influencing" host governments is not exactly LWR policy. It is therefore recommended that the third objective in the MG be modified as follows:

"To support and complement the development activities of host country governments whenever such activities are in accord with objectives 1 and 2, above."

1.6.2. Mention was made in the LWR proposal to A.I.D. of 80 projects to be included in this Matching Grant. It would be erroneous to consider this to be an important indicator or objective. As a matter of fact, LWR is funding 124 projects in the 13 countries included in MG-III. Although only 37 have been included so far in the list of those being funded by the Matching Grant, almost all of the 124 projects could qualify. However, in view of A.I.D.'s reporting requirements for each project, LWR prefers to limit the number of projects included in MG-III.

1.7. It is important to recognize that LWR does not operate its own projects in the field. Instead, its approach is that of identifying and supporting the work of partner agencies (existing groups) in the countries where it chooses to work. These include intermediary partners which offer a national perspective and through which LWR can extend assistance, advice and monitoring to grassroots partners. The latter are usually community-based organizations run by and for beneficiaries in a local area.

1.8. While affirming this philosophy, the evaluators caution LWR against taking on so many projects that their few staff are stretched too thinly to adequately support and monitor their partners in many countries. However, it is remarkable how well LWR does relate to its partners, in spite of the large numbers. This fact speaks well of the non-operational approach used by LWR.

1.9. LWR's criteria for selection of partners and projects dates back to 1974. For a variety of reasons, current LWR staff are not all familiar with those criteria. It is recommended that LWR staff in NY and in the field review the "Projects System Manual," and be more conscious of its contents.

1.10. The initiative leading to the establishment of partnerships between LWR and agencies may be taken by LWR or its intermediary partners, or by a local NGO seeking a source of funds and support for its project. In Niger, government structures are presently the only partners. Elsewhere LWR selects as partners non-governmental organizations (NGOs) whose philosophy and program are consistent with LWR's criteria and guidelines.

1.11. There is some variability in the form of assistance offered by LWR to its partners in different countries. In Niger LWR staff visit project partners almost once a month, offering assistance in technical, financial and managerial aspects. In other countries LWR staff may be involved less directly, but intermediary partner agencies in those countries provide the technical and managerial assistance needed. In

many cases such assistance is encouraged and facilitated by LWR but may involve referral of partners to locally available resources, rather than direct involvement by LWR itself.

1.12. This form of assistance contributes to the second over-all objective of the Matching Grant -- that of supporting the evolution and strengthening of indigenous organizations and networks to develop facilitation capacity which can continue beyond the grant period.

1.13. As mentioned above, there is quite a contrast between LWR's operations in Niger and the rest of West Africa (and the rest of the world). There have been good reasons for this unique intensive presence in Niger, mainly having to do with the commitment in the early 1970s to address the special needs of that country, and with the fact that the GON insisted that NGOs work through government services. In light of the reduction of LWR staff presence in the other West African countries from country directors to one regional representative, the evaluators raised the question concerning the justification of the continued presence of three expatriate staff in Niger. It can be argued that this model of direct, intensive involvement can yield dramatic results, but it is an exception to the philosophy of indirect, non-operational involvement practiced by LWR elsewhere in the world.

1.14. Another recommendation concerning West Africa is to reinforce LWR's policy of identifying and developing relationships with one or more intermediary partner agencies in each country (as is done in India, for example), rather than working directly with grassroots agencies, given the limited LWR staff.

1.15. The evaluation team was impressed with the use of major intermediary agencies in India, through which LWR maintains relationships with many partners (projects) without having its own staff in that country.

A recommendation for further strengthening that relationship is to broaden the range of expertise available by including more qualified persons in the pool of consultants called upon to advise projects, including members of other partner agencies themselves. This could be formalized as an advisory council and team of consultants coordinated by ICASA.

1.16. Although resources appear to be available for adequate monitoring and evaluation by LWR partner agencies, the evaluators believe this area of work could be improved. The evaluators found openness to assistance in improving the evaluation capacity of LWR's partner agencies. Evidently LWR in the Andean area has done much to develop evaluation methodology and practice. It is recommended that the methods developed there be shared with partners in other parts of the world.

1.17. Assumptions related to LWR's role as "resource and facilitator" appear warranted with respect to stability of partners, their openness to learning, and the adequacy of LWR funding.

1.18. Assumptions about partner selection also appear justified by the existence of capable and willing partners.

1.19. Contracts with partners were found from examination of files and survey information to be adequately documented through formal agreements, signed copies of which are in LWR and partner agency files.

1.20. Respondents to the questionnaire and the interviews utilized in this evaluation were asked to compare LWR with other international PVOs they have dealt with. LWR's method of operating, philosophy of approach, and relationships with its partners are much appreciated. Many examples were cited to illustrate ways LWR's methods are felt to be better than those of other PVOs.

1.21. Aside from a few specific recommendations for "fine tuning" LWR's operations, the evaluation team feels that there is no reason why the Matching Grant should not be continued. This seems to be a wise investment of US Government funds.

## 2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Lutheran World Relief (LWR) is a not-for profit voluntary organization incorporated in New York State in 1945. The Board of Directors which governs LWR's work has eleven directors drawn from two national churches that provide the bulk of LWR's non-governmental support: the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod. LWR was founded in response to the needs of post World War II Europe. Since this beginning, LWR has evolved as a major relief and development agency meeting relief and humanitarian needs throughout the world. In the early 1970s LWR's program emphasis began to shift from relief to development.

2.2. The majority of LWR's development activities involve the support of indigenous agencies. LWR does not directly implement projects. Instead, it facilitates development by accompanying local partners who have priorities compatible to its own in order to assist society's poorest members. LWR supports the work of its partners through grants for community-based projects, training, technical assistance, administrative overhead, and organizational development. Local partners are defined as "project holders" in LWR programs.

2.3. This current Matching Grant (OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00) is the third such grant that LWR has received from USAID/FVA/PVC, augmenting LWR's considerable private resources with grants from USAID. Cooperative Agreement #AID/SOD/PDC-G-0124 ran from 1979 to 1983, and was followed by Cooperative Agreement #PDC-0176-G-SS-3162-00 from 1983 to 1988. In addition, LWR received an OPG (AID-621-17-110-80-01) from USAID/Tanzania to support a water resource and village life improvement project in that country.

2.4. Under the terms of the Cooperative Agreement (as amended), LWR may use Matching Grant funds in the following thirteen countries: India, Philippines, Senegal, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger, Sudan, Kenya, Tanzania, Madagascar, Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador.

2.5 This evaluation is in accordance with the grant, which calls for a mid-term evaluation in the second year of the grant. In addition, there will be a final evaluation in the last year of the grant.

## 3. EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

3.1. The Statement of Work for the mid-term evaluation of this Matching Grant listed four principal issues to be addressed:

- 1) What are the different ways that LWR establishes and maintains partner relations?
- 2) Are LWR's partners receiving adequate technical and management assistance from LWR to achieve their goals?
- 3) Is LWR able to strengthen local organizations and communities?

4) Is LWR's program laying the ground work for sustainable local development once the grant is completed?

3.2. In addressing the above issues, the evaluators were asked to ask five basic questions of LWR's program:

- 1) Are the stated objectives of the Grant Agreement being met?
  - a) If yes -- what is the nature of the progress?
  - b) If not -- what are the barriers preventing program implementation? What steps is LWR taking to overcome barriers?
- 2) Are the assumptions for achieving the desired outputs warranted in light of grant activity to date?
- 3) Are the original objectives reasonable given the magnitude of the activity and LWR's technical and management capability?
- 4) Should the objectives of the grant be re-assessed?
- 5) What steps, if any, should be taken in the remaining period of the grant to achieve the objectives of the Grant Agreement?

#### 4. PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

To answer the questions posed in the evaluation scope of work, a series of indicators were identified. The evaluators addressed questions dealing with these indicators to those persons they interviewed in person, and, through a questionnaire by mail, to those related to projects included in this Matching Grant in other countries (see Annex 8.2.). What follows is a compilation of some of the responses obtained, arranged by indicator:

##### 4.1. Partner selection:

4.1.1. Number of contacts by prospective partners and types of proposal:

4.1.1.1. LWR/Niger has not been actively seeking new partners in the recent past, having its hands full with existing projects. Were it to do so, the GON's Ministry of Plan would have many proposals for consideration. However, LWR/Niger prefers to develop proposals with potential partners at the local level, rather than simply accepting them as written "to whom it may concern."

4.1.1.2. It was not possible to ascertain the number of potential partners which had been contacted by LWR. This is not a statistic felt necessary to record.

4.1.2. Existence and type of criteria for selecting partners:

4.1.2.1. Basic criteria for selecting partners are included in LWR's policy on "Partners and Allies":

The complexity of tasks, limited resources and urgent need require effective cooperation with Lutheran and other Christian and secular service agencies whose purposes are akin to those of LWR. To assure good stewardship, LWR shall develop and maintain working relationships which:

- prevent duplication or competition of effort;
- facilitate coordination of resource commitments in jointly supported programs;
- promote the development of uniform accountability standards;
- improve the quality of evaluation and learning from field-based experience; and
- provide means for examining common problems and voicing common concerns.

4.1.2.2. During the drought of the mid 1970's, LWR established many projects in Niger, most of them involving wells for dry season gardening. Having established its expertise in this field, LWR/Niger screens proposals for prospective partners mainly according to whether or not they include such wells and gardens.

4.1.2.3. The staff of LWR/Niger told the evaluators that since most LWR-supported projects in that country were "cookbook" integrated development projects based on wells construction and dry season gardening, they had not referred recently to any written criteria.

4.1.2.4. Seen in the files in LWR/Niamey was a paper titled "Proposal for a strategy to Deal with World Hunger" dated 1974, which included criteria for selecting projects. A further development of this criteria in 1975, "Development Strategy Guidelines," is included in the LWR "Projects System Manual."

4.1.2.5. Most of the projects visited in India are integrated rural development projects, which focus on equipping the poorest members of a community to avail themselves of health, education, training, gardening, and income generation elements (including agriculture, livestock and handicrafts).

4.1.2.6. However, it is unclear whether or not LWR's intermediary partner in India, the Inter-Church Service Association (ICSA), has and uses written criteria for the selection of projects, other than the 1974 guidelines. LWR Director for Asia and the Middle East Gene Thiemann told the evaluators that there is not a written contract between LWR and ICSA, and specific criteria are communicated occasionally through correspondence. An example he cited was contained in a letter from LWR/NY to ICSA dated November 8, 1990, asking ICSA for a short

strategy paper on how LWR/ICSA can implement their new focus on Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and Bihar.

4.1.2.7. Though it was not evident to the evaluators that all field offices of LWR were utilizing current LWR guidelines in the selection of partners and projects, Dr. Norman Barth (LWR Executive Director) pointed out that headquarters staff are aware of the LWR criteria, and that even if field staff did propose projects that do not meet the criteria, the Project Screening Committee would not approve the projects.

4.1.2.8. It is recommended that the LWR headquarters help clarify for LWR field staff and intermediary partners what the current criteria are, and where they are written down. (See recommendation in section 6).

#### 4.1.3. Number of partners selected:

4.1.3.1. Since the current method of projects was established in the late 1970s, LWR has selected a total of 56 projects in Niger (with the "partners" being 14 of the 28 arrondissements, plus the urban centers of Tahoua and Niamey) in that country. Eight projects are included in the Matching Grant.

4.1.3.2. In all, LWR is currently supporting 124 bilateral projects in these 13 countries; 37 of these projects are included in Matching Grant III.

#### 4.1.4. Process to determine the type of program for the selected partner:

4.1.4.1. In most cases in Niger the type of program is the predominant criteria used in selecting partners. Past experience and relationship with the local (arrondissement) government staff is also a factor, but they are moved around so frequently this can not be the major consideration.

4.1.4.2. As stated by Africa Director Frank Conlon, LWR seeks to support projects proposed by "the people," though not uncritically. They identify key individuals (such as extension agents, wells technicians), provide them with more training, expose them to other projects, and help those who conceived of the project to articulate better what the possibilities are.

4.1.4.3. The process preferred by the Ministry of Plan of the Government of Niger is for NGOs to accept proposals it has in its files. LWR prefers to be involved with the local government agents and community persons in the development of the plans for a project.

4.1.4.4. In India, LWR/ICSA place primary responsibility on the type of program and partner agency. While

dialogue and suggestions for modification may be initiated by LWR/ICSA at the outset or during the course of implementation, the partner agency is expected to have conceived the program with the intended beneficiaries, and its modification would normally result from findings from monitoring and evaluation.

4.1.4.5. Partners in the Andean area, especially those located close to where the local LWR representative has his office, expressed appreciation for the contacts they had with the LWR representative, especially relative to clarifying project objectives and considering evaluation methodology early in the process.

4.1.4.6. One of the projects in the Philippines (Primary Health Care Development Project) gave this description of how contact with LWR was initiated:

Rev. Gene Thiemann first came to visit us on a Sunday two years ago and asked for a briefing regarding the activities of IPHC, particularly in the field of Primary Health Care. He encouraged us to submit a proposal to LWR for the training of the staff of other NGOs who wanted to implement PHC but who did not have the competence to do so.

4.1.4.7. A respondent in Kenya described the then LWR staff person as being a bit pushy in pushing his own ideas into the project's proposal in 1986. He has since left LWR employment.

#### 4.2. Resource and Facilitator:

##### 4.2.1. General comments:

4.2.1.1. LWR Africa Director Frank Conlon feels that the role of resource and facilitator is definitely that played by LWR, especially in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal. He cited as examples the roles of Kathy Mintz (former staffer in Senegal) and David Olson (Mali). Mintz "always" took persons from one agency along with her to visit other projects, facilitating the exchange of ideas and experiences. Olson uses Development Facilitation Funds (up to \$10,000 in fiscal year 1990, maximum \$3,000 per project) for micro-grants for such things as a) workshops to exchange information, appropriate technology, etc.; b) small discrete projects on a small scale to test a new partner agency; or c) feasibility or base-line studies which may be used to design a new project. Olson also publishes a newsletter to circulate ideas among LWR's partners, called "Echanges d'Idees."

4.2.1.2. Similar Development Facilitation Funds are available in each LWR region.

4.2.1.3. In India it is apparent that LWR and its cooperating agents give high priority to the provision of resources for training, learning exposure through exchange visitation, and workshops.

4.2.2. Number of workshops held, content and attendees:

4.2.2.1. LWR in West Africa does not run many workshops itself, but often facilitates arrangements for participants in its projects to attend workshops organized by third parties (see below). However, in Niger, where LWR has gained expertise in well construction, it does have its own well trainers on staff, and they do training in those techniques. A number of projects mentioned that their participants got their inspiration and ideas on techniques by LWR's arranging for them to visit existing LWR projects elsewhere.

4.2.2.2. In India ICOSA has organized gatherings of LWR/ICOSA partners twice a year, one in the north and one in the south. Each of these gatherings is hosted by one of the partners, so the others have a chance to learn about that particular project, in addition to networking and exchanging experiences with staff from other projects. The director and one other staff person are invited to participate.

4.2.2.3. The partner in Senegal reported attending a workshop organized by LWR on accounting.

4.2.2.4. Thirteen of the 15 respondents in Latin America said that they have attended a total of 30 LWR workshops on a variety of topics, including 17 on various aspects of institutional or project evaluation (including a reflection/ evaluation of the LWR Andean Regional Office).

4.2.3. Number and substance of visits to third party projects:

4.2.3.1. The members of the cooperative at Bolongou in Niger told of experiences similar to those reported by participants in other projects. They visited projects in Saye, Agadez and Filingue to see methods of gardening used in those areas (quite far from Bolongou). They reported learning about different systems of irrigation, tree nurseries for live fences around gardens, and methods of preventing soil erosion. They also learned methods of processing cassava into "gari," the construction of improved mud stoves, and other techniques, including how to run co-op meetings (from CLUSA agents). The experiences of the members of the cooperative of Bolongou are indicative of those of various other cooperatives or project-holders.

4.2.3.2. The project holder in Senegal wrote that LWR staffers Kathy Mintz and Jim Noss helped arrange visits to two other projects. At one he was impressed by the small earthen dams and the way wells were constructed near the ponds for irrigating gardens.

4.2.3.3. Partners in India spoke with appreciation of arrangements facilitated by LWR/ICSA for them to visit other projects to gain new insights on approaches and experiences relevant to needs of their own communities.

