

PD-ABG-873

84581

**FINAL EVALUATION**

**LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF**

**MATCHING GRANT III**

**COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT (#OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00)**

**Evaluation Team:**

**Daniel Santo Pietro, Consultant**

**Jim Rugh, Consultant**

**Cheryl Morden, LWR**

**John Soloninka, LWR**

**Sigurd Hanson, LWR**

**September 1993**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report is a final evaluation of the Lutheran World Relief (LWR) Cooperative Agreement with the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) (Ref. OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00). The Agreement covers a five year Matching Grant (MG) which ran from September 1, 1988 through September 30, 1993. It is the third and last Matching Grant A.I.D. has given LWR culminating a funding relationship that began in 1979. The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the extent to which community (sub) project objectives were achieved, how effectively LWR has managed its relationships of support to partner agencies, and how the Matching Grant affected LWR's institutional capabilities.

In 1991, out of a total budget of about \$20 million, LWR granted about \$4.4 million to Southern Non-Governmental (NGO) partners. Though this grant making program does not represent the largest portion of its budget, most LWR staff consider it the cutting edge of its program, which is growing steadily. Currently, LWR is funding 113 bi-lateral development projects in 19 countries. The other larger portion of its budget has gone for relief and material aid, which varies considerably from year to year.

MG-III contributed to the funding of 60 projects in 9 countries, and had three overall objectives:

- 1) 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;
- 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 and complement the development activities of host country governments whenever such activities are in accord with program purposes 1 and 2 above. (as amended)

The two external evaluators interviewed key LWR staff and visited fifteen partners in Kenya, India and the Andean Region accompanied by experienced LWR staff. Thirty-three partners also responded to a survey. The findings were analyzed with LWR staff to arrive at the conclusions and lessons learned in the report.

The evaluation concluded that LWR identified projects in accord with its criteria, which in all cases included significant beneficiary participation in their planning and execution. Furthermore, the sixty LWR matching grant projects were mostly successful in achieving their diverse objectives. In nearly all the projects visited

partners have helped develop the management capability of second level community organizations and introduced technical innovations. Many projects focussed on agro-ecology concerns that need continued specialized technical assistance to better realize their objectives. Finally, enabling these people organizations to become more self-sufficient should be a central concern of LWR funding in the future.

Partners compare LWR's "accompaniment" methodology favorably to other donors. They appreciate the good communications, effective monitoring visits, and reasonable reporting requirements. LWR, particularly in the Andean Region and the Philippines, has been successful in promoting a self-evaluation approach that has strengthened partners' management capability. The evaluators concluded that partners value LWR's organizational development assistance as much as its financial support.

Although many partners have been successful in diversifying their international donor support, few have developed significant local funding opportunities, particularly with governments. LWR partners in India, the Philippines and the Andean Region are leaders in local regional NGO networks that are producing a coordination of activities and micro-regional planning that reinforce efforts to decentralize government development resources. As partners try to carry out more ambitious development efforts and influence policy in more significant ways, LWR needs to adapt its methodology and organizational resources to support these initiatives.

In the early years, the Matching Grant program helped LWR to consolidate a systematic approach to strengthening partner organizations, but the current Matching Grant program has become more onerous and less effective in furthering the LWR partnership approach. A.I.D. and LWR have collaborated successfully for fourteen years, and still have a common interest in building NGO capabilities.

The evaluators recommend LWR build on the success of its partnership grants program. Funding policy should allow for block grants to proved partners, small grants approved at a field level for second level community organizations, and expanded facilitation funds. It is also a recognized need within LWR itself to carry out a special strategic planning effort. This planning should be a process that builds on field experience and continues to serve to adapt LWR to the rapidly changing environment of its partners. The planning should take into account the convergence of program and policy advocacy, and result in continued dialogue with A.I.D. on the appropriate conditions for their funding of partnership programs.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b><u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u></b> .....	i
<b>I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u></b> .....	1
A. PURPOSE .....	1
B. METHODOLOGY .....	2
C. EVALUATION TEAM .....	2
<b>II. <u>PRINCIPAL FINDINGS</u></b> .....	4
A. OVERVIEW .....	4
B. PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS .....	5
C. PARTNER AGENCIES' INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES .....	14
D. LWR PARTNER RELATIONSHIPS .....	21
E. A.I.D.'S IMPACT ON LWR .....	29
<b>III. <u>PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS</u></b> .....	32
<b>IV. <u>LESSONS LEARNED</u></b> .....	35
<b>V. <u>EVALUATION ISSUES</u></b> .....	41
<b>VI. <u>OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS</u></b> .....	43
<b>VII. <u>ANNEXES</u></b> .....	45
ANNEX A.1. <u>SCOPE OF WORK</u> .....	45
ANNEX A.2. <u>SURVEY INSTRUMENT</u> .....	54
ANNEX B. <u>LIST OF PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER MG-III</u> .....	57
ANNEX C. <u>CASE STUDIES</u> .....	60
ANNEX D. <u>LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED</u> .....	71
ANNEX E. <u>REFERENCES</u> .....	77
ANNEX F. <u>LIST OF ACRONYMS</u> .....	79

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **A. PURPOSE**

This report is a final evaluation of the Lutheran World Relief (LWR) Cooperative Agreement with the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) (Ref. OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00). The Agreement covers a five year Matching Grant (MG) which ran from September 1, 1988 through September 30, 1993 (as extended). It is the third matching grant, referred to as MG-III, A.I.D. has given LWR that culminates a funding relationship that began in 1979. The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the extent to which community (sub) project objectives were achieved, how effectively LWR has managed its relationships of support to partner agencies, and how the Matching Grant affected LWR's institutional capabilities.

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 1970's, LWR's program began to shift from relief to development.

The majority of LWR's development activities involve the support of indigenous agencies. Local "project holders" are referred to as "partners" throughout this report. LWR does not implement projects. Instead, it facilitates development through its methodology of 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.

The intention of the evaluators is to provide a report that both satisfies the need for accountability as well as useful information for future LWR planning. Since LWR does not intend to continue in the A.I.D. Matching Grant program, the report concludes this fourteen year relationship with A.I.D.. It is a critical time for LWR's program as it adjusts its planning to its new funding approach and the evolution of needs of its partners.

## FINAL EVALUATION OF LWR MATCHING GRANT III

### B. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was carried out by a combination of external evaluators and LWR staff members. The team leader, Daniel Santo Pietro, and the other external evaluator, Jim Rugh, designed a survey that LWR sent to each of its partner organizations that received funds from the Matching Grant. This survey provided information from nearly every partner about project achievements and partner perceptions of their relationship with LWR. After reviewing project documentation and interviewing New York program staff, the external evaluators visited a sample of field projects together with LWR staff.

Daniel Santo Pietro and Cheryl Morden interviewed LWR field staff and eight partner staff in the Andean Region. With six partners they visited project sites and interviewed project beneficiaries. Jim Rugh also interviewed LWR field staff in Africa and visited three partner agencies in East Africa with John Soloninka. Then he interviewed the person representing LWR interests in Inter-Church Service Agency (ICSA) visited four partner agencies in India with Sigurd Hanson. This approach coupled the external evaluators with experienced LWR staff during all visits, but improved objectivity because the staff were not evaluating their own programs.

Since separate teams gathered most of the information, the evaluators prepared a rather detailed interview guide (See Annex A.1: Scope of Work) to assure comparability. The guide included a Typology of LWR Partners to enable the evaluators to categorize LWR partners and to measure the institutional changes that occurred during the period LWR assisted them. The information gathered was analyzed with LWR staff both in the field and in New York to arrive at the Conclusions and Lessons Learned contained in this report.

### C. EVALUATION TEAM

□ **DANIEL SANTO PIETRO** is an independent consultant with twenty-five years experience in Latin America, principally with private development organizations. He was Director of Catholic Relief Services Northeast Brazil program and later served as Deputy Director of Catholic Relief Services' (CRS) South America Regional Office. As a consultant he coordinated a training project on monitoring and evaluation for about 60 PVOs, which involved field workshops in Asia, Africa and Latin America as well as editing the Evaluation Sourcebook for PVOs. He became the Latin America Director for PACT, and supervised PVO institutional strengthening programs throughout the region, most notably in Guatemala and Costa Rica. His recent consultancies included several PVO evaluations and technical assistance to NGOs in Costa Rica and El Salvador.

## **FINAL EVALUATION OF LWR MATCHING GRANT III**

- **JIM RUGH** had 3 years of professional experience promoting rural community development in India (plus 12 years in that country as a child), over 15 years in Africa, plus 5 years in Appalachia. His academic training includes two masters degrees, the second in International Agriculture and Rural Development at Cornell University. He wrote a manual, published by World Neighbors, to help leaders of community groups conduct participatory evaluation. He has conducted evaluations for a variety of agencies in Africa and India, including the Mid-Term Evaluation of this LWR Matching Grant, and has created his own consultancy service, "Community-Based Evaluations."
- **CHERYL MORDEN** is the Associate Director of Church World Service (CWS) / LWR's Washington Office on Development Policy
- **JOHN SOLONINKA** is the LWR Regional Representative in West Africa
- **SIGURD HANSON** is the LWR Regional Representative for East and Southern Africa

## **II. PRINCIPAL FINDINGS**

### **A. OVERVIEW**

In 1991, out of a total budget of about \$20 million, LWR granted about \$4.4 million to Southern NGO partners. Though this grant making program does not represent the largest portion of its budget, most LWR staff consider it the cutting edge of its program, which is growing steadily. The other larger portion of its budget has gone for relief and material aid, which varies considerably from year to year. Currently, LWR is funding 113 bi-lateral development projects in 19 countries.