4.2.3.4. Five of the 15 partners in Latin America responding to the questionnaire mentioned 12 projects they have visited (one partner has visited 6 projects). Included in learnings were different technologies and community structure among indigenous groups as compared to their area of work, and a confirmation of the idea that rural development requires commitment of multiple social forces.

#### 4.2.4. Number and substance of site visits by LWR staff and consultants:

4.2.4.1. Monitoring visits to project sites are remarkably well organized in Niger. In the LWR/Niamey files 84 letters were found announcing visits to projects between September 1988 and July 1990.

4.2.4.2. LWR monitors visit projects in Niger about once a month during the seasons when there is activity. This was confirmed by most of the partners visited. In Gaya, for example, the evaluators were told that a LWR representative has visited there "at least every month." And each time they visit the site of the project (in this case, a forest preserve) and attend meetings of the cooperative.

4.2.4.3. At Zourbattan, Niger, there was laughter when participants were asked how many times LWR staff have visited the project. "Didier more times than we can count! Also Marily 5 times; Lou 4 times." "These visits are helpful," they added. "LWR monitors check the accounts, tell us what isn't going well. If left to ourselves, the project wouldn't go well." The LWR staff "never" visit the project site without bringing along the Government Coordinator from the town of Nkonni.

4.2.4.4. The partner in Senegal was visited by Jim Noss (from LWR/NY) in December, 1989, otherwise no visits by LWR staff since Kathy Mintz left the Dakar office over a year ago.

4.2.4.5. A partner in Kenya reports that there has been only one visit to the project's headquarters by a LWR staff person, and no visits to the project site. "New York is a bit far for smooth communication."

4.2.4.6. One of the Latin America partners said that they had no visits from LWR staff. All the others had visits to their project office, the project site, or both. Thirteen have visited the LWR office at least once. They commented that these visits, better than written communication, help to clarify the relationship with LWR, and give occasions to deal with project matters (problems, progress, suggestions).

4.2.5. Number and type of material and financial support provided to project holders:

4.2.5.1. In spite of serious difficulties recently with the banking system in Niger, the LWR staff have been very helpful in transmitting funds to projects in a timely fashion. There have even been instances when they have carried cash on their visits to projects. Appreciation was expressed with LWR's consideration for the cash-flow needs of the projects.

4.2.5.2. In Burkina Faso there was general satisfaction with the way funds are transmitted, but there was one example of sluggish response to a timely need: the CNN co-op at Nakamtenga asked LWR for assistance in transporting rocks for the construction of contour barriers to prevent soil erosion. They wanted to start work in December, when it was cool, but the funds did not come from LWR/NY until March, which didn't leave much time before the rainy season was to start.

Then they wrote a letter to LWR/NY in July of 1989 asking that a second phase of the project be funded. They said that they have not yet received a reply from LWR/NY (14 months later). They used their own funds and borrowed others to do more contour barriers during the 1990 season. It appears that the changes in LWR staff responsible for Burkina Faso has left things unclear, and this project is one example of the consequence. (Further comments on this subject under Evaluation Issues.)

4.2.5.3. The partner in Senegal feels that LWR's financial forms are "very, very difficult to fill out." Kathy Mintz helped them to fill out the first report; since then they have been filling out the financial reports in their own way and sending them to LWR/NY. Since there has been no feedback from NY, they assume that LWR accepts their method of reporting.

4.2.5.4. In India project managers at all four Matching Grant projects expressed satisfaction with the mode and promptness of financial transfers.

4.2.5.5. All 15 respondents in Latin America feel that LWR's reporting requirements are fair and helpful; that transfers of money are timely, adequate, simple, non-bureaucratic and agile; that reporting requirements are

practical, simple and help keep track of the state of their budgets.

#### 4.2.6. Number and type of information provided to project holders by LWR:

4.2.6.1. As stated by Marily Knieriemen, Director of LWR/Niger, LWR does not see its primary role to be to give out information, though it does give the GON technical services the means to provide information to project participants. The exception is that LWR/Niger has done some training in well technologies, and has produced manuals for PMB (open concrete garden wells) and hand augured wells. It has also spread information on live fences, solar food drying, and cassava processing. The LWR staff do make suggestions for places to make technical visits to learn more from others.

4.2.6.2. A numerical assessment was not possible in India, but it is apparent that information is frequently extended by ICSA to the partner agencies. This includes referrals to appropriate government offices and programs for obtaining information and assistance for various types of activities. One partner listed as examples of information provided by ICSA: clarity regarding project management and accounting procedures; dry land farming; water management; linkages with a community health center; and technology transfer for low cost housing.

4.2.6.3. The Latin America partners gave a long list of types of information they have received from LWR. These include administrative guidelines, financial reporting guidelines, alternative technologies, bibliography on organic agriculture, information on traditional medicine, conclusions on the workshop on institutional evaluation, documents on nonformal education, reports on other projects supported by LWR, the self-evaluation manual and more.

#### 4.3. Partner Agreements:

##### 4.3.1. Agreements on file:

4.3.1.1. Agreements for all active Niger projects were found in the LWR/Niamey files.

4.3.1.2. Those responsible at each project site also acknowledged having copies of the agreements in their files. Some were more aware than others of the contents of those agreements.

4.3.1.3. At Nakamtenga, Burkina Faso, the evaluators were told, "Yes, we have an agreement. It is very fair. We read it together to see if the (co-op) committee had any questions before signing it."

4.3.1.4. Due to recent staff changes, it was not clear where all the files pertaining to projects in other West African countries are, but it can be safely assumed that agreements exist and are in the LWR files either in the country, the new regional office in Niamey, or in New York.

4.3.1.5. Each of the four projects visited in India said that they have agreements on file.

#### 4.3.2. Number of active agreements:

4.3.2.1. Agreements were seen for eight active projects in Niger: Dadin Kowa, Gaya, Nadara, Bahe Bolongou, Yakaouda, Boni, Dazga II, and Zourbattan II.

4.3.2.2. Each of the projects visited in India had an agreement (or letter of understanding) with LWR.

4.3.2.3. Eleven of the Latin America respondents said that they do have official agreements with LWR. One, CADEP, did not reply, and another, APDES, replied negatively. At the time the questionnaires were received the LWR projects with these partners had ended. So it is explainable why they do not have active agreements with LWR at this time.

4.3.2.4. LWR retains the right to revoke agreements with projects which do not live up to expectations. There have been some cases when payments to a project have been put on hold pending receipt of reports. However, it has not been necessary to revoke the agreements with any of the projects included under the Matching Grant.

#### 4.3.3. Content of agreements:

4.3.3.1. There was general agreement that the content of the agreements with LWR was helpful to partners. Luc Bertrand of UNAIS in Burkina Faso was more effusive than most: He feels that the LWR agreement serves as a good guide for evaluations. It has useful details; the project management team referred to it last December during a meeting in which they wanted to check on the sense of LWR's purposes for funding that project. In response to a new staff member's implication that new leadership may not be able or willing to do what the agreement called for, Bertrand responded: "The agreement is the constitution. Representatives of partner agencies signed it, not as individuals, but on behalf of their agencies. If the project is changed by changing individuals, the population will not be served as it should be. It is precious to have the agreement. It is a tool which educates those who follow us. One is guided by a stable document."

4.3.3.2. Of the Latin American partners responding to the questionnaire, most agreed that the agreements are helpful, defining goals, and are flexible. One commented that there is excessive emphasis on quantitative aspects such as in the area of goal definition.

#### 4.4. Monitoring and evaluation

##### 4.4.1. Monitoring and evaluation schedules:

4.4.1.1. The LWR staff in Niger try to make a monitoring visit to each project about once a month. This may vary due to the level of seasonal activity, availability of governmental technical service agents to accompany LWR staff on project visits, and the staff's vacation schedules.

4.4.1.2. The LWR/Niger staff say that there are always evaluations at the end of a project, sometimes during a project. If a second phase of a project is a possibility, an evaluation of the first phase is conducted in time to affect the planning for the second phase.

4.4.1.3. In Burkina Faso, where evaluations are scheduled to be conducted every year, the UNAIS project was evaluated at the end of the first 14 months, but the second year evaluation was postponed because the project was given an unfunded extension.

4.4.1.4. In India the staff of ICSA and CASA are relied on to monitor LWR-funded projects. An example of a monitoring report was seen for the IRRM project, written by M. Francis and Moses Manohar of ICSA on their 1 1/2 day visit May 18-19, 1990. It was quite thorough, raising critical issues. IRRM Director G.N. Reddi responded with a letter addressed to LWR with copy to ICSA. The previous ICSA monitoring visit to this project site was in September of 1988 (by Dr. Cherian, a previous ICSA staffer). Though ICSA staff had met with Dr. Reddi at other locations, they had not actually made a monitoring visit to the project during 20 months.

##### 4.4.2. Evaluations on file:

4.4.2.1 Major evaluations on file include several from India (CAST and CMAI) and Niger.

4.4.2.2. Individual project evaluations seen in the LWR/Niamey files include, among others:

- Yakaouda (Oct. 6, 1989) by two extension agents: Moussa Idrissa and Namaka Soho;
- Tahoua gardens (1982, 1983 and 1984) by Animation Service;

- Boni (May 31, 1990) by LWR/Niger Director, Chef de Service Agricole, one literacy agent and one agent of the Ministry of Plan.

4.4.2.3. There was an evaluation of LWR projects in Niger by Fred Weber & Marilyn Hoskins in 1982, followed by a response by the LWR/Niger staff, then follow-up by Joe Sprunger of LWR/NY (Oct. 13, 1982) setting forth policy guidelines for LWR/Niger.

4.4.2.4. An audit in 1982 by Messrs. Cesar et Boissin. was very critical of the existing accounting procedures. This led to the hiring of a LWR/Niger Financial Officer, who established new accounting procedures.

4.4.2.5. In May of 1985 five LWR/Niger projects were evaluated by Edith Thacher and Bill Fitzgerald. Issues addressed included the beneficiaries of the wells & gardens projects.

4.4.2.6. In January of 1988 Amy O'Neil reported on her 1986-87 follow-up evaluations of 634 gardeners in nine former LWR wells projects. Part of her conclusion illustrates that LWR is benefiting from the learnings of these evaluations: "By taking a look at former projects all of us at LWR/Niger have become better at evaluating the effectiveness of ongoing project activities and studying new project proposals. ... By addressing and taking steps to correct the weak points we have identified we feel that we are improving the LWR/Niger program."

#### 4.4.3. Evaluation scopes of work:

LWR's documents for each project contain goals and objectives, and plans for evaluations, including indicators to be measured. It is clear that the inclusion of these plans is well institutionalized. What is not as clear is whether or not partners are fully aware of these plans and use them in actual evaluations.

#### 4.4.4. Evaluation methodologies developed:

4.4.4.1. As mentioned above, LWR has institutionalized evaluation planning to the extent of including it in project documents. But in Niger, at least, there has not been very much emphasis on training partners in evaluation methodologies. Director Marily Knieriemen did mention that LWR is now sending aide-encadreurs (project extension agents) to a project two to three weeks before an evaluation to obtain background data. Project evaluations generally consist of agents from the Ministry of Plan and technical services meeting with villagers for group discussions. On occasion an expatriate consultant is brought in. According to Knieriemen, few Nigerien

consultants in evaluation methodologies are available. (This issue is discussed further in the Recommendations.)

4.4.4.2. The partner in Senegal reports that LWR has neither aided in the development nor the elaboration of evaluation of the project. An evaluation is being planned with the help of Maisons Familiales of Senegal.

4.4.4.3. In India, likewise, project documents contain plans and indicators for evaluation, but this evaluation team felt there to be much room for enhanced evaluation practice. For example, an evaluation was scheduled for the IRRM project in December, but plans were still only in the early discussion stage during the team's visit in early November. ICSA acknowledged the need for ideas for alternative methodologies for conducting evaluations. (See recommendation 6.4 on this subject.)

4.4.4.4. It is not clear just how the plans and list of indicators for evaluation are developed during the process of finalizing project plans prior to their being approved for LWR funding. In some cases the partner's plans appear to be accepted as presented. In other cases it seems that LWR writes in its own. The process of dialoguing during the development of project plans would be a good time for learning to take place on improved evaluation methodologies.

4.4.4.5. At least seven of the partners in Latin America mentioned using the self-evaluation methodologies recommended by the LWR Andean Regional Office, either separately or combined with external evaluation. Three have developed special evaluation forms, and one has instituted an evaluation and monitoring unit in its organization. Two partners make specific mention of collecting quantitative data for analysis. Two mention that they involve LWR directly in their evaluation efforts at some point in time. Only one limits its reference to an institutional evaluation/reflection.

The answers from the Latin America partners indicate a definite preoccupation with the idea of evaluation -- probably as a result of LWR's insistence -- but are not specific enough with regard to details or quality of the evaluations. According to the LWR representative who analyzed the responses to these questionnaires, one can only assume that when they talk about self-evaluation as a process, that they implement the process as well as possible.

4.4.4.6. One of the partners in the Philippines described the guidance offered by LWR in developing their monitoring methodology as the provision of the (logical) framework for reporting, and that evaluations are not structured but are left to third party evaluators.

4.4.4.7. A respondent from Kenya said that evaluation methods are agreed upon with LWR at the start of a project, and that they are based on the set targets, baseline information and the achievements made. Also mentioned was the use of the logical framework.

#### 4.4.5. Methodologies transferred to partners:

4.4.5.1. LWR in the Andean area has held four workshops on self-evaluation and has published a manual to share evaluation methodologies with its partners and others. According to Director of Latin American Programs Tom Edwards, these workshops have consisted of orientation to evaluation methods, development of basic evaluation prototypes, and have instituted a successful, on-going learning process.

Replies to the questionnaire by 15 of the Latin American partners indicate that LWR has done an effective job in making the NGOs think about evaluation as a necessary part of their project planning. In all cases except one LWR either directly advised the design of the evaluation process or provided written documentation to the partner agency about the need and how to do it.

4.4.5.2. Partners in India report that they have had some advice from LWR/ICSA on how to conduct monitoring and evaluation, including modifications to the indicators listed in the project documents. ICSA staff send back comments on the quarterly monitoring reports submitted by projects. One partner reports ICSA's encouraging them to increase the participation of people's organizations in the monitoring and evaluation process (IRRM). Final evaluations seem to have mostly been done by selected outsiders.

4.4.5.3. According to Frank Conlon, LWR in Kenya has used partners as members of team evaluations of other projects.

4.4.5.4. The LWR staff in Niger admit that LWR/Niger has not been involved in training in evaluation methodologies. Their emphasis is on technology.

#### 4.4.6. Training materials

As mentioned above, a manual on self-evaluation has been published by LWR in the Andean Area. PHILDHARRA, LWR's Philippine intermediary, has written and shared extensively on this subject. No training materials on evaluation have been produced or disseminated by LWR in Africa or India.

#### 4.5. Is LWR able to strengthen local organizations and communities?

4.5.1. The method of operating in Niger, for LWR and most other western NGOs, has been to work through the local

governmental technical services. (This modus operandi has been imposed by the GON for many years.) These projects have focused on technical aspects, but may have had an indirect effect on local institutional capacity building, by working with the various forms of local cooperatives, and by strengthening (or at least enabling) the technical services in their work.

4.5.1.1. LWR/Niger Director Marily Knieriemen has proposed a new strategy of exploring possibilities of working more directly with Nigerien NGOs. In her leadership role in Groupement des Aides Privées (GAP, Niger's NGO consortium), she has helped to bring this issue to a national discussion between GON and NGOs operating in Niger.

4.5.1.2. Working with co-ops in Niger, according to Knieriemen, works towards the goal of strengthening local organizations. During exchange visits the leaders of one community co-op network with those from another community, exchanging ideas and experiences. The LWR/Niger staff feel that more training needs to be done to strengthen co-ops.

4.5.2. The partners interviewed in India, with the notable exception of CMAI, expressed appreciation for the support LWR/ICSA is giving to their organizations. (CMAI has expertise of its own in the health field which surpasses that of ICSA.) However, most of the comments had to do with the technical expertise offered by ICSA staff and consultants in their network, not so much in their skills or experience in organizational development per se. It can well be argued that equipping NGOs to respond to the technical needs of members of their communities does, indeed, strengthen the capacities of local organizations.

4.5.3. A partner in Kenya said that he did not think his organization was being strengthened by its relationship with LWR as much as it could be, though the training budget has been helpful in enabling the project to train staff. He then went on to say that "LWR staff have been supportive and encouraging and offering information and comments along the way."