MG-III contributed to the funding of 60 projects in 9 countries, and had three overall objectives:

- 1) 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;
- 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 and complement the development activities of host country governments whenever such activities are in accord with program purposes 1 and 2 above. (as amended)

A complete list of MG-III projects as of July 31, 1993 is contained in Annex B. . Annex B also compiles data about the scope of each partner's program from 33 survey replies and, in the other 10 cases from project documentation. The data gathered includes number of communities benefitted, number of primary beneficiaries, number of people trained and the percentage of trainees that were women. A summary of the number of projects by country is included in the following table.

Table 1: MG-III Projects by Country

Country	Number of Projects	Number of Partners	Amt. Expended (7/31/93)
Burkina Faso	4	3	168,575
Kenya	5	3	256,540
Niger	12	11	966,127
Senegal	2	2	98,965
India	8	5	643,067
Phillipines	4	3	393,360
Bolivia	7	4	446,480
Ecuador	5	3	317,006
Peru	13	9	791,012
Totals	60	43	4,081,132

## B. PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In assessing project accomplishments, the evaluation team used the indicators in the LWR Matching Grant logical framework as a guide. The key indicators were: strengthened community organization, introduction of innovative development activities especially involving environmental improvements, beneficiary participation in designing and evaluating activities, participation in training and improvements in food production, income and other quality of life indicators. Some data was gathered through a survey sent to all project holders, but the most significant information came from documentation and field visits to a sample of projects in three regions. Since the mid-term evaluation team did not visit the Andean Region, this report provides more detail on project accomplishments and partners in that Region.

In some instances, especially in the Andean Region, LWR often co-finances programs. In these cases the partner usually reports on total program accomplishments, not just the portion LWR funds, which expands considerably the scope of accomplishments. In the projects visited the evaluators tracked the percentage of the partners' total program budget LWR funded in each case. This information is contained in section C below.

## 1. Andean Region

The Andean Region Office (ARO) currently accompanies 29 development projects, 25 of which received MG funding. In addition, ARO funded numerous micro-projects of less than \$3,000 through the Andean Development Facilitation Fund (ADFF). Although the ADFF consists entirely of LWR private resources, it makes the use of Matching Grant funds more effective. ARO accompanied these projects with two professionals in its Quito regional office, one in its sub-regional Lima office, and a part-time consultant located in Bolivia.

**Social Organization:** LWR partners in general have significant impacts on social organization. Their projects have concentrated on 17 distinct mostly rural regions. Only three were urban based. Most programs (9) were focussed on 25-50 communities while four were smaller and four larger. (See Annex B) The average number of direct beneficiaries were around 2000. Two programs (CASAS and SEMTA) had extensive training efforts which reached considerably larger numbers.

The evaluation team visited 7 partner agencies that implemented projects in 8 regions. In six of these regions the strategies for strengthening social organization clearly had achieved important results. Two of the partners, PRE and CASDEC, had less clearly articulated results. In the six cases, not only had the partner agencies strengthened local community organizations, but they also had contributed to organizing second level federations. In most cases, managing credit and water resources provided the strongest organizational impetus. Every partner gave special attention to women's organization, and three, IDEAS, LABOR and CASDEC, had made impressive strides in building effective networks of women's organizations. The issue of self-management and autonomy of these campesino organizations was a high priority in the plans of these partners, but none asserted they had yet succeeded.

In summary, LWR projects are achieving important results in building community organizations. It is troublesome that after 10 years in most instances that these community organizations still depend on the same NGOs for training and resources. In part one can explain the dependency because these governments have diminished social programs as a result of their severe economic restructuring policies. This dependency remains a major concern for the future.

**Beneficiary Participation:** All LWR partners have devoted considerable energy to promoting broad-based participation in their projects. It was not possible to verify with precision the extent of community participation in project management. However, the meetings with beneficiaries of FEPP, IDEAS, LABOR, FEPADE and CASDEC programs verified they had ample knowledge of project objectives and a high

degree of involvement in carrying out activities. Although women participated fully through their own organizations, they still were not integrated into mainstream community organizations

Nearly all LWR partners showed commitment to involving beneficiaries in the self-evaluation approach LWR encouraged. The approach encourages on-going data collection by the farmers themselves. An indicator of success is how many of these projects have made major changes in their program approaches because of campesino pressures. The most dramatic example is the shift SEMTA made from stressing technological innovations for community agriculture in the Bolivian altiplano to family-run cattle production in response to demands from campesino organizations.

In the IDEAS, CIED, and LABOR programs, beneficiaries had also been involved in micro-regional planning initiatives mostly focussed on the use of natural resources. In these cases the NGOs had facilitated the organization of coordinating committees, congresses and other opportunities for local community organizations to meet with each other and with local government.

**Training:** All LWR partners invest a majority of their resources in training. According to the survey, the total number of persons that participated in partners' training activities during the current MG is about 39,000. The training strengthens a mix of leadership, organizational and technical skills. In many instances these NGOs have assumed the full range of developmental training needs that the governments have neglected or abandoned because of budget cut-backs. In every instance the LWR partners stressed they are providing virtually all the agriculture extension support in the regions where they work.

Women constitute nearly 40% of those trained. Many women are trained as health promoters, but at least some women in each program are receiving organizational training. In the IDEAS, CASDEC and LABOR programs interviews with women indicated that the training they had received through their women's organizations had made notable differences in their lives. In all some progress has clearly been made in enhancing the role of women, but LWR partners recognize that their training has not led to the integration of women into mainstream organizations, and much more needs to be done.

In several programs special efforts were made to institutionalize training for campesinos. CIED in Cajamarca has started a Rural Andean School in direct support of its objective of promoting Campesino self management in the region within two years. SEMTA has just started a training center in its region. This issue of helping campesino organizations to manage their own training programs without depending

on an NGO is sure to become more important in the future.

**Development Innovations:** This indicator measures the transference of new technologies to campesino organizations. LWR partners are often playing a basic research role to help improve productive possibilities in the region where they work, which includes a variety of challenging eco-systems. Ranging from Ecuador's Amazonic basin (FEPP), to Peru's dry coastal plains (IDEAS and LABOR), to mountainous highlands (CIED, FEPADE and CASDEC) and, finally, the Altiplano (CIED/Puno and SEMTA), LWR partners confront production problems that the respective governments only sporadically address even though a majority of the campesino population have to overcome them to make a living.

All but one of the partners visited have innovated by introducing agro-ecology into their programs. Instead of lamenting the persistent limitations of the lack of water and good soils, these programs are seeking different ways to come to terms with difficult realities. The interchanges and courses for LWR partner staff carried out through CLADES, the Latin American NGO agro-ecology consortium, have notably contributed to program growth in this field.

The evaluators noted that each partner visited were introducing innovations to the communities where they worked. These innovations ranged from the intermixing of fruit and wood trees with coffee plants to intensify production on small plots (IDEAS) to reviving the Incas' waru-waru irrigation techniques (CIED). LWR partners seem particularly committed to countering environmental degradation by non-traditional farming and pasture methods.

The agro-ecology emphasis applies to a wide-range of activities. Also nearly all LWR partners are carrying out reforestation and striving to introduce organic techniques like composting if for no other reason than chemical fertilization is increasingly beyond the reach of the poorer rural populations. In order for agro-ecology to be more than a fad, these type of experiences will have to be systematized and their cost effectiveness evaluated. CLADES has focussed its efforts in involving Latin American universities in agro-ecology research and training. Given LWR's considerable investment in disseminating agro-ecology, it should consider how it can most effectively consolidate the field.

In summary, LWR partners are in fact innovating and evolving new techniques and services for the communities they work with. It is not clear what the long term benefits of the new field of agro-ecology will be. Innovations require some risks, but LWR partners seem to have appropriately calculated them with the communities involved.

**Developmental Impacts:** In this region improvements in agricultural production were the most significant impacts. Although LWR's Matching Grant strategy suggests impacts in small scale enterprise and health sectors, only two projects focussed on urban enterprises, and health activities usually were small components of integrated projects. Health activities largely trained community health promoters, whose impact was limited by the poor facilities they had to work with in their communities.

It is difficult to quantify the impact of the projects LWR supported. Review of project documentation indicates that periodic reports and evaluations contain useful data, but there is not a systematic approach to measuring impact in each project nor a regular compilation of data by LWR staff. Therefore, it is not possible to measure with any precision the extent to which the Andean program had affected agricultural production or improved health conditions. (See IV.E Lessons Learned)

## **2. Africa Region**

LWR has two regional offices in Africa. The West Africa Regional Office in Niamey currently funds 21 projects with partners in Niger, Burkina Faso, Togo, Mali and Senegal. Over the course of MG-III a total of 18 projects were funded with USA.I.D. funds. The East and Southern Africa Regional Office in Nairobi currently funds 12 bilateral projects in Kenya, Tanzania and Zimbabwe (plus other relationships with partners in seven additional countries). Five projects were funded with three partners in Kenya under the MG.

Three Kenya partners were visited during this final evaluation. (Project partners in Niger and Burkina Faso were visited during the mid-term evaluation.) These are:

- Ogwedhi-Sigawa Community Development Program (OSP) of the Kenya Mennonite Church, located between three tribes in western Kenya with a history of conflict;
- Farming Systems Kenya (FSK), which provides agricultural extension services to farmers around Nakuru in central Kenya; and
- Tototo Home Industries, based in Mombasa on the eastern coast, which for 30 years has trained women in a variety of ways, including group leadership and business management.

These projects are so different from each other that it is difficult to make generalized statements about the accomplishments of LWR's partners. Brief descriptions of each of the three follow:

According to the Manager of OSP there are 50,000 "beneficiaries" in the three communities (ethnic groups) addressed by the project. He claims new developments introduced during the course of the MG included the facilitation of genuine reconciliation between the Maasai, Luo and Kuria tribes in the area; many farmers have improved their livestock; crop production has increased; nutritional status of children has improved; agro-forestry has increased; and safe water resources have been developed.

The evaluators were impressed with the farmers they were taken to visit, including a Maasai family who have successfully settled and now combine farming with improved livestock, and a Luo young man who has taken over a progressive farm from his recently deceased father. The school associated with the project includes students from all three ethnic groups, and is obviously contributing to understanding and reconciliation. But the two-day visit was neither sufficient nor intended to verify all the outcomes and impacts of the project.

The last evaluation of this project was conducted by LWR staff and Paul Maina of FSK in 1991. It found that the project "contributed significantly to the atmosphere of peace that now exists in the area." However, their assessment of the specific project accomplishments indicated more room for improvement than evidence of tangible achievements to date. The technical staff of FSK collect lots of data, but it is hard to obtain over-all perspective of achievements. Portions of the program funded by different donors are run as separate projects by FSK. All together it works in 27 communities, 9 of which are in the LWR-funded project.

According to an evaluation conducted by an external consultant from Egerton University in 1990, the LWR project had assisted 82 farmers with in-calf heifers, and over 200 farmers (many of them women) with the growing of either corn, beans or tomatoes since 1987. The forms of assistance include training, the provision of loans, monitoring, and encouraging the formation of farmer groups to address common needs, including the marketing of their produce. Beneficiaries credited the project for helping them better meet their financial obligations including school fees for children, family clothing and other domestic needs.

Several of the women farmers this evaluation team visited are doing so well their husbands have left other employment and joined their wives in farming. What was also impressive was to see how they are keeping farm records. These literate women keep track of all inputs (including their own labor) and outputs from their farm enterprises, so they can determine whether or not they are making a profit. (See Annex C FSK Case Study)

The Tototo program focuses particularly on women, including projects in rural development, vocational training, production workshops and handicrafts sales. According to a socio-economic impact assessment, which interviewed 141 clients, the Tototo program has increased the main sources of income for many families. Of 67 clients who had received loans, 56 had repaid in full. Average monthly sales for groups has increased 600% (to Kshs 28,000, or \$360, per group). During the past five years the number of women's savings clubs has increased from 20 to 45; those with individual businesses have increased from 28% to 72% of the members.

Though there are variations in accomplishments, it is safe to say that the partners LWR included in the MG in Kenya have proven to be sufficiently successful in supporting poor communities to address basic needs, and that in all cases there has been good participation by the people. These are documented in evaluations and periodic project reports.

### 3. Asia Region

LWR included in MG-III 12 projects with 8 partners in India and the Philippines. Four of the partners were visited in India during the course of this evaluation. (Three of these, plus one other, were included in the mid-term evaluation.)

The four partner agencies visited are:

- Comprehensive Rural Health Project (CRHP) in Jamkhed, Maharashtra, run by the world famous Arole Doctors. LWR is currently funding an outreach of CRHP in the tribal area of Bhandardara, which is introducing community-based health and development in 15 "backward" villages.
- Indian Rural Reconstruction Movement (IRRM) social laboratory at Pulicherla in Chittoor District of Andhra Pradesh. In the second phase of this integrated program residents of 11 villages are being helped with improved agricultural practices, silk making, milk and meat production, savings and credit organizations, community health, and leadership training.
- Christian Council for Rural Development and Research (CCOORR), at Thiruniravur, Tamil Nadu (just outside of Madras). Also in its second phase of LWR funding, this program works in 31 villages to improve primary health care, jobs for youth, fisheries, tailoring, dairying, organic farming, crafts, savings and loans clubs, and more.
- CMAI, which is a national umbrella organization of some 350 Christian hospitals plus health professionals. LWR funds three aspects of CMAI's work: primary health care; women's health and family planning; and community-based primary health care. The latter program is helping 41 Christian hospitals launch community health programs. One of these, the Hoskote Mission

Medical Centre outside of Bangalore, was visited during the course of this evaluation.

Based on what the evaluators saw and heard during their visit to the CRHP base at Jamkhed, and the extensive records, evaluations and reports by and about this program, the Arole Doctors and their colleagues (including especially village volunteers) deserve all the international acclaim they have received. A sampling of accomplishments (1971-1993) according to their records:

- Villages covered have gone from 8 to a peak of 200 (in 1985) and now down to 80 on a weekly basis plus 140 others visited monthly;
- The population reached has gone from 10,000 to 100,000;
- The birth rate has been lowered 50% -- from 40/1000 to 20/1000;
- The Infant mortality rate has dropped almost 90% -- from 180/1000 to 19/1000;
- The under-fives immunization coverage has been increased from 0.5% to 91%;
- Deliveries by trained midwives has gone up from 1% to 90%;
- Eligible couples practicing family planning was only 1%, now it's 60%;
- Activities which indicate progress towards socio-economic development include 75 women's clubs, 60 young farmers' clubs, 168 tubewells for safe drinking water, 25 plant nurseries, 4,500,000 trees planted, and 3,214 acres of land leveled. (See Annex C CRHP Case Study)

A rather thorough evaluation was conducted of the IRRM Pulicherla program at the end of its first phase of LWR (MG) funding in 1990. It identified 1,071 families in 16 villages reached by the program. In this area 17 men's clubs and 16 women's clubs had been organized, coming together in a "People's Parliament," which formed an important part of IRRM's organizing strategy. However, the evaluators found that many of the participants had joined mainly to take part in the "chit fund," a pattern of group savings whereby different members in turn are given access to the pooled savings, enabling them to make larger investments than their monthly incomes would allow.

A horticulture nursery established at the IRRM center sold 2,531 and distributed 228 free saplings of a variety of fruit trees (coconut, guava, mango, pomegranate) to villagers. Training in improved dairy practices was provided to 70 persons, 18 of whom were from the target area. About 106 women were given health education on nutrition, child care, and community health. So there were measurable achievements. However, the evaluation found many shortcomings, among them:

- IRRM was unable to achieve its many objectives in the full original target area;
- the social forestry project failed because of its weak program approach;
- farmers were not adequately consulted about crop preferences and agronomic

- practices in the dry land farming program;
- program staff were depended upon to keep savings by groups, which is not a good practice; and
  - "most of the trainings were not linked with practice."

Though there were many shortcomings cited, after prolonged negotiation ICASA and LWR agreed in 1992 to fund a second phase of the Pulicheria project (this one for five years), though in a more focused way in a reduced target area.

According to CCOORR's own statistics, during the past four years in the area it serves the birth rate has dropped from 28 to 18 per thousand, the death rate from 9 to 5 per thousand, infant deaths from 72 to 20 per 1,000 live births, under-five immunization rate from 48% to 75%, family planning acceptors from 10% to 29% of the eligible couples, and the number of unemployed youth in the area has decreased from 467 to 147.

CCOORR is involved in a wide variety of activities. These include (with numbers of beneficiaries) self-employment (158), community banking (256), job placement (490), tailoring (125), recycling industrial metal waste (56), dairy (143), eight child development centers (348), physically handicapped (11), family planning acceptors (646), and persons employed by the project itself (32). These are assisted through leadership training (502), skill training (603), awareness education (17,435), continuation education (1,008) and special educational programs for children (200). The project claims to have organized 53 village organizations in the 31 villages/hamlets organized in 15 micro-centers (2962 families, population of 15,383), according to statistics displayed on the CCOORR office wall.

CMAI started the Community Based Primary Health Care (CBPHC) program five years ago with 67 hospitals, offering them assistance in establishing programs in surrounding communities. The model was for each to cover a population of about 10,000, with a staff of 10 female Village Health Volunteers, two supervisors, and a project manager. These hospitals were offered 75% of the first year's costs, and decreasing amounts over the succeeding years. Some dropped out for a variety of reasons, including a lack of real commitment on the part of the hospital leadership. Presently 41 projects remain in the program. (LWR/MG funds seven of these.) CMAI's funding will end for the last of them in October, 1994, though it intends to continue to provide them technical assistance, monitoring and other (non-financial) support.

According to an evaluation conducted of the CBPHC program in 1992 by Dr. Sara Bhattacharji, most of the remaining hospitals say they plan to continue the projects

after the CMAI funds stop. However, the evaluation pointed out some critical concerns:

- Except in a few cases, the communities have not been given the opportunity of planning for and taking control of the "community-based" health projects; most of them are planned, directed, managed, supported, implemented and evaluated by the hospital personnel. However, in a few cases the evaluation found "healing and a movement towards giving people the primary role in their own development. In these cases very good and imaginative community health programs are being run."
- Most Christian hospitals are seen as expensive institutions for treatment beyond the reach of the common people.
- There is a lack of understanding and a tension between the hierarchy of the churches and the Christian medical institutions, and between them and CMAI. "These are identified as one of the major hindrances to the building up of the capacity of the people and the promotion of a genuine community health care program."

Given these difficulties and realities, CMAI has made a major impact in the promotion of community-based health programs in many parts of India.

A summary observation is that though LWR's partners in India are making major contributions to models of rural community development, in their efforts to be integrated there is a tendency by some to attempt to do too many different activities, rather than focus on a few successful techniques which have the potential of being adapted and spread by village people themselves. Such approaches make sustainability problematic, both in terms of replicability at the grass-roots level and in terms of the NGO's continued dependence on LWR or substitute external funding.

### **C. PARTNER AGENCIES' INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES**

The evaluators used a Typology to gather similar data on all LWR partners visited. The evaluators measured changes in total budgets, % LWR funded, total number of staff, geographical coverage, and organizational structures (governance) during the period that LWR provided assistance and particularly the period of the current Matching Grant. This analysis does not suggest that LWR caused the changes since in many instances its support is a small per cent of the total budget of partner agencies. Rather it provided a framework to analyze the effects of LWR assistance. In this section the evaluation team also assessed the evolution of LWR partners involvement in networks.

## 1. Andean Region

The following table compares total budgets, per cent funded by LWR and number of total staff between 1988 and 1993 for the partners visited. The partners are listed in order of the size of their current budgets. The three large partners all have annual budgets over \$1 million, three medium sized partners have budgets over \$300 thousand and two small partners are under this amount. In the larger partners LWR tends to support specific regional programs, so where available data is supplied both globally and for the specific regional program. All budget figures are in thousands of dollars.