4.5.4. The Latin American respondents said that LWR has helped strengthen the partners directly by way of personnel training, information and experience exchange with other NGOs, contacts with other international funding agencies, direct financial support of institutional goals as expressed in project proposals, advice in project planning (especially in goal definition and evaluation needs) and general collaboration in problem solving.

4.5.5. A summary observation with regard to LWR's ability to strengthen local organizations and communities: though it varies in style and abilities from region to region and

country to country, overall the form of assistance provided by LWR and its intermediary agencies does enable its partners to develop their organizational capabilities.

4.6. Is LWR's program laying the groundwork for sustainable development once the grant is completed?

4.6.1. The Amy O'Neil follow-up evaluation in Niger (1986-87) showed that many of the gardeners LWR helped with wells have continued to carry on dry-season irrigated gardening. In addition to helping construct these wells, LWR's wells trainers trained local men how to maintain these wells and construct others. The problem is that these wells are too expensive for poor villagers to pay for themselves, unless they are near enough to an urban area for market gardening to be commercially economic. (Even then credit would be very difficult to obtain.) Granted that some form of subsidy may be required for the construction of these wells, it does seem to be a technology well suited to sites in Niger where shallow water tables can be found.

4.6.1.1. At Bolongou, Niger, the evaluation team was told that wells cost about 15,000 FCFA/meter. In the first two phases of this project the wells were free for participants. In the planned Phase III they will be asked to contribute 5,000 FCFA (1/3 of actual cost).

4.6.1.2. LWR staffer Jon Naugle observes that, without any maintenance, the LWR PMB wells last anywhere from 1 to 10 seasons, depending on the soil and the method of extracting water. The useful life of these wells can be extended with proper maintenance and deepening. Some villagers have deepened some of their own wells, but that is the exception. The prevailing attitude is that others (govt., NGOs) should maintain the wells for the population. (LWR trains local wells technicians who are capable of maintaining wells, but even if they have not moved away to find jobs elsewhere, it requires some form of continuing project funding for them to deepen the wells.)

4.6.2. Referring to the Nadara (Niger) project, Agricultural Agent Aly Bete at Illela said that his observation is that the loans given by LWR for sheep fattening have enabled participants to make profits which they then reinvest in other animals for fattening. There is a good repayment rate. Bete feels that the co-op will continue after LWR's funding ends: it has the money in its loan fund, and reimbursements should keep coming in.

4.6.3. In Burkina Faso the LWR-supported project at Nakamtenga, like many others in that country, have picked up on a technology developed by OXFAM in the Ouahigouya area. This involves placing stones (actually large chunks of laterite) along contour lines to decrease soil erosion. The problem is that these stones are not always locally available.

To haul them in by truck is expensive, but that is what LWR (and some other NGOs) are subsidizing. LWR helps to pay for the tools for breaking and hauling rocks (picks, wheelbarrows), and for the cost of trucks to transport the rocks to the project site. Catholic Relief Services provides food-for-work.

4.6.4. One of the Kenyan partners feels that the project farm and farm supply shop are likely to be self sustaining by the end of the contract with LWR. However, the health and extension program, and water development, "will not be sustainable for some time to come."

4.6.5. Several of the projects visited in India have economic projects. Examples include scrap metal presses, sewing factories, crafts production, and animal husbandry. Many of these projects appear to have potential for sustainability, especially if the revolving loan funds started by the projects continue to function effectively.

4.6.6. There is a temptation for projects anywhere to want to develop their own "campuses" for use as training centers, demonstration farms, seed or livestock multiplication, or whatever. When evaluated in terms of sustainability, it is difficult to see how these institutions can keep going without continued outside subsidies. Many examples have been seen around the world of how such campuses have become albatrosses to well-intended programs.

4.6.6.1. The evaluators urge LWR to guide their partners away from the developing of such centers, and towards more extension-oriented approaches, promoting individuals (farmers, etc.) to become models for their neighbors.

4.7. Is LWR able to support, complement and influence host country governments whenever possible?

4.7.1. Since the drought of 1984 the Government of Niger (GON) has promoted dry-season gardening as a national policy. LWR's successful gardening technique served as a model for this national program.

4.7.1.1. In addition, LWR's model of integrated development (along with those of some other NGOs) is, according to Marilyn Knieriemen, being accepted more and more by GON. This is true also of LWR's project proposal format. A United Nations organization provided consultants to advise the GON on writing proposals. They met with various agencies, including LWR, and now LWR recognizes aspects of its proposal format in the GON format.

4.7.1.2. However, Knieriemen feels that the goal of complementing and influencing the host government is not a conscious goal of LWR/Niger, but is a by-product.

4.7.1.3. A World Bank evaluation done in June, 1990, noted the needs for projects "to respond to needs of rural people, and limited capacity of (GON) technical services to respond to all the demands coming from classic aid projects," recommended that the technical services "identify NGOs or private operators capable of supporting them in the preparation and execution of projects..."

4.7.1.4. USAID/Niger just signed a new convention with GON. At A.I.D.'s insistence, there will be increased emphasis on promoting work done by expatriate and indigenous NGOs. LWR has encouraged this development.

4.7.2. One of LWR's partners, the Christian Medical Association of India (CMAI), has considerable influence on national health issues in India. This includes responsibility for certification in nursing education, paramedical diplomas, post-grad degree-level education for doctors, etc.

4.7.2.1. Other partners evaluated in India have complementary working relationships, if not influence, on government at the local (District) level. In some cases this includes encouraging the poor to approach governmental authorities to obtain services due them.

4.7.3. Though examples were found of how LWR or LWR's partner agencies have affected government policy in a number of countries, LWR staff are uncomfortable with stating as a major objective the "influencing" of host governments. It is recommended that the wording of this third objective be changed. Such a recommendation is made in Assessment of Grant Activities (section 7.2.4.).

#### 4.8. Comparing LWR to other NGOs:

4.8.1. In Burkina Faso, members of the CNN co-op at Nakamtenga spoke very highly of LWR's relationship: "LWR is not the same as other NGOs. Others give money, but don't stop to see whether CNN used the money well or not. With LWR, we enjoy closer relations, everybody knows what is happening. Some other NGOs simply give money to the Prefet, tell him to help the peasants, but what peasant could go to the Prefet to ask for help? LWR works with the grassroots. The peasants are responsible for the project, not LWR. LWR's follow-up gives CNN strength. If money is missing, LWR knows because it is there 'sur le terrain.' LWR can also help with technical solutions. If a donor finances a 1 million FCFA project and follows it up well, that is better than a donor that finances a 100 million FCFA project and does not follow it up well. Because LWR visits frequently, we can discuss these problems face to face--if CNN had to put all this in writing, the response would have been unsatisfactory." [This testimonial in spite of the fact that there have been gaps in LWR staff turnover!]

4.8.2. The Bolongou coordinator in Niger said that LWR's methods of contact with partners is different. "Others work only with coordinator (don't visit the villages as LWR staff do). LWR is always informed, always schedules their visits. Each government service is informed of LWR visits. After each visit, a report follows. Each technical service sees the financial reports. In other projects, there is not the same level of contact. The villagers like to see the LWR representatives in the field. The villagers know they are not alone."

4.8.3. Erna Kerst, USAID/Niamey, said that PVOs which have succeeded in Niger are basically those which started in the mid 1970's, mainly CARE, AFRICARE, and LWR. "We've always been very happy with LWR; good collaboration; we respect their independence." A.I.D. has come around to doing activities that are more like those of PVOs. What PVOs are doing in Niger is very important, even though they are few. "LWR's wells and dry season gardens have influenced national policy, which GON now pushes, and counts vegetable production as part of its accounting of food production in the country."

4.8.4. The OXFAM staff in Burkina Faso were asked to compare LWR with other NGOs that do not have bases in Ouagadougou. Their reply: At least LWR's base is in Niamey (rather than just in a foreign headquarters city). They don't just breeze through the country and leave on the next plane. LWR goes to the field to visit projects. Dada (of AMURT) went to Niger to learn wells technology. It appears that follow-up is effective from Niamey. Other NGOs depend on local "sponsor", feel that LWR could benefit from this also. They recommend having local "antenna" in the field. LWR should evaluate the health of its Burkina Faso program, see if it has a chance of taking off; if it does, open up local "antenna". (More on this subject of the need for intermediary partners in Recommendations, chapter 6.)

4.8.5. ICSA in India reports that the Swedish NGO Diaconia has recently adopted the LWR-type relationship of working through ICSA in southern India. Previously the Diaconia representative based in Dacca, Bangladesh, related directly to individual projects in India. Now it, like LWR, relies on ICSA as an intermediary, to help assist and monitor projects. (Evidently this and some other funding agencies had not required projects to submit financial reports, only an assurance that their finances had been audited.)

4.8.6. Dr. G.N.Reddi of IRRM in India expressed appreciation for LWR's holistic approach, rather than the sectorial specialties of some NGOs. Some funders are willing to fund "X but not Y," one technology but not another. He feels this denies the local partners flexibility and latitude to determine program directions in response to needs ascertained in the local community. "If the local partner is judged competent, allow the democratic process to determine program

at the local level," he said. Dr. Reddi likes the way LWR does this.

4.8.6.1 The evaluators point out, however, that there can be value to insisting that a partner develop plans, in keeping with the needs and participation of the local community, and stick to those plans unless there are significant changes in circumstances. Otherwise there is the danger of a program drifting without direction.

4.8.7. The partners in Latin America responding to the questionnaire compared LWR very favorably to other international agencies. The fact that LWR has at least a regional office and can participate more closely and appreciate the real problems faced by the NGOs seems to be a factor in LWR's favor. Several respondents expressed appreciation of the fact that LWR/ARO emphasizes self-evaluation over external evaluation. LWR was described as understanding of problems, gets involved, supportive, open to new ideas, shows concern for people, and "is not just a funding agency."

4.8.8. A partner in Kenya wrote that the relationship with LWR has been much better than their five year experience with another US PVO. "LWR is stable, doesn't alter the terms of the contract, is flexible to emerging needs along the way, and we feel they are really backing us up and want us to succeed."

## 5. EVALUATION ISSUES

### 5.1. LWR's relationship to the Matching Grant

5.1.1. LWR has a great deal of latitude in deciding which projects should be included in this MG. Within the thirteen countries listed, LWR is free to choose which of the projects it works with should be included in its reports to A.I.D. Because of the reporting requirements it is obvious that they prefer to include fewer larger projects than a longer list of smaller projects. At present there are 37 projects in eight countries included in this MG-III. (Some of these projects have been or soon will be completed; others will be added during the period of this grant.)

5.1.1.1. In the MG-III proposal LWR mentioned the number of projects as 80. The question has been raised as to the significance (or lack thereof) of this number. LWR currently works with 124 bilateral projects in the listed thirteen countries, though it has seen fit only to include 37 so far in the MG. If "80" is not a goal nor a magic number, should it be deleted from the MG documentation? Need there be another number in its place?

5.1.1.2. For a perspective on this question of numbers of projects LWR deals with, see further discussion in section 7.2.3. and Annex 8.3.

5.1.2. Before putting a project on the MG list LWR sends a one-page telex asking for permission of the partner. The stated conditions include a willingness to receive evaluators from A.I.D., subject to reasonable advance notice and agreement [as was done for this mid-term evaluation]; allowing accounts to be inspected by auditors from LWR or A.I.D. if requested; and the provision of normal progress reports (which are required by LWR anyway).

5.1.3. LWR faces difficulties in reporting to A.I.D. because the format of the MG report assumes that the grant recipient administers its own project(s). LWR tries to make the point that it is non-operational; that it supports projects through partner agencies. The LWR staff wish there could be more understanding and flexibility on the part of FVA/PVC in recognizing the "uniqueness" of LWR's modus operandi.

5.1.4. FVA/PVC asks LWR to provide a copy of the MG annual report for each country covered. Are copies sent to the A.I.D. offices in those countries? John Grant in New Delhi said that he would appreciate receiving copies of such annual reports.

## 5.2. LWR staffing structure in West Africa

5.2.1. There is quite a contrast in the LWR staff presence between Niger and the other countries of West Africa (and other parts of the world). Because of its intense involvement in Niger since the early 1970's, and the difficulty of finding appropriate intermediary agencies to work through in that country (and the GON insisting that its own technical services operate projects), LWR/Niger still has three expatriate staff. They visit projects as much as once a month, closely monitoring finances and facilitating technical inputs in conjunction with the technical services.

5.2.1.1. LWR/Niger Director Marily Knieriemen describes the LWR program in Niger as not being operational, but more financial, administrative and technical. [LWR staff visits every month to the projects sound pretty "operational", depending on how that term is defined.] LWR/Niger has been working through GON technical services, facilitating (with funding) and pushing (through visits) them to do their jobs in providing support to the projects LWR funds.

5.2.1.2. LWR/Niger is seeking ways to work more directly with Nigerien NGOs as they emerge, with less dependence on the GON technical services as intermediary. Would this make LWR/Niger even more operational than it is now? Is that good or bad, in terms of responding to the needs

and realities of Niger, and in relationship to the way LWR operates in the rest of the world?

5.2.2. By contrast, Burkina Faso, Senegal and Togo are now covered only by the LWR Regional Representative based in Niamey (as of August, 1990). (He also covers Mali, but at present there is a Country Representative there.) According to Director of Programs for Africa Frank Conlon, LWR is seeking intermediary agencies to work with and through in these countries.

5.2.2.1. In the Fall of 1986 when LWR expanded into Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal, it placed Country Representatives there. The plan was that in 2-4 years they would have identified local partner agencies with whom it shared a philosophy, and through whom LWR could channel assistance. LWR would then pull out the country representatives and replace them with one regional representative who would continue to provide oversight to these countries, working with those partner agencies.

5.2.2.2. John Soloninka has been hired as West Africa Regional Representative. Due to the premature departure of the country directors from Burkina Faso and Senegal, he is faced with picking up unfinished business with existing projects in those countries and developing relationships with potential intermediary partners.

5.2.2.3. The partner in Senegal wrote that he has not written reports to LWR/NY since September, 1989. The project still has a million FCFA francs left in its account, which they do not want to return to LWR. "We have enough money to continue forever." There hasn't been an audit; an evaluation is scheduled before the end of 1990. Evidently they heard that there is now a regional representative in Niamey, but don't know his address. [It sounds as though the loss of the LWR country representative has left this project quite out of touch with LWR.]

5.2.2.4. It was not clear at the time of the evaluation team's visit (just two months after Soloninka took the post) what Soloninka's relationship will be with LWR/Niger, where there is a different form of LWR program, and three expatriate LWR staff.

5.2.2.5. Frank Conlon and LWR Executive Director Norman Barth visited West Africa just after the evaluation team was there. After that visit Frank Conlon reported that he does not foresee any additional changes in the way West Africa staff work. As stated in his letter in August to all partners outside of Niger, their primary point of contact with LWR would be the Regional Representative (John Soloninka). Within Niger Soloninka will serve as "a source of wisdom and can offer advice to

the Niger staff, but will not have responsibility for that program in its current manifestation."

5.2.2.6. Conlon also noted that if Nigerian NGOs emerge with whom LWR can work, the Regional Representative would have responsibility for that portion of the program.

5.2.3. A related and broader question for LWR in West Africa, as elsewhere around the world, deals with finding intermediary partners to work with. These may be implementors of projects, or may serve as intermediary agencies between LWR and grassroots projects, helping to provide technical support, networking, relationships with government, financial oversight, and other functions needed yet difficult for an agency not based in a country to provide.

5.2.3.1. Especially now that LWR/West Africa has gone from a pattern of country representatives to one regional representative, it seems prudent to rely even more on intermediary agencies in each country, rather than try to relate directly to small grassroots partners. (See recommendation, below.)

### 5.3. LWR partners in India

5.3.1. The evaluation team was impressed with the use of major intermediary partners in India, through which LWR maintains relationships with many partners (projects) without having its own staff in that country.

5.3.2. All four projects included in the MG are under the responsibility of the Inter Church Service Association (ICSA) based in Madras. ICSA is a structure which was in existence as a service agency for churches with which LWR established a relationship 12 or so years ago to provide staff services for fund transfers, project visitation, monitoring and evaluation, to facilitate training events, to direct projects to resources and exchange networks. The evaluation team sought to determine whether current ICSA staff were equipped adequately to meet the needs of the partners.

5.3.3. Dr. G.N.Reddi of IRRM made the suggestion that LWR/ICSA avail themselves of the expertise that some of their partners can offer in sharing with others. "Brain trust" was one description of this approach -- with ICSA coordinating a team of persons with a variety of skills available to train and advise others.

5.3.4. The evaluators saw merit in this suggestion, and recommend that the contributions of ICSA staff be complemented by those of other partners.

5.3.5. LWR, through ICSA, has been organizing gatherings of their partners every six months or so (one group in south India, another in the north). Several partners expressed appreciation for these times of networking and exchanging

ideas. This might be further formalized into an advisory council, where partners are invited to share in some of LWR and ICOSA's strategy considerations for the accompaniment/-partnerships in India. This should include at least occasional participation by the LWR Program Director for Asia and the Middle East. [Gene Thiemann was already planing to attend the meeting in February.]

5.3.6. In addition to CASA and ICOSA, LWR may want to consider treating CMAI as an intermediary partner. It is a national apex-type organization, which supports the work of many member Christian hospitals, encouraging them to do more in community health. (It needs to be recognized, however, that this is only one model for the promotion of improved community health. LWR should continue to support partners using other models through CASA or ICOSA.) This new relationship may include taking part in CMAI's proposed roundtable for a consortium of donors. [LWR has already decided to implement this decision.]

#### 5.4. Over-all staff-project relationships

5.4.1. Visits by LWR staff to monitor projects and maintain personal relationships with partners is somewhat spotty and variable in some countries. In most cases this can be explained by the reliance on staff of intermediary agencies to make these contacts on behalf of LWR. Though most projects report a satisfactory and helpful relationship with LWR, there are a number of cases discovered during this evaluation where there were gaps of over 12 months between visits.

5.4.2. In most of the world LWR covers many projects in many countries with very few staff. Though there is a danger of being spread too thinly to effectively support and monitor so many projects, it is commendable how effective LWR is in identifying partners, developing projects, providing financial support, and monitoring progress.

5.4.3. At the other extreme of the staff involvement spectrum, in contrast to being spread too thin in most countries, LWR in Niger has three expatriate staff who personally monitor projects every month during seasons of project activity.

5.4.4. If LWR intends to be more than "just a funding agency," it needs to take care not to extend itself too far. Perhaps there needs to be a balance somewhere between the intensity of expatriate involvement in Niger, on the one hand, and the paucity of direct contact which has been experienced in some countries, on the other hand. More reliance on intermediary agencies is one solution, but even that model calls for close working relationships on the part of the LWR staff.

## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 6.1. Criteria for selecting partners

6.1.1. Documentation does exist which shows LWR's criteria for the selection of partners and projects. For a variety of reasons, current LWR staff are not all familiar with those criteria. (One of the reasons given is that when there are insufficient funds for expansion the staff are not actively seeking new partners, thus do not think much about what those criteria are.)

6.1.2. It is recommended that LWR staff in NY and in the field review the "Projects System Manual," and be more conscious of its contents.

## 6.2. LWR structure in West Africa

6.2.1. It is recommended that, rather than work directly with grassroots projects, LWR identify and develop relationships with one or more intermediary partner agencies in Burkina Faso, Mali, and Senegal. (There already is a primary partner in Togo.) This is in keeping with current LWR strategy.

(See Annex 8.6 for definitions of the terms "intermediary" and "grassroots" agencies as used by LWR.)

6.2.2. Due to the long history of LWR's direct involvement with projects in Niger (with the GON as the official "partner," but LWR effectively operational), changes in the mode of operation in that country are not easy to make. Nevertheless, it is recommended that opportunities be sought to identify and work with indigenous NGO partners in Niger.

6.2.2.1. It is further recommended that LWR identify one or more intermediary agencies in Niger which could serve to provide the necessary support and monitoring of projects, and then consider phasing down the direct LWR involvement in that country, in keeping with the modus operandi of LWR in other countries.

## 6.3. LWR partners in India

6.3.1. The support offered to partners in India by LWR's intermediary agencies, ICSA and CASA, is evidently a good model, appropriate for the Indian context, and appreciated by many of the partner agencies. A recommendation for further strengthening that relationship is to broaden the range of expertise available by including more qualified persons in the pool of consultants called upon to advise projects, including members of other partner agencies themselves. This could be formalized as an advisory council and team of consultants coordinated by ICSA (and perhaps CASA).

6.3.2. Given the level of expertise of CMAI (the Christian Medical Association of India) in the field of public health, it is recommended that LWR consider CMAI as an intermediary agency in India, in addition to CASA and ICSA.

## 6.4. Promoting evaluation methodologies

6.4.1. Apparently LWR in the Andean Region has done much to develop and promote evaluation methodologies. Workshops have been held, a manual published, and partners are advancing in their practice of self-evaluation.

6.4.2. Such attention to evaluation was not evident in West Africa (including Niger) and in India. Though there have been some multi-project evaluations in Niger which are impressive, and evaluations are built into the plans for each project, LWR does not seem to have focused much on promoting improved evaluation methodologies among its partners.

6.4.3. It is recommended that LWR/Africa and LWR/Asia learn from LWR/Latin America ways to strengthen the techniques and practice of self-evaluation by their partners.

6.4.4. One way to share such experiences would be for LWR to organize more inter-regional exchanges among LWR staff and partners.

6.4.5. A related recommendation by Dr. G.N.Reddi which the evaluators pass on is that LWR invite key partners to participate in training in leadership styles. (Some have democratic partnership personality styles, some are more hierarchical, autocratic. How do they interact? What does true partnership mean?) [This has already been included in the plans for the February 1991 meeting of partners in India.]

#### 6.5. Promoting sustainable development

6.5.1. There is a temptation for projects anywhere to want to develop their own "campuses" for use as training centers, demonstration farms, seed or livestock multiplication, or whatever. When evaluated in terms of sustainability, it is difficult to see how these institutions can keep going without continued outside subsidies. Many examples have been seen around the world of how such campuses have become albatrosses to well-intended programs.

6.5.2. The evaluators urge LWR to guide their partners away from the developing of such centers, and towards more extension-oriented approaches, promoting individuals (farmers, etc.) to become models for their neighbors.

#### 6.6. Financial reporting form

It was noted in India that some of the financial reports submitted by projects are confusing in that they mix in-kind with cash receipts and expenditures. It is recommended that changes be made in the form to ask that financial reports include, but separately, the following:

- a) funds received from LWR,
  - b) funds received from other sources for this project,
  - c) expenditures related to these funds (this project),
  - d) description and valuation of in-kind contributions,
- and

e) an annual summary of funds received from all sources by this agency for all it does (the full picture). (Items (b) and (c) are projected in the proposal to LWR, but not consistently reported.)

#### 6.7 Objective #3 re. host governments

There was some question among the LWR staff concerning the wording of the third objective as contained in MG-III. It is recommended that it be modified as follows:

"To support and complement the development activities of host country governments whenever such activities are in accord with objectives 1 and 2, above;"

#### 6.8 Number of projects included in MG-III

Though 80 projects were mentioned in LWR's proposal to A.I.D. for this Matching Grant, it is recommended that that number not be considered a significant objective or indicator. Since LWR actually supports 124 projects in these 13 countries, it has already shown its capacity of working with more than 80 projects. The decision of how many projects to include in the MG has more to do with reporting requirements than an indicator of LWR's capacity.

Indicator 1.a. under purpose 1 on the logical framework should be modified in light of this recommendation.

#### 6.9. Reporting to A.I.D.

6.9.1. The LWR staff face difficulties in reporting to A.I.D. because, they feel, the format of the Matching Grant report assumes that the grant recipient administers its own operational project(s). The evaluators make this recommendation or request to USAID/FVA/PVC: recognize that LWR's method of operating may be different than that of other PVOs (being non-operational); allow for a different form of reporting which reflects the fact that the projects LWR supports are independent partner agencies.

### 7. ASSESSMENT OF GRANT ACTIVITIES

#### 7.1. Four principal issues addressed by this evaluation:

Having gone through the process of summarizing the responses to the indicators selected for this evaluation, let us now back up and address the four principal issues to be addressed in this mid-term evaluation (as contained in the Evaluation Scope of Work):

7.1.1. What are the different ways that LWR establishes and maintains partner relations?

The initiative leading to the establishment of partnerships between LWR and agencies may be taken by LWR or its intermediary partners, or by a local NGO seeking a source of funds and support for its project. In Niger government structures are presently the only partners.

Elsewhere LWR selects as partners non-governmental organizations (NGOs) whose philosophy and program are consistent with LWR's criteria and guidelines. (See section 4.1.)

7.1.2. Are LWR's partners receiving adequate technical and management assistance from LWR to achieve their goals?

7.1.2.1. There is some variability in the form of assistance offered by LWR to its partners in different countries. In Niger LWR staff visit project partners almost once a month, offering assistance in technical, financial and managerial aspects. In other countries LWR staff may be involved less directly, but intermediary partner agencies in those countries provide the technical and managerial assistance needed. In many cases such assistance is encouraged and facilitated by LWR but may involve referral of partners to locally available resources, rather than direct involvement by LWR itself.

(Note that this form of assistance contributes to the second over-all objective of the Matching Grant -- that of supporting the evolution and strengthening of indigenous organizations and networks to develop facilitation capacity which can continue beyond the grant period.)

7.1.2.2. In almost all cases evaluated partners report satisfaction with the level of support offered by LWR or its colleague agencies. One exception is the Christian Medical Association of India (CMAI), which is a major resource to medical personnel, hospitals and clinics throughout India. LWR feels no need to provide such services for this partner agency. CMAI itself is available to help provide technical and management assistance to other agencies involved in health-related projects.

7.1.3. Is LWR able to strengthen local organizations and communities?

This is certainly a goal of LWR. Due to the variety of types of local organizations and communities they work with, however, there may be varying degrees or interpretations as to how they are being strengthened. The work with some may be more focused on technical aspects, such as wells; the assistance offered by LWR to others deals more directly with institutional development. In any case, the local groups are strengthened by the form of support offered by LWR. (See section 4.5.)

7.1.4. Is LWR's program laying the ground work for sustainable local development once the grant is completed?

Whether this question is answered in terms of when the Matching Grant to LWR is complete, or in terms of when

LWR's support of these particular partner agencies is complete, the intent is there to work towards sustainable development. There are cases where the particular technology used may require outside subsidies if it is to be made available to the poorest sectors of the community. In some instances the individuals being assisted may be helped to become more self-supporting, while the organizations themselves may not. If their work involves educating and training people, that work will likely require outside assistance for some time. (See section 4.6.)

## 7.2. Answers to five basic questions:

In addressing the above issues, the evaluators were asked to ask five basic questions of LWR's program:

7.2.1. Are the stated objectives of the Grant Agreement being met?

For reference, those three objectives are repeated here:

- 1) To support poor communities in their efforts to meet their own needs; as Lutheran World Relief partners as they share in the proposal design, implementation, evaluation, and promotion of development projects;
- 2) To support the evolution and strengthening of indigenous organizations and development networks capable of, and committed to, continuing development facilitation beyond the grant period; and
- 3) To support, complement and influence host country governments whenever possible.

7.2.1.1. On the basis of visits to ten project sites in three countries, discussions with partner agency staff and others, and through responses to questionnaires from 18 other partners in six countries, it is clear to the evaluation team that the objectives of the Matching Grant Agreement are being met.

7.2.1.2. There is one qualification. Respondents, including LWR staff, see little opportunity for LWR to directly influence governments. They acknowledge, however, that partner agencies have exerted such influence at various levels in various ways. Nevertheless, the evaluators recommend a change in the wording of Objective #3 (see section 7.2.4, below).

7.2.2. Are the assumptions for achieving the desired outputs warranted in light of grant activity to date?

7.2.2.1. Assumptions related to the "resource and facilitator" role appear warranted with respect to stability of partners, their openness to learning, and the adequacy of LWR funding.

7.2.2.2. Assumptions about partner selection also appear justified by the existence of capable and willing partners, and at the time of this evaluation, the existence of stable social and political conditions conducive to institutional development. (The political problems in India at the time of the team's visit posed no immediate threat to any of the projects visited.)

7.2.2.3. Assumptions about partner agreements were found from examination of files and survey information to be adequately documented through formal agreements, signed copies of which are in LWR and partner agency files. In only a few cases did it appear that the partner agencies were not entirely familiar with the agreement, although one existed. Not all partners have had previous experience with contracts of this sort. No agreements have been revoked, though there have been times when transmittals have been delayed pending receipt of subsequent satisfactory project reports.

7.2.2.4. Although resources appear to be available for adequate monitoring and evaluation by LWR partner agencies, the evaluators believe this area of work could be improved. Partners were found to be receptive to monitoring and evaluation, and appear to have adequate potential, but may be deficient in defining the most pertinent criteria and elaborating a manageable plan which combines a good balance of performance data with impact-oriented concerns related to broad project objectives.

Considerable variation was found in the length and complexity of evaluation criteria, and in two instances it appeared that evaluation criteria as contained in the original proposal by the partner agency had been altered in the final project agreement. It was not clear how much dialogue between LWR and these partners took place in this process.

The evaluators found openness to assistance in improving their evaluation capacity and this desire was also expressed by a LWR partner (ICSA) in India. It is understood that LWR in the Andean area has done much to develop evaluation methodology and practice.

The above concerns notwithstanding, the monitoring and evaluation reports received are of good quality and thorough in reflecting project status.

7.2.3. Are the original objectives reasonable given the magnitude of the activity and LWR's technical and management capability?

7.2.3.1. The question with regard to the "indicator" of 80 projects to be included in MG-III requires some discussion:

7.2.3.1.1. In its proposal dated September 1, 1987, LWR proposed funding of \$7,120,000 for the

financial support of 80 projects. At that time, LWR intended the "indicator" of "80 development assistance projects in 12 countries within 5 years" to show the average budget of projects to be included in the Matching Grant: \$75,000-\$80,000. Understanding that A.I.D. is accustomed to projects with higher budgets, LWR intended to illustrate that the grant would be divided in what A.I.D. would probably call micro-projects. Although the indicator states that LWR would use the grant to support 80 projects in 5 years, this "indicator" was meant to help A.I.D. understand LWR's proposal, rather than to measure the success or failure of the Matching Grant.

7.2.3.1.2. In fact, in the 13 countries now included in the Matching Grant, LWR currently supports 124 projects that theoretically could be funded by the Matching Grant (see Annex 8.3). LWR chooses to minimize the number of projects funded by this mechanism because of the reporting required for each project.

7.2.3.1.3. When LWR approves projects at its regular Project Screening Committee, the Program Director indicates whether the project meets the criteria laid out in the Matching Grant. If the project is a candidate for the Matching Grant, the Program Director writes to the project holder to secure permission for the project to be funded by the Matching Grant. If permission is secured, program staff in LWR/NY examine spending patterns in the Matching Grant. If additional spending is required, program staff add the new project to the Matching Grant.

7.2.3.1.4. LWR feels that the "indicator" of 80 projects was useful only at the stage where A.I.D. was considering the grant proposal, rather than being a useful indicator of success or failure, and therefore prefers that this "indicator" be removed.

7.2.3.1.5. Alternatively, considering that LWR's original proposal of \$7,120,000 was approved at the level of \$5,000,000, it could be argued that the "indicator" be reduced proportionately. The appropriate "indicator" would then call for LWR to support 56 projects. At the time of the evaluation, near the end of the second grant year, LWR's inclusion of 37 projects in the Matching Grant "indicates" that LWR is on schedule to meet this objective.

7.2.3.1.6. Whether the number of projects is not used as an indicator at all, or that number be

changed, those changes will need to be reflected in an altered logical framework.

7.2.3.2. It is important to recognize that LWR does not operate its own projects in the field. Instead, its approach is that of identifying and supporting the work of partner agencies (existing groups) in the countries where it chooses to work. These include intermediary partners which offer a national perspective and through which LWR can extend assistance, advice and monitoring to grassroots partners. The latter are usually community-based organizations run by and for beneficiaries in a local area.

7.2.3.2.1. While affirming this philosophy, the evaluators caution LWR against taking on so many projects that their few staff are stretched too thinly to adequately support and monitor their partners in many countries. Nevertheless, it is remarkable how well LWR does relate to its partners, in spite of the large numbers. This fact speaks well of the non-operational approach used by LWR.

7.2.3.3. It is the opinion of this evaluation team, based on the visits to three of the countries, and gaining a perspective on the over-all operation, as reported in the rest of this report, that LWR's technical and management capacity appears entirely capable of fulfilling the original objectives of the Matching Grant.

7.2.4. Should the objectives of the grant be re-assessed?

7.2.4.1. The third objective, as now stated, is "to support, complement and influence host country governments whenever possible." Several LWR staff persons questioned whether this is really an objective of LWR. Evidently the wording got changed in the process of the preparation of the MG-III proposal.