TABLE 2: LWR ANDEAN PARTNER COMPARISONS 1988-93

PARTNER AGENCIES	1988			1993		
	BUD.	% LWR	STAFF	BUD.	% LWR	STAFF
FEPP/GLOBAL	1,000	5	70	5,000	.7	140
FEPP/LAGO AGRIO	158	31	--	204	12	--
CIED/GLOBAL	1,305	7	70	1,261	14	70
CIED/PUNO	55	36	--	183	30	--
CIED/CAJAMARCA	160	25	--	190	32	--
IDEAS/GLOBAL	300	10	59	1,048	5	64
IDEAS/PIURA	54	60	6	500	20	23
FEPADE	100	70	16	500	8	26
SEMTA	493	6	30	485	12	23
LABOR	60	30	12	370	13	27
CASDEC	110	23	8	190	14	14
PRE	17	65	4	23	70	8

In general LWR has worked with rapidly growing NGOs. During the current MG, four of the eight NGOs visited more than tripled their global budgets during the last five years. Two NGOs, CIED and SEMTA, experienced similar growth in the early eighties when LWR started to work with them, and were consolidating their programs in the last five years. It should be noted that all eight NGOs have been working with LWR for eight or more years. Only PRE has not been successful in opening other funding sources, and has remained dependent on LWR funding.

The other two factors studied -- changes in geographical coverage and in organic structure or governance -- revealed further trends. Although LWR was instrumental in helping FEPP and IDEAS start new regional programs, most of their partners have remained stable in terms of the geographic areas where they work, and have actually tended to concentrate in fewer communities with fewer families within these geographic areas. A substantial part of the budget growth in the cases of FEPP, IDEAS and FEPADE have been due to larger investments in more ambitious productive projects, such as irrigation schemes, small scale agri-industries and reforestation efforts. FEPP's spectacular institutional growth also had the special impetus of a debt swap that created a \$3 million land credit fund that has already financed 175 purchases of land for indigenous and campesino communities. These purchases are carefully planned to offer alternatives to the inefficient mini-fundio form of agriculture.

The last factor analyzed was changes in organizational structure, especially governance. Many of the LWR partners visited underwent extensive organizational changes in the last five years. For most it was a sign of vitality and adjusting to rapidly changing contexts, especially in Peru. The organizational structure of LWR partners visited clearly vary. Only one still operates within a church structure. Most have strong staff participation on their boards, but only a few have clear community representation. Four of the eight (all three in Peru) significantly changed their system of governance during the current Matching Grant period which emphasizes the importance of LWR's steady institutional support.

The involvement of LWR partners in NGO networks has also changed considerably in the last five years. In Peru and Bolivia, local regional networks have become effective means for NGOs to work together and to gain some influence over government policies at least at these local levels. In Piura (IDEAS), Ilo (LABOR), Puno (CIED), and Cochabamba (FEPADE and CASDEC), LWR partners are all playing a leading role in local consortia.

The Puno experience is particularly interesting in that the consortia, Andean Council for Ecological Management (CAME), emerged from the need to offer a coordinated response to the problem of chronic drought. CAME is playing both a research and

development role in seeking solutions to ecological problems. Various other LWR partners have visited CAME to learn from their approach. LABOR is involved in a committee to develop a long term development plan for the Ilo area, which politically is joined to the PUNO region. Two regional congresses have occurred where NGO, community and local government leaders have participated in joint planning efforts. These experiences are trying to take advantage of Peru's supposed steps toward decentralization, which up to now have resulted in the national government's virtual disappearance from rural development with little resources trickling down to local governments. In this sense the NGOs and local governments have a common cause. At a national level in Peru all LWR partners are active in the National Association of Centers (ANC), which associates all but a few of Peru's largest NGOs. The ANC is still largely an information sharing mechanism, but as these local consortia gather strength, several NGO leaders voiced the hope that the ANC will become a lobbying force with the national government.

The Bolivia NGO context has evolved even more dramatically. CASDEC and FEPADE are both leaders in UNIBAMBA, which is one of several departmental groupings of NGOs. UNIBAMBA has three commissions that have planned and in one case funded a joint gender program. Local government and national initiatives relevant to NGOs are normally coordinated with UNIBAMBA. For instance the National Fund for the Environment (FONAMA), a \$22 million environmental project fund, is using an NGO member of UNIBAMBA to promote projects in the region.

At the national level a Network Coordinator was created to bring together all the regional and thematic NGO networks under one roof. This coalition led by one of the oldest NGO consortium, UNITAS, is considered the principal channel for NGO/GOB collaboration. Although the NGOs visited view GOB funds such as the Social Investment Fund (FIS) and FONAMA and ministerial programs like the Campesino Fund as bureaucratic and unresponsive, they recognize the importance of influencing development policies to channel more resources to campesino organizations, especially with a new administration taking office this month.

In Ecuador LWR partners have not established local networks. FEPP has formed various coalitions with other NGOs on specific themes such as cholera prevention and saving mangroves, but has declined to support formal consortia. It has been a leader at the Latin America level in ALOP, which groups 33 NGOs from 18 countries. ALOP recently formed FOLADE (Latin America Development Fund) as a mechanism for NGOs to seek access to multi-lateral and other large funder development resources in a coordinated fashion. Potentially, the approach will give the NGO sector a greater voice in the use of these resources.

In summary, LWR Andean partners have made notable strides in organizing networks that help NGOs to find solutions to intractable development problems. In a period of economic restructuring that emphasizes the private sector, NGOs are becoming an organized force that both pressures government and offers efficient alternatives to support popular sector initiatives. The development of this capability is an important challenge to LWR's future program.

## 2. Africa Region

**TABLE 3: LWR KENYA PARTNER COMPARISONS 1988-93**  
(Budget figures in Shillings X 1,000) (present exchange \$1 = Sh.78)

PARTNER AGENCIES	1988			1993		
	BUD. (Sh.)	% LWR	STAFF	BUD. (Sh.)	% LWR	STAFF
OSP	600	59	15	2,440	38	32
FSK	2,015	61	10	3,000	13	23
TOTOTO	1,078	54	35	1,265	0	45

These programs in Kenya reported significant increases in budgets and staff during the past five years, while the proportion of their support they are receiving from LWR is decreasing. (The LWR funding for Tototo ended in 1990.)

The main issue facing OSP is that of sustainability, and the question of replacing the American Director with a qualified Kenyan (their preference would be a member of the Mennonite Church of Kenya). There has been a Kenyan Manager since 1985. The need for more qualified field staff pointed out in the 1991 evaluation has been partially addressed by sending some of the local employees off for higher academic training in Kenyan institutions.

FSK takes very seriously the continuing education of its staff. Several have taken part in an exchange program with California Polytechnic State University (where the Director, Paul Maina, received his education), receiving American academic degrees. Whereas eight years ago FSK was basically the Director plus some support staff, there are now three or four very qualified technical staff, making a much stronger Management Team.

As will be recommended later in this report, LWR needs to keep a perspective on all a partner agency does, not just the piece its funds are designated for. FSK is an example of this. Evidently of its own accord, it keeps very separate in its operations (including record keeping and reporting) those projects funded by LWR and other donors (one of which is the Nairobi USA.I.D. Mission).

The Tototo program continues to grow and strengthen its institutional capabilities. One significant recent addition is an in-house Monitoring for Evaluation System. This should enhance the agency's capacity for data collection and management, leading to better analyses of its various projects, and improved reports to its donors and other interested partners.

### 3. Asia Region

**TABLE 4: LWR INDIA PARTNER COMPARISONS 1988-93**  
(Budget figures in Rupees X 1,000) (present exchange \$1 = Rs.31)

PARTNER AGENCIES	1988			1993		
	BUD. (Rs.)	% LWR	STAFF	BUD. (Rs.)	% LWR	STAFF
CRHP	3,150	10	350	5,836	21	355
IRRM	1,316	32	35	1,300	32	19
CCOORR	746	34	14	1,878	53	14
CMAI	6,378	12	94	19,023	17	94

The 1990 evaluation of the IRRM social laboratory at Pulicheria cited above pointed out the problems associated with rapid staff change-over. Project leadership had changed four times during three years. About 21 staff left during that time. The evaluation was very critical of many other aspects of the program. This led to major changes before the second phase was launched in 1992, including the reduction of the target area from 28 to 11 villages (474 families). Yet, in reply to the current evaluation's survey, Dr. G.N.Reddi claimed that IRRM is working with 1300 families in 30 communities.

According to that survey response, IRRM has provided leadership in spreading to other

agencies in South Asia watershed management and participatory and sustainable technologies. Dr. Reddi, based in Bangalore, is founder and President of the South Asia Rural Reconstruction Association (related to the International Institute for Rural Reconstruction). This involves him in frequent travels to many countries.

The evaluation team's observation is that too much of what goes on at Pulicheria still depends on the Executive Director, Dr. Reddi. If sufficiently qualified staff can be found and maintained at the project site, they need to be adequately empowered to carry on the program as they, in turn, empower the villagers to further their own development.

The CCOORR project is run by six professional staff (including Dr. Ravi Raj Williams and two nurses), two administrators, 3 middle-level managers, 8 education workers and 15 health workers (traditional birth attendants). Dr. Williams and his wife, also a MD, run their own private hospital in Tiruninravur.

According to Dr. Williams, he was instrumental in initiating the formation of the Southern Regional Partners (mostly LWR partners in Kerala and Tamil Nadu), which brings together project holders and their seconds in command twice a year, once for business and the other time as a family social time. He expects this network to expand to other states and then to non-LWR partners. He is "very happy about this networking."