7.2.4.2. In LWR's proposal dated September 1, 1987, the third purpose of the MG was "to support, complement and influence development activities of developing country governments whenever possible." The "schedule" of the grant agreement dated August 24, 1988, which takes precedence, cites this purpose as "support the development activities of developing country governments when possible." The "description" of the grant, same date, calls for the grant to "support, complement and influence developing country governments whenever possible."

7.2.4.3. Although the evaluators did find examples of how LWR has influenced the policies of governments (i.e. dry

season garden wells in Niger), "influencing" host governments is not exactly LWR policy. It is therefore recommended that the third objective in the MG be modified as follows:

"To support and complement the development activities of host country governments whenever such activities are in accord with objectives 1 and 2, above;"

7.2.5. What steps, if any, should be taken in the remaining period of the grant to achieve the objectives of the Grant Agreement?

7.2.5.1. Improvement of the monitoring and evaluation capacity of its partner agencies would likely contribute to enhanced capacity of the partners to assess progress and strengthen their programs. (See also Recommendations, section 6.)

## 8. ANNEXES

- 8.1. Glossary of Acronyms Used
- 8.2. Places Visited and People Interviewed
- 8.3. Perspective on Types and Numbers of Projects LWR Works With
- 8.4. LWR Projects Supported by Matching Grant III
- 8.5. Evaluation Scope of Work
- 8.6. Definition of types of partners: Intermediary and Grassroots Agencies
- 8.7. Questionnaire used
- 8.8. Review of Responses to Questionnaire from Andean Area
- 8.9. LWR Projects System Manual
- 8.10. Selected Bibliography

## ANNEX 8.1. GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

A.I.D./USAID:	United States Agency for International Development
AMURT:	Amanda Marga Universal Relief Team (Burkina Faso)
APDES:	Association for Promotion and Social Development (Peru)
ARO:	Andean Regional Office of Lutheran World Relief
BSONG:	Bureau de Suivi des Organisations Non-gouvernementales (Burkina Faso)
CADEP:	Andean Center for Education and Promotion (Peru)
CASA:	Churches' Auxiliary for Social Action (India)
CASDEC:	Social Action Center for Community Development (Bolivia)
CAST:	Community Action for Social Transformation (India)
CESS:	Center for Social Studies "Solidaridad" (Peru)
CIED:	Center for Investigation and Development (Peru)
CLUSA:	Cooperative League of the USA
CMAI:	Christian Medical Association of India (India)
CNN:	Comite Nongtaaba of Nakamtenga (Burkina Faso)
CODEL:	Coordination in Development, Inc.
CRS:	Catholic Relief Services
FCFA:	Francs of the Communauté Financière Africaine
FEPP:	Ecuadorian Fund for Human Progress (Ecuador)
FVA:	Food and Voluntary Assistance, office of A.I.D.
GAP:	Groupement des Aides Privées (Niger)
GON:	Government of Niger
ICSA:	Inter-Church Service Association (India)
IPHC:	Institute for Primary Health Care (Philippines)
IRRM:	Indian Rural Reconstruction Movement (India)
LABOR:	Center for Popular Culture (Peru)
LWR:	Lutheran World Relief
MG:	Matching Grant
MG-III:	Matching Grant OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
NGO:	Non-Governmental Organization
PHILDHARRA:	Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas (Philippines)
PMB:	Puits maraîcher en béton (concrete garden wells)
PRE:	Ecuadorian Rural Pastors' Association
PVC:	Private and Voluntary Cooperation
PVO:	Private Voluntary Organization
SCFI:	South Cotabato Foundation, Inc. (Philippines)
SEMATA:	Center of Multiple Services for Appropriate Technology (Bolivia)
UNAIS:	United Nations Association-International Service (Burkina Faso)

ANNEX 8.2. PLACES VISITED AND PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Aug. 7	Washington, DC	USAID FVA/PVC: Loreta W. Williams
Aug. 8-10	New York City	LWR/NY: Joe Sprunger, Dir. of Finance & Administration Tom Edwards (Latin America Region) Frank Conlon (Africa) Gene Thiemann (Asia)
	<u>Niger</u>	
Aug. 23	Niamey	LWR: John Soloninka (W.Africa) Marilyn Knieriemen (Niger) Jon Naugle (Niger)
Aug. 24	Bolongou	Co-op: 68 members Coordinator: Abdoulai
Aug. 25	Niamey	(LWR/Niamey files)
Aug. 27	Niamey	USAID: Erna Kerst Barry Rands
	Gaya	Service de l'Environnement: Amadou Moussa
Aug. 28	Gaya	Co-op leaders: 8 Coordinator Elhadji Dauda Adamou CLUSA agent Noma Seini
Aug. 29	Birni N'Konni	Sous-Prefet Technical Services
	Zourbattan	Coordinator Moussa Co-op President Aide Encadreur Animatrice
Aug. 30	Illela, Nadara	Coordinator: Aly Bete
Aug. 31	Niamey	GAP: Abdou Galadima CLUSA: Lisa Matt
Sep. 1	Niamey	(LWR files)
	<u>Burkina Faso</u>	
Sept. 2	Ouagadougou	World Neighbors Peter Gubbels OXFAM: Alice Iddi
Sept. 3	Nakamtenga	CNN co-op: 13 leaders Animateur: Joseph Ilboudo
Sept. 4	Ouagadougou	USAID: Dennis B. McCarthy OXFAM: Mamadou Kone Alice Iddi Yacouba Seba AMURT: "Dada" Michel Vrezil CRS: Drawie Assitan Johnie Swaragio
Sept. 5	Reo (Sanguie)	UNAIS: Luc Bertrand MoHealth: Dr. Samu Souliman Mme. Ouema
Sept. 6	Ouagadougou	BSONG: Francois Ouedraogo (LWR/W.Africa files)



Annex 8.2., Places & People, cont.

Responses to questionnaires received by mail

Peru: APDES Community Health  
Bartolome de las Casas  
CESS Cooperative Development III  
CCAIJO Campesino Women's Promotion  
CIED Puno  
CIED Cajamarca  
LABOR Women's Promotion  
CADEP Peasant Women's Promotion  
IDEAS Ag, Livestock & CD

Ecuador: FEPP

Bolivia: CASDEC  
SEMTA

Senegal: N'dianda Peul

Kenya: Ogwedhi Sigawa Project  
Farming Systems Kenya Ltd.  
Tototo Home Industries

Philippines: Primary Health Care Development Project  
Tribal AgroTechnology Project

ANNEX 8.3. PERSPECTIVE ON TYPES AND NUMBERS OF PROJECTS LWR WORKS WITH

Note: LWR supports a variety of different types of projects. Within the development category, as opposed to relief, LWR works 1) multilaterally through NGO consortia such as CODEL and Lutheran World Federation; 2) bilaterally with a northern NGO partner such as the International Rescue Committee in its work in refugee camps in Thailand; and 3) bilaterally with southern NGOs. Of these categories, LWR applies Matching Grant funds only to the third.

Here is a summary of bilateral development projects held by southern NGO partners with whom LWR is working in the thirteen Matching Grant countries:

<u>Africa:</u>	<u>LWR</u> (currently)	<u>In MG-III</u> (to date)
Sudan	2	0
Tanzania	4	0
Kenya	9	3
Mali	11	0
Niger	16	8
Burkina Faso	6	3
Senegal	5	1
Madagascar	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	57	15
 <u>Latin America:</u>		
Bolivia	4	3
Ecuador	3	3
Peru	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>
Total	20	16
 <u>Asia:</u>		
Philippines	7	2
India	<u>40</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	47	6
Combined totals: 124		37

LWR PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY MATCHING GRANT OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	ACTIVITY SECTOR	DURATION	FUNDING
Burkina Faso	UNAIS: Primary Health Care and Sanitation, Sanguie	Health	87-89	\$ 74,349
	Integrated Rural Development, Deou	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Energy	88-90	89,182
	CNN: Soil and Water Management, Nakamtenga	Natural Resources	89-90	21,183
Kenya	KMC: Ogwedhi-Sigawa Community Development	Natural Resources, Energy, Agriculture, Private Enterprise	87-90	155,561
	FSK: Small Farmers Support Program, Nakuru	Agriculture	87-89	148,791
	Tototo Women's Rural Development Program, phase II	Private Enterprise, Public Sector, Human Resources	87-90	167,159
Niger	Zourbattan Integrated Development, phase II	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Health, Private Enterprise	89-90	42,098
	Forest Management, Gaya	Natural Resources	88-94	800,220
	Yakaouda Basin Development	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Private Enterprise, Human Resources	88-89	53,488

	Bahe Bolongou, phase II	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Private Enterprise, Human Resources	88-89	30,267
	Integrated Rural Development, Nadara	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Private Enterprise, Human Resources	88-90	71,444
	Dazga Area Gardening, phase II	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Health, Private Enterprise, Human Resources	89-90	49,088
	Dadin Kowa Area Gardening, phase II	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Health, Private Enterprise, Human Resources	88-90	55,344
	Boni Integrated Development Project	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Health, Private Enterprise, Human Resources, Energy	87-90	119,225
Senegal	Ndianda Peulh Agro-pastoral Project	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Private Enterprise	88	18,467
India	CAST: Economic Development & Health Care	Agriculture, Human Resources, Health	89-94	124,184
	CMAI: Community-Based Health Care	Health	90-93	161,239
	IRRM: Integrated Rural Development, Pulicherla Mandal	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Human Resources, Private Enterprise	88-91	108,079

	CCOORR: Integrated Rural Development II, Tirunravur	Natural Resources, Human Resources, Health, Private Enterprise	89-94	124,437
Philippines	SCFI Tribal Agrotechnology Program	Agriculture, Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Agriculture, Energy, Human Rights, Private Enterprise	89-92	60,014
	IPHC Primary Health Care Development	Health	89-92	321,236
Bolivia	CASDEC: Agroforestry and Community Development III	Agriculture, Human Resources, Natural Resources, Health	89-91	113,110
	SEMTA: Alternative Agricultural and Organizational Development	Agriculture, Human Resources, Health	85-88	90,000
	FEPADE: Peasant Rural Promotion	Agriculture, Health, Human Resource	86-89	90,000
Ecuador	PRE Campesino Development II	Agriculture, Health, Human Resources	88-90	60,500
	SENDA Workshops for Youth	Private Enterprise, Human Resources	86-89	76,756
	FEPP Lago Agrio Regional Development Program	Natural Resources, Human Resources, Agriculture, Infrastructure	88-91	234,750
Peru	APDES Community Health	Health, Private Enterprise, Human Resources	87-90	91,196

CESS Cooperative Development III	Agriculture, Human Resources	89-91	157,420
CCAIJO Campesino Women's Promotion	Agriculture, Health, Human Resources	88-91	75,800
CIED Porcon Microregional Development (Bridging Grant)	Natural Resources, Agriculture, Human Resources	89	20,000
CIED Production and Women's Promotion (Bridging Grant)	Agriculture, Human Resources	89	20,000
CIED Microregional Development Cajamarca II	Natural Resources, Agriculture, Health, Human Resources	89-90	130,700
Labor Women's Promotion, Ilo	Human Resources, Population, Health	88-90	69,000
IRINEA Microregional Development, Paca II	Agriculture, Natural Resources, Human Resources	90-92	95,000
CADEP Peasant Women's Promotion	Human Resources, Health	86-88	90,000
CASAS Radio/Campesino House	Human Resources	88-90	125,000
IDEAS Agriculture, Livestock and Community Development	Agriculture, Human Resources, Health	89-90	150,000

11

**STATEMENT OF WORK FOR MID-TERM EVALUATION OF  
COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT (OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00) WITH  
LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF (LWR)**

**1. SUMMARY**

This is a statement of work for a mid-term evaluation of LWR's activity under Cooperative Agreement #OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00. This is a five-year grant that began on September 1, 1988 and is scheduled for completion on August 31, 1993. The statement identifies key evaluation issues, details an evaluation scope of work, and describes an evaluation methodology. The evaluation will assess LWR's progress in implementing its program to support poor communities in their efforts to meet their own needs, strengthen indigenous organizations and development networks, and support host governments' development efforts. The evaluation will pay special attention to LWR's institution building capacity in poor environments. The evaluation will be carried out during the period August through December, 1990 by a two person team composed of an external expert in institutional development and a LWR representative. The final report is due no later than December 17, 1990.

**2. BACKGROUND**

**2.1. Brief History.** Lutheran World Relief is a not-for-profit voluntary organization incorporated in New York State in 1945. The Board of Directors which governs LWR's work has eleven directors drawn from two national churches that provide the bulk of LWR's support. LWR was founded in response to the needs of post World War II Europe. Since this beginning, LWR has evolved as a major relief and development agency meeting relief and humanitarian needs throughout the world. In the early 1970s, LWR's program began to shift from relief to development.

The majority of LWR's development activities involve the support of indigenous agencies. LWR does not directly implement projects. Instead, it facilitates development by accompanying local partners who have priorities compatible to its own to assist society's poorest members. LWR supports the work of its partners through grants for community-based projects, training, technical assistance, administrative overhead, and organizational development. Local partners are defined as "project holders" in LWR programs.

16

In 1986, LWR won the Presidential End Hunger award for its work in bringing relief to civilians on both sides of the civil war in northern Ethiopia.

2.2. FVA/PVC Grants to LWR. This current Matching Grant is the third such grant that LWR has received from FVA/PVC. Since 1979, LWR has augmented its considerable private resources with grants from A.I.D. Cooperative Agreement #AID/SOD/PDC-G-0124 ran from 1979 to 1983, and was followed by Cooperative Agreement #PDC-0176-G-SS-3162-00 from 1983 to 1988. In addition, LWR received an OPG (AID-621-17-110-80-01) from USAID/Tanzania to support a water resource and village life improvement project in that country.

2.3. Current Cooperative Agreement. The current Cooperative Agreement is for five years beginning September 1, 1988. The Cooperative Agreement has three basic purposes:

- o To support poor communities in their efforts to meet their own needs through participation in the proposal, design, implementation, evaluation, and promotion of development projects;
- o To support the evolution and strengthening of indigenous organizations and development networks capable of, and committed to, continuing development facilitation beyond the grant period; and
- o To support, complement and influence host country governments whenever possible.

Under the Agreement, LWR is to assist local institutional strengthening and community development through agricultural development, water development, health, and local income generation. Whenever possible, LWR is to complement and influence host country governments in the same areas of activity.

Under the terms of the Cooperative Agreement, LWR may use Matching Grant funds in the following thirteen countries: India, Philippines, Senegal, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger, Sudan, Kenya, Tanzania, Madagascar, Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador. To date, LWR has expended grant funds in nine of these countries. India, Philippines, Senegal, Burkina Faso, Niger, Kenya, Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador.

### 3. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to provide FVA/PVC and LWR with an assessment of LWR's progress in undertaking activities under the Cooperative Agreement. The evaluation is a management activity to provide FVA/PVC and LWR with insights into the process of accompaniment and institution building that characterize LWR's programming. Therefore, the evaluation will address the following issues of overall grant implementation:

- o What are the different ways that LWR establishes and maintains partner relations?
- o Are LWR's partners receiving adequate technical and management assistance from LWR to achieve their goals?
- o Is LWR able to strengthen local organizations and communities?
- o Is LWR's program laying the ground work for sustainable local development once the grant is completed?

In summary, the critical evaluation task is to determine the degree of effectiveness in LWR's process of accompanying communities and local organizations in their own development.

### 4. EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

The evaluation will assess the progress to date. It will be based on LWR's detailed implementation plan and logical framework (Attachment 1). The evaluation strategy directs the evaluators to assess those areas of grant implementation important for LWR's continued support to local organizations and communities.

4.1. Evaluation Methodology. The evaluators will employ a methodology that utilizes a standard set of assessment questions. Each assessment question is to be applied to various sources of information that describe LWR's process of institution building. The methodology is summarized as a matrix in Attachment 2.

4.2. Assessment Questions. The evaluators will ask five basic questions of LWR's program.

- a) Are the stated objectives of the Grant Agreement being met?

i) If yes -- what is the nature of the progress?  
 ii) If not -- What are the barriers preventing program implementation? What steps is LWR taking to overcome barriers?

b) Are the assumptions for achieving the desired outputs warranted in light of grant activity to date?

c) Are the original objectives reasonable given the magnitude of the activity and LWR's technical and management capability?

d) Should the objectives of the grant be re-assessed?

e) What steps, if any, should be taken in the remaining period of the grant to achieve the objectives of the Grant Agreement?

4.3. Evaluation Data Sources. The assessment questions will be asked of two different data sources. The first data source is program documentation, including internal evaluations, baseline data sets, the Grant agreement, annual reports, past evaluations, partner proposals, partner reports, partner screening criteria, project review committee minutes, project implementation plans, evaluation plans, and progress reports. The second data source is interviews conducted with LWR headquarters and field staff, USAID in-country staff, project holders, and project beneficiaries.

4.4. Evaluation of Program Activity. Assessment questions will be asked of each of the four aspects of LWR's program activity.<sup>1/</sup> These are:

a. Partner Selection. The first activity that LWR pursues under the grant is the selection of partners to work with.

i. Progress Indicators.

Progress in identifying and selecting partners will be assessed in terms of the following indicators:

---

<sup>1/</sup> The Evaluation Team should note that the Program Description in the Grant Agreement does not set specific outcomes or processes -- it only outlines LWR's grant activities. The specific program activities identified in this section represent the components of LWR's strategy to fulfill the program purposes and achieve program goals. They are more fully identified in the Matching Grant proposal.

- o The number of contacts by prospective partners and type of proposal;
- o The existence and type of criteria for selecting partners;
- o The number of partners selected;
- o The process to determine the type of program for the selected partner.

ii. Data Sources. To assess progress in selecting partners the following data sources will be used: Pre-project correspondence; selection criteria; LWR headquarters and field staff, project holders, review committee documentation.

iii. Data Collection and Analysis Techniques. Information on partner selection will be drawn from document analysis and informant interviews.

iv. Assumptions. Assumptions will be assessed by asking several questions including: Do willing and capable potential partners exist for LWR to work with?

b. Resource and Facilitator. The second component of LWR's grant activity is to act as a resource and facilitator to its partners. LWR assists project holders as needed through formal and informal means such as workshops, training, and on-site visits. In addition, LWR acts as a resource for information and material support as appropriate for partners' projects.

i. Progress Indicators. Progress in establishing resource and facilitator relationships will be assessed with the following indicators:

- o Number of workshops held, content, and attendees;
- o Number and substance of visits to third party projects;
- o Number and substance of site visits by LWR staff and consultants;
- o Number and type of material and financial support provided to project holders;
- o Number and type of information provided to project holders.

ii. Data Sources. To assess progress in establishing resource and facilitator relations, the following data sources will be used: Interviews with LWR headquarters and field staff, and project holders; and LWR staff activity reports.

**iii. Data Collection and Analysis Techniques.**

Information on LWR's role as a resource and facilitator will be drawn from document analysis and interviews.

**iv. Assumptions.** Assumptions will be assessed by asking several questions: Are the partners stable? Are partners open to new ideas and assistance? Do the partners act on the information? Are LWR staff/consultants available and appropriate to assist partners?

**c. Partner Agreement.** The third component of LWR's process of strengthening local organizations and communities is the establishment of a formal cooperative relationship with a local project holder. The evaluation will assess the nature of agreements LWR has reached with project holders under the Cooperative Agreement.

**i. Progress Indicators.** Progress in establishing and implementing cooperative relationships will be assessed with the following indicators:

- o Agreements on file;
- o Number of active agreements;
- o Content of agreements;
- o Agreements revoked.

**ii. Data Sources.** To assess progress in establishing and implementing cooperative relationships the following data sources will be used: Interviews with LWR headquarters and field staff, and project holders; agreement documents (letters of understanding, exchange agreements, contracts, etc.).

**iii. Data Collection and Analysis Techniques.**

Information on cooperative agreements will be drawn from document analysis and interviews, which should determine how each of the parties interprets the agreements and understands its mutual responsibilities.

**iv. Assumptions.** Assumptions will be assessed by asking the following questions: Are agreements adequately documented by headquarters, field sites, and project holders? Do project holders have a tradition or experience with contractual relations?

**d. Monitoring and Evaluation.** The final aspect of LWR's grant activity is the evaluation and monitoring of partners'

projects. Part of this process involves the transfer of planning skills (evaluation and monitoring) to project holders.

i. Progress Indicators. Progress in implementing evaluation and monitoring activities will be assessed with the following indicators:

- o Monitoring and evaluation schedules;
- o Evaluations on file;
- o Evaluation Scopes of Work;
- o Evaluation methodologies developed;
- o Methodologies transferred to partners;
- o Training materials.

ii. Data Sources. To assess progress in meeting evaluation and monitoring objectives, the following data sources will be used: Evaluation plans; evaluation methodologies; interviews; field staff and partners progress reports.

iii. Data Collection and Analysis Techniques. Information on evaluation and monitoring will be drawn from interviews and documentation at headquarters, field offices, and project holders.

iv. Assumptions. Assumptions will be assessed by asking several questions including: Does LWR have adequate evaluation resources? Are partners receptive to evaluation procedures? Do partners have adequate resources to adopt monitoring and evaluation activities?

4.5. Evaluation Sites. The evaluation will be carried out at LWR's New York headquarters and three field sites. Project holders and LWR field staff will be evaluated in Niger, Burkina Faso, and India. The field sites are selected because LWR has expended significant amounts of its match in these countries.

In addition, it is expected that LWR-sponsored projects in Niger, Burkina Faso, and India will illustrate a wide range of development styles and techniques. In India, the evaluation team should observe the impact of working solely through local counterparts. In Niger, the evaluation team should observe LWR's impact of working with a large field staff and cooperating Nigerian ministries. Finally, in Burkina Faso the team should observe LWR's impact of working with small grassroots organizations. In addition, the team will meet with the appropriate USAID Mission staff in-country.

4.6. Evaluation Survey. In order to collect evaluation data from all of LWR's regions, the evaluation team will develop a survey instrument to be administered by field staff in Kenya, the Andean region (Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador), and the Philippines. The survey instrument will incorporate the assessment questions. The source of information will be both project holders and field staff.

## 5. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of one external evaluator and a LWR representative. The former will be an expert in organizational and institutional development. The evaluation team will visit all three countries as indicated above.

## 6. EVALUATION REPORT

The final report should not exceed 40 pages. Given the complexity of the evaluation and volume of data anticipated, the report should be supplemented by as many annexes as considered important by the evaluators. The report will be organized as follows:

- o Summary
- o Principal Findings
- o Principal Recommendations
- o Evaluation Issues
- o Assessment of Grant Activities
- o Annexes

## 7. TIME FRAME <sup>2/</sup>

August 7-10	Briefing Washington, D.C. and New York; design mail questionnaire
<b>TOTAL 4 working days</b>	
August 22	Depart for Niger
August 23	Arrive Niamey
August 24	Briefing Niamey
August 25	Niamey-Bahe Boulongou-Nadara-Niamey site visits
August 26	Niamey-Gaya site visits
August 27	Gaya-Maradi site visits
August 28	Birni Nkonni and/or Madaoua site visits
August 29	Rest

---

<sup>2/</sup> Timeframe subject to flight availability and final scheduling; A.I.D. regulations allow for a six-day work week.

(6)

August 30 Return to Niamey  
 August 31 Briefing Niamey  
 September 1-3 Niamey-Deou (Burkina Faso)-Nongataaba  
 site visits  
 September 4 Rest  
 September 5 Nongataaba-Ouagadougou  
 September 6 Briefing Ouagadougou, depart Ouagadougou  
 September 7 Arrive New York  
**TOTAL 17 working days**

October 23 Depart for Delhi  
 October 24 Arrive Delhi, rest  
 October 25-26 Briefing Delhi  
 October 27-28 Trivandrum site visit  
 October 29 Rest  
 October 30-31 Madras site visit  
 November 1-3 Madras site visit  
 November 4 Rest  
 November 5-8 Bangalore site visit  
 November 9 Bangalore-Delhi  
 November 10 Depart Delhi  
 November 11 Arrive New York  
**TOTAL 19 working days**

November 13-15 New York for debriefing and review of  
 survey questionnaires  
**TOTAL 3 working days**

November 28 Deadline for submission of final draft  
 report. A total of 8 days at  
 evaluator's residence is provided for  
 drafting and finalizing report.  
 A.I.D./W and LWR will submit their  
 comments on draft evaluation report no  
 later than December 17, 1990.

It is understood that a preliminary  
 draft report containing the conclusions  
 and recommendations of the Africa  
 portion of the evaluation will be  
 presented no later than September 24,  
 1990.

**TOTAL 8 working days**

December 31 Final report due

**GRAND TOTAL 51 working days**

1/10

PROGRAM : ACTIVITY	PROGRESS INDICATORS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION	ASSUMPTIONS
Resource & Facilitator	Workshops held # Visits to 3rd party projects Site visits by LWR Staff # & Type of Partner	Project holders LWR field Staff LWR HQ Staff LWR Staff activity reports	Informant Interviews Document Analysis	Partners are stable Partners open to learning Adequate LWR resources
Partner Selection	# of Contacts by prospective partner Criteria for partner selection Type of partner project selected	Pre-project reports LWR field staff LWR HQ staff Project holders Review Committee reports	Informant interviews Document analysis	Existence of willing & capable partners Social and political conditions are conducive to institutional development
Partner Agreements	Agreements on file # active agreements Agreement content Agreements revoked	Agreement documentation LWR field staff LWR HQ staff Project holders	Informant interviews Document analysis	Adequate documentation by LWR & partners Partners have tradition or experience with contracts
Monitoring & Evaluation	M & E Schedule Evaluations on file M & E scopes of work M & E Training materials	M & E plans M & E methods LWR field staff LWR HQ staff Project holders	Informant interviews Document analysis	Adequate LWR M & E resources Partners receptive to M & E Adequate partner M & E potential

## EVALUATION MATRIX

LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF MATCHING GRANT PROPOSAL

APPENDIX C: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

GOAL	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p><b>OVERALL GOAL</b> To enable the poor majority of developing countries to develop the ability to meet their own needs while becoming full participants in socially, economically and politically viable communities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased income of poor.</li> <li>2. Increased food production.</li> <li>3. Improved health:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Increased life expectancy;</li> <li>-reduced Infant Mortality Rate;</li> <li>-reduced malnutrition;</li> <li>-reduced incidence of disease;</li> <li>-reduced population rate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Increased literacy rate.</li> <li>5. Increased environmental protection and restoration.</li> <li>6. Reduction of number of people in danger of starvation.</li> <li>7. Increased participation of poor, particularly women, in local and national affairs, including economic, community and social groups.</li> <li>8. Spread of appropriate technologies.</li> <li>9. Increased access of poor to government services.</li> </ol>	<p>Surveys, analyses and studies of UN agencies, developing country governments and other national and international organizations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No major global conflicts.</li> <li>- World economic system does not deteriorate.</li> <li>- No catastrophic shifts of weather and climate patterns.</li> <li>- No natural disasters.</li> <li>- Those in control of social, economic and political environment allow the development of the poor.</li> <li>- The poor have a desire to meet their own needs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>POSE</b></p> <p>Support poor communities in their efforts to meet their own needs through participation in the proposal, design, implementation, evaluation and spread of development endeavors.</p> <p>Support the evolution and strengthening of indigenous organizations and development networks capable of and committed to continuing development facilitation beyond the grant period.</p> <p>Support, complement and influence host country governments whenever possible.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1a. 80 development assistance projects in 12 countries within 5 years.</li> <li>1b. 75% of individual/community beneficiaries:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-have formed/strengthened organizations responsible for development activities;</li> <li>-initiated at least one additional development activity within 5 years;</li> <li>-participated in designing, implementing and evaluating projects;</li> <li>-participated in training;</li> <li>-participated in improving their environment (soil conservation and replenishment, reforestation, etc.);</li> <li>-have greater access to existing resources (natural, technological, economic, etc.) and infrastructures;</li> <li>-demonstrate one or more of: increase in food production, income, literacy, access to public services, nutritional intake; reduction of birth and death rates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Partner agencies will have:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-increased technical capabilities;</li> <li>-new/improved regularized program management and reporting systems;</li> <li>-a greater awareness of and contact/work with other similar indigenous PVOs in country/region;</li> <li>-demonstrated greater capability to organize the poor majority to take charge of their own development;</li> <li>-increased ability to exploit/complement existing resources, technologies and services;</li> <li>-moved in the direction of self-sufficiency;</li> <li>-replicated project activities when appropriate and possible.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Successful development activities have been adopted by other communities/organizations and/or have influenced local government policies or programs.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LWR records.</li> <li>- Partner agency files, project reports and activities.</li> <li>- Pre and post-project baseline data.</li> <li>- On-site visits by LWR staff and others.</li> <li>- Interviews with partner agency staff and beneficiaries.</li> <li>- Internal and external evaluation and audit reports.</li> <li>- Government reports and statistics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community level leadership exists or can be developed.</li> <li>- Community leaders and project beneficiaries recognize the need for change and desire to participate in development activities.</li> <li>- Partner agencies desire improved effectiveness in planning, implementing and evaluating development assistance.</li> <li>- Partner agencies' stability.</li> <li>- Qualified partner agency staff are available and trainable.</li> <li>- Local and national governments are favorable to the development initiatives.</li> <li>- National and local government stability.</li> <li>- Development activities are acceptable and possible under local tradition, culture and economy.</li> </ul>

OUTPUTS

- 80 projects supported in response to community identified needs and abilities.
- Improved economic, nutritional, educational, and nutritional status of project beneficiaries.
- Community ability to analyze and address development problems increased.
- Partner agency staff increase capabilities through training and exchange experiences.
- Increased communication, cooperation, coordination and consultation among LMR partner agencies and other local PVOs.
- Regularized reporting and evaluation systems of partner agencies established.
- Local/National government interest, understanding, and support for project activities increased.
- LMR/Partner agency/Community influence government policies and promote replication of project activities.
- LMR staff better able to identify and accompany partner agencies.

- 1a. Number of projects supported.
- 1b. Beneficiaries understand and willingly participate in project implementation.
2. Improvements as related to pre-project baseline data.
  - 3a. Change in community organizational structure and development activities.
  - 3b. Planned future activities of beneficiaries.
  - 3c. Project activity successes inspire replication by other groups/communities.
- 4a. Number and type of training and exchange experiences.
- 4b. Observable changes in behavior, attitude and managerial and technical skills.
5. Cooperative activities and contact among/between partner agencies and other local PVOs.
  - 6a. Reports received regularly from each project and partner agency.
  - 6b. Qualitative improvements in reports.
- 7a. Frequency and quality of contact with government representatives.
- 7b. Government personnel and services involved in project implementation.
8. Rate and scale of government adoption of and support for similar development activities in other communities.
- 9a. Increase in the quality of performance of partner agencies.
- 9b. Increased access to development networks and resources.

- 1a. Project reports and evaluations submitted to LMR.
- 1b. On-site visits and interviews with beneficiaries.
  - 2a. Baseline data.
  - 2b. Government records and reports.
  - 2c. Project reports and evaluations.
- 3a. Baseline data and project evaluation reports and collective community memory.
- 3b. Proposed development activities.
- 3c. Expressed interest of other groups and communities (correspondance, visits, etc.).
- 3d. Attempts and/or requests for assistance to replicate project activities.
4. Reports and correspondence from/about partner agency experiences and improved abilities.
5. Partner agency reports, interviews and project proposals.
6. LMR report log.
- 7a. Government correspondance and reports.
- 7b. Project reports.
- 8a. Government request for assistance in replicating project activities.
- 8b. Government policy statements, reports, and project activities.
- 9a. Reports and evaluations of partner agencies and projects and on-site visits and interviews.
- 9c. Successful completion of training, seminars, etc.
- 9d. Lists of development contacts made and of available resources.

- Partner agencies need and request outside funds.
- U.S. Government funds acceptable to partner agencies.
- Partner agencies desire additional training and will participate in exchanges.
- Local and national government policies conducive to community level development activities and community initiative.
- Political, economic, social and natural environments conducive to replication of activities.