In 1985 CMAI did a study of its network of hospitals and found that though many talked about community health work, 80% were doing poor quality primary health care, if any at all. So it launched (and found donors to support) the Community-Based Primary Health Care program. As revealed in its mid-term evaluation, CMAI recognizes the problem of trying to change the philosophy and ideology of hospital leadership towards community-based preventive work. Still looking for ways to more effectively promote community health in the most needy areas of India, it is running a variety of other programs, some with hospitals, some with congregations, and is now making plans to work directly with inspired individuals.

At LWR's initiative two of the MG-funded partners in India are developing a new joint venture. The plan calls for CMAI to identify teams of two or three persons in needy areas who have shown an interest in initiating community health projects, send them to CRHP/Jamkhed for training, and then provide follow-up support for up to six years.

Institutional capacity building also found its way into two projects in the Philippines. The IPHC has trained NGOs in primary health care; the International Institute for Rural Construction (IIRR), with government and international links, is working with a project

in a "pristine" area. Together they will tap the government services, roads, water, animal husbandry, and education to form a fully comprehensive project.

#### D. LWR PARTNER RELATIONSHIPS

This section analyzes LWR's role in influencing the project accomplishments and institutional strengthening of its partners. Jerry Aaker credits Mario Padrón with articulating the concept of a three partnership relationship. These include (1) the community-level or grassroots organization, (2) the local NGO, and (3) the international PVO of development cooperation. "Each of these organizations works together on a common area of concern (usually a project), but each retains autonomy and relationships beyond the project. Partnership is not a marriage, nor is it a stringent business contract. It is a relationship based upon trust and shared objectives."<sup>1</sup>

The table below averages by region thirty-three NGO partner responses to the survey. (See ANNEX A.2, section III) Partners rated LWR's contribution to improving their institutions in specific ways on a scale of one (not at all) to five (greatly).

**Table 5: NGO Partner Perceptions of LWR Effectiveness**

Institutional Improvement	Andean	Africa	Asia	World
Technical capabilities	3.6	3.8	4.1	3.8
Monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems	3.7	4.5	4.7	4.2
Networking with other NGOs	3.3	3.2	4.0	3.4
Capability to organize marginal populations	3.7	4.1	4.0	3.9
Ability to complement services, resources, technologies	4.0	3.4	4.1	3.8
Move toward self-reliance	3.2	3.8	4.4	3.7
Replicate appropriate project activities	3.8	4.2	4.0	4.0

<sup>1</sup> Aaker, Jerry, *Partners with the Poor: An Emerging Approach to Relief and Development*, Friendship Press, 1993. Page 100.

In the mid-term evaluation, there existed considerable variation among the LWR regional programs, which for the most part continues today. Because of the small sample size, the absolute numbers have little significance, but the relative importance given to the different types of improvement in each region is useful. Overall, LWR's emphasis on self-evaluation is ranked high in all the regions while, apparently, it's support for NGO networks is not perceived as strong. Most partners perceive LWR as particularly effective in helping them to complement and replicate their existing program, which most likely is attributable to LWR's flexibility in the use of their funding. Only the Asia partners rank LWR because it has helped them achieve self-reliance.

Finally, partners perceive LWR as relatively effective in helping them organize the populations they assist. Executive Director-designate Kathryn Wolford explained this perception best, "We'd like to believe that if LWR disappeared tomorrow, we would have left stronger organizations in place. An important criterion in the selection of partner institutions is that they involve the participation of people in the identification of needs, establishment of plans, implementation of activities, and conducting of evaluations. (LWR) would not fund somebody that considered people as passive beneficiaries. We are committed to involving people in every step of the process."

The interviews with LWR partners in each region offered other insights:

### **1. Andean Region**

Partners give high marks to LWR's overall funding approach. They praise LWR's respect for the integrity of their planning and flexibility in funding all reasonable training and staff costs. In the last five years LWR has moved toward funding programs rather than projects. A limitation mentioned by several partners is the small amount of resources LWR provides (In Peru the limit is \$30,000 a year). LWR often co-finances programs to encourage diversification of funding sources. In a few instances LWR has actually played a role in finding co-financing for partners from donors such as Diaconia/Sweden and LWR/Canada. LWR most often is co-funder with ICCO and Bread for the World/Germany.

The LWR policy for block funding of global programs is not clear. In Ecuador and Bolivia LWR contributes to the total budget of its partners, either globally or for regional programs, who then report on their overall programs. In Peru LWR funds are earmarked for specific activities, and reported on as such. Although in both instances LWR is flexible in coordinating with other donor funding, there should be uniform procedures in the region, if not institutionally.

Judging from LWR's controls, nearly all project reporting is up-to-date. Partners compare LWR's monitoring favorably to other donors. Specifically, they mention frequent communications that provide as well as ask for information. Partners are pleased at LWR's quick response and feedback on reports. Monitoring visits usually occur twice a year and are sufficiently in depth to appreciate problems. One difficulty is that the heavy project load in Peru has stretched the sub-regional's office capacity to accompany projects, and an adjustment is needed to maintain current quality.

Partners present brief semestral reports and more lengthy annual reports that summarize self-evaluations. In the last year of funding phases, generally three to four years cycles, LWR requires a more in-depth self evaluation, preferably with outside facilitation, as a prerequisite for further funding. Partners find the approach efficient because it solves many problems before they become serious. However, most partners felt that LWR, ICCO and BFDW could further streamline administrative requirements and save them considerable time in preparing reports. They suggested more direct coordination between LWR and other key donors.

Partners particularly appreciate the speed of ADDF responsiveness to critical short-term needs. From their prospective this support is invaluable for staff development. For example, SEMTA mentioned that nearly all their key staff have participated in courses, interchanges, or LWR seminars funded by ADDF grants.

Another important ingredient of the relationship with partners is learning processes. In the early eighties ARO devoted most of its energies to facilitating learning. Evaluation as well as gender were early themes around which LWR organized a series of reflections. In 1988 LWR changed regional directors, and began to look for more systematic ways to extend its learning activities. LWR developed a practical manual for NGOs to use to carry out self-evaluations of their programs with extensive participation from the beneficiaries. FEPADE and CASDEC both still follow the system the ARO director helped them start with a week long workshop in 1990. FEPP incorporated the Lago Agrio experience into the evaluations of their other regions. Most other partners confirmed they have applied the techniques in the manual to some degree, and have instituted annual in-house evaluations. The evaluation team reviewed several of these recent evaluation reports, and found that in fact many program improvements were carried out as a result.

One complication is that other donors require most partners to conduct external evaluations. The extreme case was CIED/PUNO which in 1992 in addition to carrying out an internal review also underwent three separate external evaluations.

An interesting evolution of LWR's experience with helping NGOs build a management capability is its recent experience in Peru with strategic planning assistance. The rapid changes of the past five years have left many NGOs seeking to redefine their mission. The end of the Cold War displaced many ideological arguments antiquating the left/right debate. The retreat of financially strapped governments from many social areas thrust NGOs to the forefront in new unaccustomed roles. Many NGOs need to construct a new vision of the future they want to work toward, and devise the strategies to get there. More than ever NGOs require strategic planning, but to provide this assistance implies a more direct intervention in the institutional life of partners. (See Annex C Labor Case Study)

As a first step LWR helped finance the publication of a practical guidebook on the subject. LWR's first experience in providing this assistance occurred with LABOR (See case study). It needed several weeks of an experienced consultant's time, but probably saved the institution from collapse. There is no doubt that other LWR partners and many NGOs face similar crises, perhaps not so severe. LWR needs to determine how strategic planning fits into its accompaniment methodology.

The LWR relationship with partners has been effective. As LWR contemplates more structural changes in ARO, probably centralizing operations again in Lima, it needs to consolidate its evolving methodology and decide what will work best in the future. The success of its approach has depended on using ARO human resources and consultants well, and this challenge will be even greater now.

## 2. Africa Region

As mentioned previously, LWR currently has two Regional Offices in Africa: One in Niamey covering West Africa, and one in Nairobi covering East and Southern Africa. This represents a reduction from six country offices five years ago. Each has an expatriate Regional Representative. In Niamey the Representative is assisted by a local professional, who is responsible for monitoring projects in Niger. In Nairobi there is also a Program Coordinator with regional responsibilities.

These offices accompany 23 projects that have received MG funds in Burkina Faso, Niger, Senegal (West Africa) and Kenya (East Africa). LWR/NY had said that communications by telex were sent to each partner seeking approval before funding from USA.I.D. as allotted to that project. However, the evaluators were told in East and West Africa that neither Regional Offices nor project partners were formally asked before the decision was made in LWR/NYC to add projects to the MG list. In any event it was evident that they did know that LWR was using A.I.D. funds.

Some, but not all, of the agreements contain the statement "LWR agrees to pay up to US\$X or up to (local currency) Y." The cap is whichever turns out to be the lower amount. With changes in exchange rates, which can make a significant difference. In a number of countries the dollar buys more than twice as much local currency now than it did three years ago. The problem is that usually inflation accompanies lowered exchange rates, so the projects can not carry out all of their planned activities with only the local currency total in their original budget.

The way this is handled by LWR seems to be up to the staff person(s) involved, and varies from case to case. Revised budgets can be approved by LWR/NYC before the end of an agreement phase. But, lacking an agreed formula for such situations, there is some confusion among the partners. Some feel they should get the total dollar amount, even if the exchange rate has changed (much to their favor).

The two Regional Offices in West and East Africa, in addition to monitoring partners and receiving visitors in their offices, communicate through newsletters. In West Africa "*Exchange*" and in East Africa the "Quarterly Narrative Report" keep partners and other interested parties informed of important issues. There are a number of administrative issues that affect relationships in the Africa region. In the past the role of the Regional Offices was mainly to identify projects and send their proposals to New York for approval. After approval the NYC headquarters monitored the projects by correspondence. Since 1990 the responsibility for monitoring has been shifted to the Regional Offices with better results.