INPUTS

1. COMMUNITY & LOCAL INSTITUTIONS
  - a. Human Resources
    - project ideas and proposals;
    - labor
    - community organizations, leadership and meetings which promote and support project activities;
    - support for continuation and replication of activities;
    - training facilities and expertise (e.g. Universities);
    - community based training.
  - b. Financial/Material Resources
    - local funds;
    - local material resources;
    - bank and other loans available to beneficiaries.
2. PARTNER AGENCIES
  - a. Human Resources
    - assistance to communities in all aspects of project activities;
    - technical expertise;
    - participation in staff exchanges, trainings and seminars;
    - program management;
    - reporting to LMR;
    - project monitoring, reporting and monitoring;
  - b. Financial/Material Resources
    - local funds for agency administrative support;
    - budgetary support for project administrative costs.
3. LOCAL/NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS
  - a. Human Resources
    - staff project participation on secondment, training and/or consultative basis;
    - project site visits;
    - encouragement of project activities;
  - b. Financial/Material/Other Resources
    - customs, tax exemptions;
    - project and beneficiary subsidies;
    - local materials;
    - assistance with access to materials

LMR

- a. Human Resources
  - project and partner agency identification;
  - identification/promotion of partner agency networks;
  - proposal review and approval;
  - program management;
  - project monitoring;
  - visits to partner agencies and project sites;
  - maintaining contact with host country governments
  - reporting to AID;
  - identification and promotion of available technical resources.
- b. Financial Resources
  - funds from private sources.

AID

- a. Human Resources
  - review LMR reports;
  - evaluate LMR program;
  - project visits.
- b. Financial/Other Resources
  - matching grant funds;
  - information sharing;
  - evaluation consultants fees.

A. NON-FINANCIAL RESOURCES

1. Communities and Local Institutions
  - change in attitude and level of participation of community members, particularly women;
  - change in level of acceptance of women, particularly in leadership roles;
  - continuation and replication of development activities;
  - number and amount of loans (bank, revolving fund, etc.) approved and repayment rate;
  - numbers of persons trained, types of training, where held, by whom;
  - evidenced of changed behavior, attitudes and skills.
2. LMR/Partner Agency
  - frequency, quality and type of LMR-Partner Agency-Community communication;
  - staff evaluations;
  - reports written and received;
  - number of visits made;
  - projects proposed and reviewed;
  - frequency and type of participation in exchanges, trainings and seminars;
  - evidenced change in quality of performance of staff;
3. Local and National Government
  - numbers and types of personnel participating in projects;
  - number of visits by government personnel;
  - number and substance of reports produced;
  - other assistance arranged for projects.
4. AID
  - Amount of staff time spent on monitoring and evaluating;
  - number of project visits.

B. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

	LMR	AID
Year 1	800,000	600,000
Year 2	825,000	635,000
Year 3	800,000	600,000
Year 4	825,000	635,000
Year 5	800,000	600,000
TOTAL	4,050,000	3,070,000

Financial resources of Governments, Partner Agencies, Communities and Local Institutions not quantified.

- Project and Partner Agency progress, financial and evaluation reports;
- Local/National Government Reports;
- LMR Annual Report;
- LMR Quarterly financial reports;
- AID financial records;
- Project, Partner Agency and LMR Audits;
- Local bank records.

- Local communities interested in a committed to project activities.
- Local inputs continue to be available.
- Partner agency staff capable of program implementation and administration.
- Local/National governments continue to allow and to support development activities.
- LMR staff time for program development and management continue to be available.
- LMR private fund sources continue to contribute.
- AID funds continue to be available.

ANNEX 8.6.            DEFINITION OF TYPES OF PARTNERS: INTERMEDIARY AND GRASSROOTS AGENCIES

In the Matching Grant, LWR works through indigenous NGOs with special knowledge or skills related to the project at hand. When these NGOs hold responsibility for a project, they are called partners, or project holders. Indigenous partners can fall into several categories:

**\*Intermediary agencies** are NGOs established in their fields, often with salaried, professional staff. LWR frequently calls on intermediary agencies as consultants to other projects. In India, the Inter-Church Service Association (ICSA) specializes in this sort of consultative role: it visits project proponents, helps develop project proposals to LWR, makes monitoring trips to projects, discusses with project holders the progress of the project, helps evaluate the project, and offers networking advice to the project holders. ICSA is not itself a project holder. In the Philippines, PHILDHERRA also follows this pattern. In regions where there are no LWR offices, LWR relies more on intermediary agencies.

A related example is the Institute for Primary Health Care in the Philippines, which is a project holder and an intermediary agency at the same time. IPHC is the project holder of Primary Health Care Development; the objectives of this project include training the staff of smaller NGOs in primary health care.

Intermediary agencies offer their services to a gamut of LWR partners, but are most useful in dealing with grassroots agencies.

**\*Grassroots agencies** are typically small agencies with limited professional skills, but much enthusiasm and local expertise. These agencies may have limited experience with formal accounting or reporting requirements. They are run primarily by volunteer labor. Examples of grassroots agencies funded by the Matching Grant are Comite Nongtaaba of Nakamtenga in Burkina Faso or PRE in Ecuador.

Many of LWR's project holders fall somewhere between these two extremes. Partners may have one or two professional, technical staff members, but rely much on volunteer community organizers and labor. Some project holders may be large and established, but work on concentrated projects, rather than providing services to a range of other agencies.

Jeff Whisenant 3/91

61

ANNEX 8.7. QUESTIONNAIRE USED AS SURVEY INSTRUMENT  
WITH LWR PROJECT HOLDERS

Name of project:

Country:

Location:

Date:

Respondent's name:

1. Briefly describe your initial interaction with LWR/ICSA at time of developing proposal:
2. Have you attended any LWR workshops? yes/no  
If so, how many? On what subjects?
3. Has LWR facilitated your visits to other projects? yes/no If so, how often? What did you learn?
4. In the past year: how many times has an LWR staff person or consultant visited your headquarters? Your project site? Have you visited the LWR (country) office? Have these contacts been helpful? yes/no Comment:
5. Are LWR's financial reporting requirements fair and helpful? Are the methods of transferring of funds timely and adequate? Is LWR responsive to your transmittal needs? Comment:
6. What kind of information has LWR (or intermediary agency) provided you? Please explain.
7. Do you have an official Agreement with LWR? yes/no Is it fair and functional? Comment:
- 8.a. Do you have a schedule and plan for monitoring and evaluation?
- 8.b. Briefly describe how you conduct evaluations.
- 8.c. Has LWR offered any guidance in developing your evaluation methodology? yes/no Describe:
9. Do you feel your organization is being strengthened by its relationship with LWR?
10. Do you see this project as working toward sustainable development? yes/no If so, how? If not, why not?
11. Do you receive assistance from other international aid organizations? yes/no If so, how would you compare LWR with the others?

## ANNEX 8.8

### REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FROM ANDEAN AREA

#### Introduction

Fifteen of 30 questionnaires were filled out and returned. In general, the questionnaire did not elicit the type of thoughtful feedback that might have been expected. Practically all of the answers were positive in their opinions about LWR as an institution and about their particular interaction with LWR. Basically they limited themselves to affirming that LWR does a good job relative to each of the questions asked, without much elaboration or suggestions for improvement.

Only two answers in the whole survey had negative connotations at all and those two, upon further reading, contradicted their own initial negative stance with compliments. Only one question, #3 about observation trips to other projects sponsored by LWR, received answers of the type, "We would like to see LWR do such and such." These were the institutions which had not visited any other project but would like to.

Two questionnaires, from Jesus Obrero "CCAIJO" and from Centro IDEAS, were received after this review was completed. Their answers are generally consistent with the other respondents. CCAIJO comments that the financial reporting requirements are a bit long. IDEA is very positive toward LWR. They do recognize that even though they hope their projects will be sustainable, they will need financing for some time to come.

A brief summary of the answers to each question follows. As an addendum, there is a compilation of all the answers (summarized) to each question presented by institution, followed by a numbered guide to the institutions and their projects.

1. Briefly describe your interaction with LWR staff at the time of developing your project proposal.

The answers to this question were not limited to the time of proposal development except in a very few cases. Mostly the respondents described their general relationship to LWR.

LWR has a very positive relationship with the NGOs. Those which are located close to where LWR has an office seem especially impressed with LWR's continuing interest in them as an institution, in their projects and in the impact of the project on the target groups. Contacts with LWR's local rep during proposal development were considered valuable, especially relative to clarification of project objectives and need to think about evaluation methodology early in the process.

Annex 8.8 REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FROM ANDEAN REGION

2. Have you attended any LWR workshops? Yes 13 No 2 If yes, how many? 0 to 5 On what subjects?

All except CIED/Puno of Peru and CASDEC of Bolivia have attended at least one workshop. The other 13 have attended a total of 30 workshops on following subjects: feeding, 6 on women's problems, 17 on various aspects of institutional or project evaluation (including a reflection/evaluation of LWR/ARO), organic agriculture, 2 on urban problems, exchange of experiences with other NGOs, institutional organization and one unspecified.

3. Has LWR facilitated your visit to any other projects? Yes 5 No 10 If so, how often? 0 to 6 What did you learn?

Ten have not gone. Other 5 have visited 12 projects (CAPER has visited 6). Answers for what was learned are basically just descriptions of projects visited (see appendix, #3). Only two answers reflect on what was learned: SEDEC observed different technologies and community structure among indigenous groups as compared to their area of work and CIED/Cajamarca (EDAC) confirmed idea that rural development requires commitment of multiple social forces.

4. In the past year, how many times has an LWR staff person or consultant visited your headquarters? 0 to 3 your project site? 0 to 3 Have you visited the LWR office? Yes 13 No 2 Have these contacts been helpful? Yes 14 No 1

Comments:

Only CAPER had had no visits from LWR staff. All others had visits either to office, project site or both (12). Thirteen had visited the LWR office at least once. The only one which answered that the visits were not helpful (CEPAM) implied that they were in the "comment" part of the question.

Visits help clarify relationships and project matters (problems, progress, suggestions) better than written communication; permit exchange of experiences; allow parties to get to know each other better; assure achievement of objectives (strengthen project implementation).

5. Are LWR's financial reporting requirements fair and helpful? Yes 15 No 0 Are the methods of transferring money timely and adequate? Is LWR responsive to your transmittal needs? Comments:

Transfer are timely, adequate, simple, non-bureaucratic, agile--no problem. Reporting requirements are practical, simple and help keep track of state of budget.

Annex 8.8 REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FROM ANDEAN REGION

6. What kind of information has LWR provided you? Please explain.

The following compilation and classification of answers was done by the reviewer. The respondents did not agree among themselves how to classify similar types of information (e.g., information about financial reporting appeared under administration, financial, technical, institutional development and other information).

Administration: Admin. guidelines from other project; how LWR works;

Financial: Sources of financing; 6 guides for financial reporting; personnel training;

Technical: Alternative tech. and tech. transfer; irrigation systems; one book;

Agricultural: Manual on eval. of rural projects; bibliography on organic ag.; revistas and one book;

Health: Traditional medicine; self-eval. of Moco-Moco project;

Community development: Results of women's workshop; document; rural promotion and organization; experiences in Peru; info. on similar projects;

Institution development: Institutional reflection of LWR/ARO; various publications; results of NGO workshop; document; conclusions and perspectives of institutional evaluation; proceedings of a meeting; institutional development and change; info on institutional policy;

Human resource development: Document; nonformal education; various documents in this area;

Other information: Direct comments and written info about economic projects; contacts with other orgs. interested in agroecology; planning; 8 project self-evaluation as a process; situation of indigenous women in Peru; sustainability of projects; reflections on rural development work; reports on other project which LWR supports; "The Woman As a Protagonist in the Region"; "Letter From Lima";

7. Do you have an official agreement with LWR? Yes 12 No 3  
Is it fair and functional? Yes 11 No 1

Comments:

General opinion is that agreement is helpful, defines goals and is flexible. Only TEKHNE comments that there is excessive emphasis on quantitative aspects such as in area of goal definition.

Annex 8.8 REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FROM ANDEAN REGION

8a. Do you have a schedule and plan for monitoring and evaluation?  
Yes 15 No 0

8b. Briefly describe how you conduct evaluations.

A variety of answers here. Three inform only when they do evaluations (by month, semester, year). Seven clearly mention a self-evaluation process (as recommended by LWR) either alone or combined with external evaluation. Three have developed special evaluation forms (one calls it a survey, another a "matrix") and one of them has an evaluation and monitoring unit. Two make specific mention of collection of quantitative data for analysis. Two mention that they involve LWR directly in their evaluation effort at some point in time. Only one limits its reference to an institutional evaluation (a reflection?).

The answers indicate a definite preoccupation with the idea of evaluation--likely a result of LWR's insistence--but are not specific enough to guess as to the details or quality of the evaluation. One can only assume that when they talk about self-evaluation as a process, they implement the process as well as possible.

8c. Has LWR offered any guidance in developing your evaluation methodology?

The answers indicate that LWR has done an effective job in making the NGOs think about evaluation as a necessary part of their project planning. In all cases except one (CAPER did not answer this question), LWR either directly advised the design of the evaluation process or provided written documentation to the agency about the need and how to do it.

9. Do you feel your organization is being strengthened by your relationship with LWR? Yes 14 No 1 If so, how? If not, could it be?

LWR has helped strengthen NGOs directly by way of personnel training, information and experience exchange with other NGOs, contacts with other international funding agencies, direct financial support of institutional goals as expressed in project proposals, advice in project planning (especially in goal definition and evaluation needs) and general collaboration in problem solving.

The one negative answer was not supported by a negative comment. The comment was actually positive.

10. Do you see this project as working toward sustainable development? Yes 15 No 0 If so, how? If not, why not?

## Annex 8.8 REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FROM ANDEAN REGION

The wording of this question was such that none of the organizations could possibly say "No," not to the question and not to one of their funding agencies which wants to finance sustainable projects. The answers tend to describe the overall goals of the various projects and describe these goals as "working toward sustainable development," instead of saying they are intended to work toward that end. The answers seem to reflect intentions, not facts derived from some kind of evaluation of results.

11. How do the assistance you receive from LWR and your relationship with LWR compare with the assistance and relationship you have or have had with other international agencies?

LWR appears to compare very favorably to other international agencies. The worst comment is that it is similar to others. Another is that comparisons are difficult due to varying priorities among the agencies. The other comments are all very positive. The fact that LWR has at least regional offices and can participate more closely and appreciate the real problems faced by the NGOs seems to be a factor in LWR's favor. Several appreciate the fact that LWR emphasizes self-evaluation over external. LWR understands problems, gets involved, is supportive, is open to new ideas, shows concern for people, is not just a funding agency.

## Annex 8.8 REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FROM ANDEAN REGION

### Conclusions

From this survey, one must conclude that LWR is doing its job to the satisfaction of the NGOs. Its policy to go beyond mere project funding--to include institutional development of the NGOs themselves, to facilitate information exchanges, to advise the proposal and planning process, and to demonstrate very clearly its concern for their beneficiaries--is very well received. The presence of permanent local and regional offices seems to be an important factor in facilitating LWR's good relationship with its counterparts. Another positive factor which is easily detected is LWR's treatment of its counterparts as equals in the development world. This is reflected in LWR's timeliness in transmittal of funds and in its working style, which avoids a qualification as a bureaucracy by the NGOs.

Negative comments were so rare in this survey as to be considered without importance. The extent to which this has to do with the wording of questions (even constructive criticisms was rare) or with the fact that LWR is one of the hands that feed them (and therefore not to be bitten) is not clear.

LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF

PROJECTS SYSTEM MANUAL

Introduction

Most LWR project support results from dialogue with indigenous private agencies with whom LWR has enjoyed a long association. Many of these agencies are or have developed from ecumenical organizations in the host country. LWR initiates new relationships to respond to new situation of human need. In such situations LWR seeks first to develop a mutual relationship of understanding with potential new partners before providing project support.

Project Criteria and Agency Relationships

The Development Strategy Guidelines, (attachment A), have been the primary frame of reference within which LWR has reviewed proposals since 1975. LWR developed these guidelines based on an intensive review of past experience and discussion with indigenous partner agencies. LWR is particularly concerned that projects should address needs common among the poor majority in a manner consistent with their own understanding of the nature and priority of such needs. LWR supports project which stimulate communities to participate successfully in activities designed to meet their basic human needs and which strengthen networks and infrastructures which will enable communities to continue development activities beyond the life of the project itself.

## Project Application and Review

Project proposals are normally received by LWR after discussions between LWR program staff and the partner agency. LWR program staff review the proposal for coherence and clarity and request additional information or clarification as needed.

In the case of a new project holder, LWR staff will visit the counterpart agency to develop an adequate understanding of the project holder's development philosophy, its base of support, and its administrative and financial management capacity. As a part of this process, LWR staff ask for the information outlined on the counterpart agency profile format (attachment B).

Though received in various formats, the project proposal is ultimately written in the form outlined in attachment C. The Development Projects Screening Committee, DPSC (consisting of LWR's New York based program staff), reviews all development project proposals for completeness, consistency with LWR development strategy guidelines, soundness, and relevance. The Development Projects Screening Committee may approve projects up to \$50,000. All other projects are recommended to LWR's Board of Directors for funding authorization.