The evaluator found instances where LWR provides financial support only for specific projects operated by a partner NGO, and accepts narrative and financial reports only on those projects. This can lead to "project myopia," where LWR sees only that aspect of its partner and not the totality of what the partner agency is involved with. This can lead to several undesirable consequences, including the possibility of funds from more than one source being used for the same purpose, and unrealistic expectations from each donor for expanded activities, not realizing all else the partner is already doing. ( See IV. Lessons Learned)

The Africa Region has not been as systematic as other Regions in requiring that evaluations be conducted of projects nine months before the decision of whether or not to do another phase. There is no unified approach to evaluation. The emphasis in the Africa program is to diminish the importance that is attached to the term "evaluation", and stress the reassessment of the original work plan, or implementation plan, periodically, every three months when an activity report is prepared. End of project status reports are not always based on evaluations, but rather on the views of the field staff based on monitoring visits and cumulative progress reports.

There are cases where it is not clear who LWR's "partner" is. One example is the OSP, which is run by the Mennonite Church of Kenya (MCK). The agreement letter from LWR/NYC was with the MCK, yet it was addressed to the Director of the OSP. The question is, which institution is LWR interested in building up, the Church or its project?

The LWR East and Southern Africa Regional Office (EARO) maintains relationships with 40-50 partners in 10 countries. LWR only utilized MG funds in Kenya. East Africa staff noted that the varied partners require different understanding and capabilities. The EARO staff say it is taxing to take care of all of Eastern and Southern Africa. There is not enough time for dialogue, really sitting down with your partners to make decisions. They felt they should be dealing with fewer partners. LWR relationships with sister agencies such as CWS, CRS, and CRWRC in Senegal, may provide a model for developing such relationships in parts of East and Southern Africa.

Much of the time and energy of the EARO Representative has been devoted to emergency situations in Somalia, Sudan, Ethiopia and Eritrea in recent years. That makes it difficult to maintain quality relationships with LWR's "regular" partners. LWR last conducted an evaluation of the East Africa office in 1986, and it appears that another is needed.

### 3. Asia Region

LWR does not have a resident Regional Representative stationed in Asia. Instead, the Program Director in New York relies on counterpart agencies to act on behalf of LWR to identify, monitor, provide technical assistance and encourage networking of LWR partners. In the Philippines all LWR partners are members of and coordinated by PHILDHARRA. In India most relationships are conducted through ICASA, though bilateral relationships have been established with two national bodies -- CMAI and Church Auxiliary for Social Action (CASA) -- and a world-renown independent program, CRHP.

There are advantages and disadvantages to working through other agencies in this way. One of the advantages is that LWR does not have to hire or administer its own staff. A downside is that it must rely on whomever the counterpart agencies employ in the position which relates to LWR. During the past five years there have been four representatives in PHILDHARRA and three (plus two assistants) in ICASA. The rapid turnover, according to LWR's Program Director "has the effect of hampering the getting of our minds on the same track. It is really important for that staff person to know and feel and sense well the philosophy we have. (When there is a change) it is going to take some more time."

The present ICSA representative plans to retire shortly. ICSA is in the process of hiring another person for the position which links LWR with its partners in India. LWR learned this news only after the fact. The LWR Asia Program Director observed:

One of the concerns I have is, what is the strength and ultimate value of working on a bilateral basis through ICSA? They're fast, they're generally good, I get quick turn-around. All of those are important. But they may not have the expertise, they may not network, they may not really be investing in the long term. I think it is really better to go with a big player like CASA, which can interact within their own staff, even if the reporting to us is less favorable in terms of regularity and our being able to ask for what we want. It might ultimately be best to support an institution that's big and can grow. The downside of that it may be too big! That's also a problem.

How are we trying to address some of these inadequacies with ICSA? One thing we are trying to do, which also is an outcome of the MG Mid-Term Evaluation (although we were already in a sense doing this) is to bring together all of our partners nationally (in India) every even year, plus one regional meeting; and other regional meetings every other year. We have three regional groupings. So there are four meetings every two years, spring and fall.

LWR has decided to focus its future efforts in India in the poverty belt states, mainly Orissa and Bihar. There arrangements have recently been made with the Xavier Institute of Management, as a sub-contractee of ICSA, to provide support including feasibility studies and training.

The strategic decision to concentrate in the poverty states means LWR will be "delinking" (i.e. not extending funding to subsequent phases) with some of its partners in other states by 1997. Exceptions anticipated include the CRHP project in the tribal region in north-west Maharashtra, and certain parts of the poorer eastern parts of that state.

LWR sends its funds to ICSA which then forwards transmittals to projects when it is satisfied that reporting requirements are adequately met. So, with the exception of the three bilateral relationships, LWR relies on ICSA to represent its relationships with partners for selection, technical assistance, monitoring and evaluation, and financial control. ICSA is paid a service charge for handling funds, monitoring, etc. Until recently ICSA was utilizing for its own purposes the interest earned on LWR funds held in its accounts. However, LWR recently changed the policy, saying that the accrued interest has to be added to the project fund. In compensation it increased the fees ICSA can charge for its services.

As expressed by IRRM's Dr. G.N.Reddi, "LWR's strengths are the strengths of its project partners, and their linking." He went on to express appreciation with LWR's holistic, integrated approach, and its flexibility. "LWR is open to the project partners. You can have a democratic partnership. We can negotiate." Other agencies, he feels, give the impression that they know everything, that they have the solutions.

A couple of suggestions Dr. Reddi had was that LWR should encourage the development of professional capabilities of the staff of its partner agencies for fully integrated development, and that they (partner agencies) should develop partnerships "even with government agencies." Though they may be ineffective and inefficient, development agencies need to "build up the people's abilities to even challenge the government, and to demonstrate that NGOs have a role to play."

CCOORR's Dr. Ravi Raj Williams credits ICSA with helping CCOORR to reduce the time spent on paper work, by reformatting their proposal to fit LWR's form; and by giving training to its leaders and middle management staff. He also expressed appreciation for Gene Thiemann's bringing books from other places on primary health care. He says LWR's and ICSA's partnership is more than the dollars they bring.

Yet he is quite concerned (and upset) that LWR's funding will end when this phase ends in 1994 (due to the shift of focus to the poorer states of India). He feels that CCOORR "would be dead" if it had to go for other external funding; would hope that LWR, if it can not continue itself, would help to find alternate funding. "Donor agencies encourage those who go around the world begging. I have a commitment to the community; am not superficial." Though "90% of the projects" run by the program could become self-sustaining, he feels a burden and need to continue to find salary support from outside for the 32 staff. And yet he feels that it would be "beneath my dignity" to ask for funds for staff salary support from Indian donors. An Indian doctor friend in Atlanta, on CCOORR's behalf, wrote a 2-3 page pre-proposal and sent it to 300 NGOs in the US. They received only 6 replies, all saying "sorry."

CMAI credits LWR (among other donors) for helping the agency to develop its grants management capacity through the CBPHC program. This included the need to develop its own monitoring and reporting system with its micro-grants recipients in a way that provided all the information requested by all donors. Also, LWR and others ask "quite sharply and clearly what we are doing for women."

CMAI has formed a consortium of its donor partners. Those who's funding sources allow them to have agreed to provide block grants. LWR has not been free to do so with MG funds. Mukarji has told LWR he hopes that they will not rely on A.I.D. funds for future funding of CMAI.

In the Philippines LWR's agreement with PHILDHRRRA is that it will select partners from its own membership in Mindanao. (An exception is a bilateral relationship LWR has with IIRR.) PHILDHRRRA staff do the feasibility studies and send proposals to LWR/NY. PHILDHRRRA has a strong networking among its members, and does monitoring. Unlike ICOSA in India, however, LWR does not look to PHILDHRRRA to handle funds or do financial monitoring. That is done directly by LWR/NYC. According to the Asia Program Director, "they do keep an eye on that, however, in terms of auditing, and clue me in if there are financial irregularities." One of the PHILDHRRRA member organizations has skills in auditing, so it is relied upon to audit the others. "Then if there are any irregularities or anything going wrong, they will not just say this is wrong, but will sit with them and offer retraining classes, lessons, skill building, things like this."

According to the Asia Director, PHILDHRRRA's strength is in networking, institution building and sharing. "The smartness that I get, in the best sense, of clean-cut monitoring of projects is high with PHILDHRRRA. They do a very nice job."

#### **E. A.I.D.'S IMPACT ON LWR**

There are two levels of interaction between LWR and A.I.D.. One is at the USAID Mission level, and the other at the United States level between LWR headquarters and office of Private Voluntary Cooperation in Washington. This section comments first on the field level relationships. It then describes the relations with PVC and the overall impact of the A.I.D. Matching Grant on LWR.

##### **1. Relationships with USAID Missions**

There is virtually no interaction between LWR and local USAID Missions. None of the LWR partners in the Andean Region have received direct USAID funding, and until recently few have managed grants from local government funds for NGOs such as the FIS. There is interest among some of the partners visited in exploring the possibility of government support, especially considering the amount of resources required for rural infrastructure. In Peru the newly established NGO strengthening project is intended to provide numerous grants to medium sized NGOs. There is an obvious mutual interest since LWR already has a wealth of experience in making similar grants.

Several of the partners in Kenya and one in India have received direct funding from their A.I.D. Missions. They all expressed frustration with that source of funding, generally saying that there was far too much unnecessary paper work involved. The NGOs in Kenya expressed the need for meeting as a group with the A.I.D. office in

Nairobi to discuss the reporting requirements. When the A.I.D. representatives were presented with this suggestion by this evaluation team the reply was that they already have given a couple of workshops on how recipient institutions should report to A.I.D.. They missed the point -- it is time for A.I.D. to listen to their NGO partners, not just tell them how to fit A.I.D.'s guidelines.

One of the reasons EARO gave for not extending its funding of Tototo was that it was getting support from the Nairobi USAID Mission. (The implication being that they therefore no longer needed LWR funding.) Yet LWR is quite aware that a portion of FSK's work is funded directly by the Nairobi Mission. The fact that FSK was receiving funding from USA.I.D. both through the MG with LWR and from the Mission is interesting. Nobody seemed to think this posed any problem.

## **2. Relations with the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation**

A previous LWR Senior Policy Advisor and Program Director credits the Matching Grant program with "engendering an open and critical review of new programmatic endeavors". Before receiving A.I.D. funding LWR did not have a formal screening committee or serious critiquing by staff of projects proposed for funding. Most systems were in place by the end of MG-I, and the experience of LWR has been that each successive matching grant became more onerous and an intervention in the agency's established procedures.

Over time the rapid turnover of staff in the PVC office has made it difficult to maintain a constructive dialogue. Efforts to use the MG for creative initiatives has disappeared. The current staff view of the Matching Grant is that it does not allow LWR to do anything different. It is simply a source of funding which allowed LWR to do more of what it was already doing. That is the way the grant request was written.

The LWR Director of Finance and Administration feels that LWR learned how to do better evaluations during the time it received Matching Grants. He observed that evaluation was talked about before, "but we weren't very good at actually doing it." Though LWR had been saying that it was impacting people's lives, it really had not been forced to say exactly how. Having to report to A.I.D. forced LWR to find ways to work harder at quantifying and summarizing the accomplishments of its various partners.

One Program Director credits LWR's ability and willingness to support large NGO programs like CMAI in India, to the availability of MG funds. It is a big, competent organization that can manage a large amount of money, \$500,000 in one project and \$165,000 in another. The MG gave field staff confidence that the resources were

available to support a large project. On the other hand, the MG is not used in most African countries because of the complications it creates to add an additional country.

One of the factors that led to LWR's decision not to apply for another MG was the requirement that the PVO provide proof that it had consulted with the local A.I.D. missions, and the request fit within their country strategy. A Program Director stressed that "the only way it made sense would be if LWR had operational field offices in all of those countries." This requirement seems to undermine the partnership approach.

Someone in LWR estimated that it would take more than 1,400 person-hours to put together a proposal for another MG. That work, plus the annual reports, annual registration process with A.I.D., and evaluations made it evident that looking at the cost-benefit, that it was not worth it. Using that time to speak to people who have already given LWR unsolicited money seems more cost effective.

Although there was value in A.I.D.'s reporting requirements, most staff felt that increasingly A.I.D. did not call for the type of quality reporting which could be helpful. For example, the results called for a snapshot of what was accomplished each year. The grantee was not asked to report on cumulative outputs. So one year a report may say that 5 wells were dug; another year 8 wells. But the total number of wells constructed during the course of the grant as compared to the target was not asked for.

The official reasons for LWR not seeking a fourth Matching Grant is contained in Norm Barth's October 6, 1992 letter to the previous Director of PVC, Sally Montgomery. He expressed concern that the format of the requests for applications and subsequent reporting formats being developed by A.I.D./FHA/PVC assumed the PVO to be the implementing agency. "In our eyes it is based on a very top-down management style, with no space for a PVO to allow the indigenous NGO (partner) to define its own development." He was also concerned that the MG program was expecting the PVO to have field staff in each country where grant funds were to be used. (Though not stated in the request for applications, it was implied by PVC staff during PVO week.) "This approach appears to clone PVOs in A.I.D.'s image, and from the exterior appears to have a paternalistic ring." LWR therefore determined that it would be "unwise to seek (another) Matching Grant as the program is currently structured." But he left the door open in case LWR's analysis and interpretation of the perceived directions of the MG program were wrong.

### **III. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS**

#### **A. COMMUNITY PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

1. LWR matching grant projects were successful in achieving the objectives of diverse rural development programs and, in a few exceptional cases urban based programs.
2. LWR identified projects in accord with its criteria which in all cases included significant beneficiary participation in their planning and execution.
3. There needs to be more clarity on the policy with regard to the amount and currency of funds LWR commits in its agreement with a partner in countries where exchange rates fluctuate in relation to the dollar.
4. LWR has helped many partners, particularly in the Andean region, to develop program planning and evaluation systems that have strengthened the technical capacity of community organizations to do their own planning.
5. There are numerous cases where partners have helped develop the management capability of second level community organizations, but these organizations have had limited success in mobilizing resources themselves.
6. Helping NGO partners enable the community organizations they support to be more self-sufficient should be a central concern for LWR funding.
7. LWR policy on funding global program proposals is not clearly defined, and its response has varied among and within regions.
8. There is a need for more technical assistance to LWR partners in defining their objectives and strategies in the new field of agro-ecology.

#### **B. LWR AND PARTNER RELATIONSHIPS**

1. Partners compare LWR's relationships favorably to other donors, appreciating the good communications, monitoring visits adequate to appreciate realities and problems, and reasonable reporting requirements.
2. In Asia and Africa, the Matching Grant generally funded larger projects. In all the regions LWR has tended to maintain long term commitments to partners of ten years or more. As a result few new partners were funded during the current matching grant.

- 3. Most partners grew significantly while receiving LWR support and successfully expanded their programs.**
- 4. Though most of the partners interviewed have been successful in diversifying sources of international funding, few have made progress in taking advantage of local funding possibilities and entrepreneurial opportunities as part of a strategy to move toward self-sufficiency.**
- 5. Partners value LWR's organizational development assistance as much as its financial support.**
- 6. The availability of flexible LWR resources through Facilitation Funds for partner staff training, exchange visits, and consultant services have been particularly effective in promoting institutional development.**
- 7. Most partners in the Andean Region have adopted the self-evaluation approach LWR promoted and believe it has strengthened their planning capability.**
- 8. The use of participatory self-evaluation has not been as actively promoted by LWR in the African and Asian Regions although partners use it frequently in the Phillipines.**
- 9. LWR's accumulated experience has advanced its accompaniment methodology during the past five years, also reflecting the growing maturation of its partners. Three important changes include shifting toward program rather than project grants, support for strategic planning, and growing attention to supporting the development of NGO networks.**
- 10. Nearly all LWR partners have adopted innovative approaches to working on gender issues, partly as a result of LWR's extended learning process.**
- 11. LWR staff resources are distributed unevenly to manage the monitoring of currently funded programs among and within regions.**
- 12. In conclusion, LWR has developed an efficient funding approach, building on its long term relationship with many partners. The overall approach to reporting and monitoring is comprehensive and systematically followed up.**

## **C. NETWORKING**

- 1. The leadership of LWR's partners in the Andean Region in local regional NGO networks is beginning to produce a coordination of activities and micro-regional planning that reinforces efforts to decentralize government development programs.**
- 2. In India, as well, there is evidence that, with LWR's support and encouragement, more networking is taking place among its partner agencies. This has not yet been done on a regular or systematic basis in Africa for a variety of reasons. In the Philippines LWR partners are all members of PHILDHRRRA, which already is a strong network.**
- 3. LWR's support for CLADES has been an effective way of introducing training and technical assistance in agro-ecology to some of LWR partners.**
- 4. While LWR's program has encouraged partner participation in networks, there is a need for clearer policy and more direct support for networks.**
- 5. The limited ability of the NGO sector in all regions to develop policy proposals and participate in policy-making processes at local, national and international levels points to the need for greater agency-wide LWR effort in this area.**

## **D. RELATIONSHIP WITH A.I.D.**

- 1. In the early years, the Matching Grant program helped LWR to consolidate a systematic approach to strengthening partner organizations, but the current Matching Grant has become more onerous and less helpful in continuing to develop the LWR approach.**
- 2. The difficulty in fulfilling A.I.D. administrative requirements meant that A.I.D. resources were not used for some of those programs that were particularly effective in promoting institutional development, such as the regional Facilitation Funds.**
- 3. Both LWR and A.I.D. stand to gain from greater interaction at the country level, especially in situations such as Kenya and Peru.**

## **IV. LESSONS LEARNED**

### **A. "PASSING ON THE GIFT"**

Those PVOs which use child sponsorships as a part of their fundraising strategy acknowledge the desire on the part of many individuals to be able to identify the end recipient of their contributions. They, literally, want to see "the color of the eyes" of their beneficiaries.

LWR is fortunate in that most of those who give to it, either through their Lutheran Churches or directly, trust the Board and staff sufficiently to make undesignated gifts, allowing LWR to use the funds wherever and however it sees fit.

One of the complaints about the USA.I.D. Matching Grant was that the U.S. Government was asking to see exactly where its funds went. So lists of projects had to be prepared, and reports on these projects submitted to USA.I.D. each year and included in the evaluations.

The present evaluation team observed that LWR's attitude towards many of its partners is more like that of USA.I.D. (or child sponsors) than its own generous donors. What we are referring to is its requirement of many partner NGOs to identify exactly what part of what project is being funded with the LWR monies. One examples of this was found in Farming Systems Kenya, where certain farmers were considered the "LWR farmers," while others were funded by FSK's other donors. In fact, such specified funding for limited parts of the NGOs' work was more common than block grants.

Our point is that if LWR trusts its partners it should be as willing to give them block grants as its donors are in giving undesignated funds to LWR. By giving block grants LWR would, in effect, say "we believe in your over-all program and want to accompany you in all you do." This would call for reporting of all the NGO partner does, not just the piece "bought" by LWR. As we've said elsewhere in this evaluation, the practice of accepting reporting only on such pieces does not allow LWR to get to know its NGO partners in a whole way.

In the Andean Region LWR has begun varied approaches to block funding. There are also examples where LWR is a part of a round-table of donors to certain (usually larger) NGOs. These include SOTOPRODER in Togo and CASA and CMAI and in India. The evaluators were impressed with the CMAI audit, which included the auditor's certification of funds received from each donor, but the same report is sent to all donors (with sufficient detail for each). Hopefully, it will be possible to develop similar donor collaboration and reporting procedures with other partners.