## Project Support & Reporting Expectations

Following LWR Board of Directors' approval, LWR offers a grant agreement (attachment D) to the project holder for an amount up to the agreed budget. The General Provisions for Grant Agreement (attachment E) and the project description are part of the grant agreement.

For its part, LWR provides funds and any other form of support outlined in the grant agreement, and LWR will continue its interest in both the project and an ongoing dialogue with the partner agency. LWR staff, either New York or regionally based, will normally visit projects supported by LWR.

The project holder is responsible for carrying out the project and other activities specifically outlined in the grant agreement, including providing various reports to LWR. These include quarterly financial reports (attachment F), quarterly progress reports (attachment G), annual evaluations (attachment H), and annual audits (attachment I). Any special concerns related to these reports will normally be spoken to in the grant agreement or in separate correspondence.

Funds transfers are based on project funding needs and project reporting performance. LWR makes funds available for the first two quarters' activities before the first financial or progress reports are due. Subsequent funds transfers are subject to LWR receiving financial and progress reports from the project holder. At the close of any reporting period, the project will normally have a balance approximately equal to the current quarter's planned expenditures. Following receipt and review of the financial and progress reports, LWR will forward funds for the next quarter.

**EXAMPLE:**

- a. Project sends financial progress reports for period ending 31 March.
- b. The closing balance of funds available on 31 March should be sufficient for April, May and June expenditures.

- c. On 01 May LWR acknowledges receipt of reports to 31 March
- d. Following satisfactory review of financial and progress reports, LWR transmits additional funds on 15 June to cover expenditures planned for July - September.

This process is repeated each quarter.

Finance reports are to be submitted every three months on the standard form found in attachment F. The purposes of this report are: to assure accountability for funds provided by Lutheran World Relief; to enable both the project holder and LWR to remain up-to-date on the financial status of the project; to assure a timely availability of funds to the project.

Progress reports are to be submitted every three months. The purpose of these reports is to provide a regular mechanism for reviewing project implementation. These reports focus on activities during the period, problems encountered, changes in the project, and where appropriate, the impact of the project. The specific activities covered in these reports are based on mutual agreement between the project holder and LWR. They should follow the general format in attachment G.

Project evaluations are carried out on an annual basis. These reports should focus on the project's impact, i.e., changes which have resulted from the project's activities. The specific kinds of changes to be reported depend on the nature and purposes of the project and mutual agreement between the project holder and LWR. Further detail about these reports is found in attachment H.

## Annex 8.9

Audit reports on the project holder's use of funds are to be provided on an annual basis. Audits should be carried out by nationally accredited auditors. Guidelines for audit reports, including their scope and content are outlined in attachment I.

Each of these reports is reviewed by LWR staff and enables them to remain current on project activities and accomplishments. The reports are reviewed for accuracy, completeness, and important issues which may be raised. LWR views the reporting relationship as important to the broader continuing relationship with counterpart agencies. Though there will commonly be additional aspects to the relationship with a counterpart agency, the reporting relationship is central to understanding and relating to individual projects.

Reports from individual projects form a primary basis for LWR review of its overall program. LWR always welcomes suggestions on improving its relationships with project holders, including its reporting relationships.

## ATTACHMENTS

- A. Development Strategy Guidelines
- B. Counterpart Agency Profile
- C. Information for Project Descriptions
- D. Letter of Agreement
- E. General Provisions for Grant Agreement
- F. Quarterly Finance Reports
- G. Guidelines for Quarterly Accomplishment Reports
- H. Guidelines for Evaluation Reports
- I. Guidelines for Audit of Activities supported by LWR Grants

LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF

DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY GUIDELINES  
(Revised November 10, 1975)

1. PROJECT IDEAS MUST ORIGINATE IN THE TARGET GROUP.

- Implications:
- A. Projects will recognize and attempt to accommodate social customs and cultural values.
  - B. They should reflect felt needs.
  - C. They should seek harmony with government planning.

2. PROJECTS SHOULD SERVE THE POOREST MAJORITY.

- Implications:
- A. Projects should help the poor toward self-reliance and determination of their own destiny.
  - B. They should embody direct intervention at the grass-roots level.
  - C. Project personnel should identify with the poorest majority.
  - D. Project participants should be consumers as well as producers of the project benefits.

3. THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF PROJECTS SHOULD WORK IN FAVOR OF THE ULTIMATE WELL BEING OF THE TARGET GROUP.

- Implications:
- A. Projects should take into account all relevant political, social and economic factors.
  - B. Predictable consequences of project success should be projected.
  - C. The project's effect on the environment should be estimated.
  - D. Projects should contain a "multiplier factor" for maximum impact.

4. PROJECTS SHOULD STIMULATE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL AND LOCAL STRUCTURES, ENABLING THEM TO IDENTIFY PROBLE, PLAN SOLUTIONS AND ORGANIZE WORK.

- Implications:
- A. Permanent improvement of indigenous organizational infrastructure is a desirable project objective.

B. Establishment of foreign organizational infrastructure should be avoided.

5. PROJECTS SHOULD USE INDIEGENOUS HUMAN AND MATERIAL RESOURCES AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE.

- Implications:
- A. Human employment should be preferred to capital investment; that is, projects should be labor-intensive.
  - B. Qualified locals should assume administrative and technical responsibility for projects as soon as practicable.
  - C. Local materials should be given preference over imports.
  - D. Machine technology should be at a level appropriate to the best use of indigenous human resources.

6. PROJECT ACTIVITIES SHOULD BECOME SELF-SUPPORTING.

- Implications:
- A. Successful "projects" will be absorbed into societal patterns and become a way of life.
  - B. External projects supporters may need to insist that project participants take management responsibilities and strive for autonomy.
  - C. Project financing must be at a level that can be supported eventually from local sources.

7. PROJECTS SHOULD BE TECHNICALLY SOUND.

- Implications:
- A. Project use appropriate technology.
  - B. Adequate and competent personnel must be available to projects.
  - C. Projects are logical - resources and planned activities reasonably can be expected to produce the desired results.

8. INDIVIDUAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE INTEGRATED INTO A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM.

- Implications:
- A. Analysis of all relevant needs and constraints before project implementation is necessary.

- B. The comprehensive program will be sufficient to make significant, permanent improvements in participants' quality of life.
- C. Donor and implementing organizations in the target area should achieve maximum cooperation and coordination.
- D. Project should be mutually reinforcing.
- E. Project designs must avoid both critical omissions and wasteful duplication.
- F. Priorities will be assigned to various project activities.

9. PROJECTS MUST BE REVIEWED AND EVALUATED PERIODICALLY.

Implications:

- A. Projects should be evaluated in the context of their contribution to overall objectives of the comprehensive program.
- B. Project goals must be stated in such a way that progress toward their achievement can be measured.
- C. Project evaluations will be defined and scheduled before implementation.
- D. Evaluation during implementation should lead to corrective changes in project design and support.
- E. End-of-project evaluation should focus on a project's suitability for replication.

COUNTERPART AGENCY PROFILE

Date:

- 1. Official Name of Agency:
- 2. Address:
- 3. Telephone Number:
- 4. Telex/Cable Address:
- 5. Names and Titles of Agency Executives:
- 6. Type of Governing Body:
- 7. Legal Status of Organization:
- 8. Founding Date of Agency:
- 9. Brief Summary of Overall Objectives of the Agency:
- 10. Types of Programs Supported:
- 11. A. Number of Staff:
 

Nationals:	Salaried: _____	Volunteer: _____
Expatriates:	Salaried: _____	Volunteer: _____
- 12. Total Agency Budget:
 

Last year:	_____
This year:	_____
Next year (estimate):	_____
- 13. Bank Name & Address:
 

Account #:	_____
------------	-------
- 14. Name and Address of External Auditing Firm:
 

Type of accreditation or credentials:	_____
---------------------------------------	-------
- 15. Describe Any Procurement Policies:
- 16. Primary Sources of Agency Support:

18

GUIDELINES FOR PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS  
 (Revision for use by Project Holders)

- Title: Country: Project Title, City or Region
- Project Holder: Official Title of agency (acronym)
- Purpose: Indicate what is to be accomplished and who will be affected. (Where can also be addressed if relevant.)  
 Example: To increase vegetable and fruit production of 134 small-scale gardeners in a traditionally food-deficit region.
- Need: Describe the specific needs to be addressed by the project. E.G. food shortage resulting in malnutrition during 2 months preceeding harvest due to:
1. Inadequate local storage facilities
  2. Inadequate local production
- Describe how the community currently deals with this need.
- Description: Summarize important components which tell how project will accomplish stated purpose. Example:
1. Provide 50 shepherds with 20 local ewes and one ram of improved breed.
  2. Train shepherds incare and breeding of improved sheep.
    - A. Government to provide veterinary service.
    - B. Shepherds society and government sheep farm to participate.
- Funding:
- |   | <u>YR 1</u> | <u>YR 2</u> | <u>YR 3</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| LWR Grant Request:  |             |             |             |              |
| Total Project Budget:   |             |             |             |              |
| Local Support:<br>(including in kind support)                       |             |             |             |              |
| Other Donor Support:<br>(list names or other donors but no amounts) |             |             |             |              |
- Time: Period to be covered by the project.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Objective: Objective should be in support of or in order to accomplish the purpose and address the needs outlined.  
Objectives should be specific and measureable.  
Strategy: The activities or steps in reaching the objectives.

EXAMPLE:

Objective: 1. Establish brickmaking cooperative for unemployed Harijan youth in Khamgeon village.  
Strategy:  
a. Construct tin shed, small house and furnace for bricks on cooperatively owned land.  
b. Purchase four oxen and two carts for local transport of raw materials and finished products.

EVALUATION PLAN

Indicate who will conduct the evaluation, when it will be done, the indicators to be measured and, if possible the methodology to be used.

BUDGET IN DETAIL

Display the total project budget by year, if possible and indicate if LWR funds are designated for certain items. (This is the budget against which the quarterly reports will be submitted.)

EXAMPLE:

	<u>YR 1</u>	<u>YR 2</u>	<u>YR 3</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>Salaries</u>				
Director				
Secretary				
<u>Program</u>				
Health				
Agricultural Production				
Literacy				
Other				
TOTAL				

10



GUIDELINES FOR PROGRESS REPORTS

Grant agreements between project holders and LWR call for quarterly progress reports from the project holder. The purposes of these reports is to provide a regular mechanism for reviewing and recording the progress of project implementation activities during the period, changes in the project, and when appropriate, discernable project impacts.

The following should be included in each project report:

1. Project: (name & location) 1a. Date: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Project Holder: (name & location) 1b. Period Covered: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Report prepared by: (name) \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_
4. Significant activities or accomplishments during the period. Which activities to include will be based on mutual agreement between the project holder and LWR and project holder's best judgement. Reporting should be both current and cumulative where feasible. Several examples of the types of activities may include:

	<u>This Period</u>	<u>Total to Date</u>	<u>Target</u>
Number of wells: initiated	10	20	50
: completed	5	15	50
Literacy courses conducted	10	20	50
Number of participants	200	200	150
Midwives trained	10	20	50
Tomatoes marketed tons	10 tons	10 tons	20
Hectares planted	100	100	100
Irrigation system built	20%	40%	100%

Qualitative progress Narrative comments on activities explaining either quantitative or qualitative aspects of the project.

5. Problems project has faced Expected or unexpected. Technical, social (cooperation of community or authorities), political, etc.

6. Comments concerning the impact of project activity. While this is the primary focus of annual evaluations, comments regarding impact are welcome on the progress reports as well. These might include:

- . Increased production resulting from project activities;
- . activities initiated by the community in part because of participation in project;
- . changes in the community's health, social or economic status
- . increased access to government programs/resources/assistance.

It is most helpful to receive both an explanation of the result (impact) as well as logical explanation of how participation in the project contributed to these results.

7. Any issues, information, or activities the project participants or project holder would like LWR or other donors to be aware of.

THESE REPORTS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED QUARTERLY.



- f. Improved health status of the community. This should be demonstrated by comparing earlier and current mortality and/or morbidity rates, armband measurements, percent of children gaining weight, or other meaningful health measures.
5. Project Impact. This includes any qualitative or quantitative changes in community as a result of this project. Particular note should be made of changes in: relationships among groups within the community; access to official structures and infrastructures; and ability of the community to work as a cohesive groups. Expected or unexpected, positive or negative changes related to project's achievements should be analyzed.
6. Analysis of any other issues the participating communities or the project holder consider important.
7. Description of evaluation methodology. This should include how information was gathered, how information was verified, and how conclusions were reached from the information gathered.

Project evaluations should be carried out annually. They should take into consideration the needs and knowledge of the project participants and project holder. They can be conducted by outside consultants, but the project participants and project holder should be involved.

Project evaluations should emphasize the impact of projects. For example, evaluation should focus on the degree of increased agricultural production and what the community does with that increase, rather than focus on construction of an irrigation system that led to the increased production.

LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF

Guidelines for Audits of Activities  
Supported by LWR Grants

The agreement between Lutheran World Relief and project holders requires an annual external, agency-wide audit by an independent, certified/chartered public accountant. These audits are considered necessary as a point of good business practice. As with any audit, these provide an external check on the adequacy and accuracy of the project holder's financial management and record keeping systems.

With particular reference to the grants LWR makes to any given project holder, the purpose of independent audits shall be to determine the propriety and necessity of expenditures reported in terms of the purposes for which the funds were made available and the adequacy of the financial management of those funds.

To fulfill this audit provision, LWR anticipates that the following steps would be taken:

1. That the purpose of the audit as indicated above would be shared with the auditors.
2. That the auditors have complete access to any records regarding projects supported by grants from LWR including project proposals, budgets and correspondence with LWR.
3. That the auditors be asked by the project holder to issue a statement with the agency's audit report indicating their opinion as to whether:  
(i) generally accepted accounting principles were followed; (ii) the periodic reports submitted to LWR have been accurate and adequately substantiated; (iii) physical verification of project accomplishment and/or activities have been adequate; (iv) expenditures were within reasonable bounds of propriety and necessity in terms of the purpose for which the funds were made available and the actual achievements of the project.

4. The auditors' statement, requested in point c. above, be included with the auditors' general opinion, the project holder's agency-wide audit and any comments the auditors may include with their reports.

Auditors employed by the project holders should be certified public accountants or hold the nearest equivalent national accreditation. Auditors should meet reasonable tests of independence, such as not benefiting from the project holder's program or not being related to important persons on the project holder's board or staff.

September 1982

101



- 2. Received during quarter from LWR: \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Received during quarter from Other Donors (include Local Resources): \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. Other Income during quarter (Repayment of Loans, Sales, Interest Income, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Total Available (Add #1,2,3 and 4): \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. Total Expenditures during quarter: \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. Balance on hand (Subtract #6 from #5) \_\_\_\_\_

Report filed in \_\_\_\_\_.

Submitted by \_\_\_\_\_

Currency

Signature

Exchange rate: U.S. \$1.00 = \_\_\_\_\_.

Name and Title

(Please Print or Type)

## ANNEX 8.10. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Project files in Niamey (including project agreement with partner, project proposal, progress reports, correspondence, and where appropriate, project evaluations) for following projects:

Zourbattan Integrated Development, phase II  
Forest Management, Gaya  
Yakaouda Basin Development  
Bahe Bolongou, phase II  
Integrated Rural Development, Nadara  
Dazga Area Gardening, phase II  
Dadin Kowa Area Gardening, phase II  
Boni Integrated Development Project

UNAIS: Primary Health Care and Sanitation, Sanguie  
Integrated Rural Development, Deou  
CNN: Soil and Water Management, Nakamtenga

Project files in India (including project agreements, correspondence between ICSA, LWR and project holders, and where appropriate, project evaluations) for following projects:

CAST: Economic Development and Health Care  
CMAI: Community-Based Health Care  
IRRM: Integrated Rural Development, Pulicherla Mandal  
CCOORR: Integrated Rural Development II, Tirunravur

LWR Policy and By-Laws, 1990

LWR Project Systems Manual

Development Strategy Guidelines, 1975

Proposal for Strategy to Deal with World Hunger, 1974

Evaluation of LWR projects in Niger, 1982, Weber and Hoskins

Audit of LWR/Niger, 1982, Cesar and Boissin

Evaluation of five LWR/Niger projects, 1985, Thacher and Fitzgerald

Follow-up of evaluations of LWR wells projects, 1988, O'Neil

A Process Approach to Evaluation, A Manual for Development Practitioners, LWR Andean Regional Office