## **B. EVOLUTION OF FUNDING RELATIONSHIPS**

Over the past five years LWR has developed a variety of funding relationships with its partners. As discussed in "Passing on the Gift", the underlying issue is one of trust, and over time the relationship with partners should evolve. The next phase of the LWR program should begin with an explicit policy concerning the stages of its funding relationship with partners. The evaluation team suggests at least four stages:

1. Project--LWR funds a specific set of activities and expects reporting on the realization of those activities. This relationship is appropriate when LWR first begins to work with a partner.
2. Program--LWR co-finances a portion of a larger program and expects reporting on the over-all program, which in many cases means reporting at an institutional level. This relationship is appropriate when LWR has worked with a partner long enough so that there is mutual confidence in each others management capability and the likelihood of a long term relationship.
3. Core Support--LWR contributes to partners' budgets without respect to any specific program and receives reporting exclusively on an institutional level. This relationship is appropriate in a few exceptional cases where LWR has a close affinity to the partner's goals.
4. Extension-- LWR no longer finances the partner's budget, but cooperates with the partner in funding second level community organizations or network initiatives in which the partner plays a leading role.

The clear definition of these four stages would avoid confusion among field staff and clarify the issue of trust. Any PVO wishing to support the development of various Southern partners will face a similar issue.

## **C. CONSOLIDATING THE ACCOMPANIMENT METHODOLOGY**

LWR started its grants program with a strong ethos about how it wanted to work with partners. As the agency gained experience it articulated a methodology called accompaniment. Although most of its basic tenets are not unique to LWR, the methodology is an important institutional accomplishment of the last ten years. Since LWR developed the methodology in both a decentralized and inductive fashion, its application is both diffuse and subject to much individual interpretation.

There evidently has not been much encouragement by LWR for interchange among its various Regional Representatives: The East Africa Representative reported that during the four years he has been working for LWR in Nairobi the visit to India during this evaluation was the first time he had been to another LWR region. The West Africa Representative's visit to East Africa as a part of this evaluation was another welcome cross-visit.) These representatives have not been invited to visit the NYC This can probably be attributed to a lack of communications. It would seem that there would be mutual advantages and a strengthening of relationships if cross-visits, and certainly visits by field staff to LWR/NY were encouraged.

The last opportunity for LWR to bring together its international staff was 1987. The meeting did not produce a structure for institutional learning. The experience of the last five years was vast, and could serve to consolidate the methodology. It may be appropriate to deal with methodology in the context of strategic planning since LWR already recognizes the need to rethink its long range planning. Considering how rapidly the context of our world is changing, most PVOs have this need. The three essential questions are:

1. What difference has LWR made? (The evaluative question)
2. What vision does it want to work toward in the future? (The planning question)
3. How can it best work toward the vision? (The strategic question)

From this process an important product should be a more explicit methodology that guides staff without failing to recognize the varied contexts in which LWR works. The process should avoid the "big meeting" mentality, and create on-going learning process for policy development.

#### **D. CONVERGENCE OF PROGRAM AND POLICY**

As LWR partners become increasingly sophisticated and involved in local, national and international NGO networks, there is a growing convergence between LWR program and policy advocacy work. The partnership approach and accompaniment methodology both imply a two-way flow of information, where LWR and its partners should work together on broader issues of mutual interest. Mechanisms to facilitate this flow of information exist for "hot-spots" like Central America and Somalia, but little exists in other regions for longer term concerns such as the effectiveness of international cooperation, both bilateral and multi-lateral. As environment becomes a major program concern, it too is generating the need for information exchange and coordination of policy efforts.

LWR through its networks has access to information in the United States that could be enormously useful to partners, and the partners have first-hand experience that should fuel advocacy efforts at this level. The question is how much can LWR do internally, and what can it do to build links with related organizations interested in the same policy issues to achieve an effective information exchange. This issue is related to development education, which LWR has creatively tackled through its study tours, but requires a more systematic staff effort.

#### **E. MEASUREMENT OF IMPACT**

The LWR accompaniment methodology has the objective of helping partners achieve the greatest lasting impact on community organization and people's quality of life possible with limited resources. It has stressed evaluation as a tool to analyze this impact and improve programs. Although the partners seem to use evaluation effectively to improve their programs, LWR itself is not making sufficient effort to measure the overall impact of its program. This failure to compile impact information and to analyze it regularly makes it difficult for LWR to determine its own effectiveness and to take corrective measures.

A first step is to create a process whereby each region analyzes the annual project reports it receives from partners and makes an annual statement of the combined impact of its partners. Each region should relate this impact to the resources employed and make some judgements about cost-effectiveness. If institutional strengthening efforts have been successful, over time cost-effectiveness should improve. This type of analysis, possibly done together with partners, would enhance credibility and be part of an on-going learning process.

Curiously, the A.I.D. Matching Grant requires the compilation of information on projects, but LWR staff felt the information required was not useful to analyze effectiveness. A.I.D. should consider whether its interest as a donor would be better served by encouraging reporting that is more analytical and geared to the needs of PVOs to evaluate their own effectiveness. Undoubtedly, this approach would also make external final evaluations more meaningful.

#### **F. IS EXPATRIATE REPRESENTATION DESIRABLE?**

For a number of reasons, there is quite a different style of LWR's representation in Asia than in Africa or Latin America. Other than the Program Director based in New York City, there is no American in either India or the Philippines. Rather, LWR relies on counterpart agencies in those countries to identify projects, provide technical assistance, monitor and evaluate.

Jerry Aaker, a previous LWR Regional Representative, quotes Charles Elliot as observing that "it seems that northern NGOs that have their own nationals in the field learn faster and more thoroughly than those who have withdrawn all expatriate staff and/or have a purely funding relationship with local NGOs." My feeling is that it is quite difficult for national staff of partner organizations to interpret and package information for use in the North. There are great benefits to maintaining a people-to-people connection through a minimal presence of expatriate personnel working with local staff in NGO field offices." He feels there is a need for these field staff to focus on writing, interpretation and education of the home audience.<sup>2</sup>

In contrast, John Clark advocates transferring decisions over project funding to Southern specialists. "It is lamentable that, as the century draws to a close, there is a colonial residue which still believes that decisions concerning poverty alleviation in India can be better made in London or New York than on the spot, where the real expertise lies." He goes on to advise Northern NGOs to be prepared to move to a more secondary role.<sup>3</sup>

Referring specifically to India, though obtaining a long-term visa may be a difficulty in placing an expatriate, might there be advantages to consider in having a full-time LWR representative, expatriate or Indian, in India? This person, while employed by and reporting to LWR, could be seconded to an India-based organization. The East Africa Representative points out that in Kenya he is officially "a Director with the All Africa Council of Churches." This arrangement would give LWR more direct control of program in India. It might also allow for flexibility in moving this Representative to Orissa, where programs are now to be concentrated.

Having a more visible LWR person could lead toward more participatory exchanges with partners in India, with an eye towards a perspective on the whole LWR program in that country. ICSA's role has already diminished, with LWR having bilateral relations (i.e. not through ICSA) with CMAI, CASA, and CRHP (the Aroles), and moving in that direction with the Xavier Institute of Management. This means that Gene has to maintain four or five relationships. A LWR Rep in India would relate to all of these.

---

<sup>2</sup> Aaker, Jerry, Partners With the Poor: An Emerging Approach to Relief and Development, Friendship Press, 1993; page 138.

<sup>3</sup> Clark, John, Democratizing Development: The Role of Voluntary Organizations, Kumarian Press, 1991; page 121.

**There may be advantages to maintaining the special relationship with ICSA. However, the rapidity of change-over in ICSA representatives in recent years, and the fact that LWR has no control over the selection of those staff (indeed, was not even informed that the present one is soon to retire), raises the question of the value of this partnership to LWR. If there are sufficient reasons for maintaining the relationship with ICSA the proposed LWR Representative could be seconded to that institution, even if not based in Madras.**

## **V. EVALUATION ISSUES**

How can one effectively evaluate a PVO with programs in many countries around the world? Limiting the scope of work to the countries and projects LWR included in the MG left 60 projects with 43 partner agencies in 9 countries to choose from! Even the sampling of 15 of the partner agencies in 5 countries, plus interviews with LWR staff in the NYC headquarters and three field offices provided so much information it has been hard to synthesize it into this evaluation report.

The Team Planning Meeting in Washington was useful in a number of ways, especially in a situation like this where members of the evaluation team were going out to visit different countries. It was helpful in giving the team, with participation of A.I.D./FHA/PVC and LWR staff, an opportunity to refine and more fully develop the plans for this evaluation.

One part of this evaluation team visited the Andean Region. The other with two different LWR staff visited East Africa (Kenya) and Asia (India). While necessary given the linguistic, cultural and other realities, this presented some difficulty in putting the findings together in a combined report.

It was neither the intent, nor practically possible, for these evaluators to conduct evaluations of the many projects. That is a function of others -- hopefully, in many cases, the participants themselves. The evaluators were impressed with the number of evaluations that have been conducted of and by partners and projects covered under this Matching Grant. A list prepared by LWR staff of evaluations found in the files indicates that during the course of the MG 26 evaluations have been completed on projects, and 13 on the partner agencies. Fourteen evaluations have not been done. (Presumably some of these are still expected to be done.)

Another difficulty faced by the evaluators was that of trying to quantify the results of the surveys mailed in by project participants. Those portions which involved numbers (communities, beneficiaries, trainees, etc.) are included in the spreadsheet (Annex B). But there were many qualitative comments with regard to project accomplishments and relationships with LWR which have been hard to summarize. Most of this evaluation report has been based on the information and perspectives gained by the evaluators from their interviews with project and LWR staff.

It was useful for LWR staff members from different regions/responsibilities to accompany the external evaluators in their visits to regional offices, countries and projects. Their perspectives were useful, as were their two-way interactions with

**their counterparts. They enriched the evaluation report, especially the conclusions, and, hopefully, learned from the process in ways that provide a built-in follow-up to the evaluation.**

**Another issue worth mentioning here regards the audience of this evaluation. Especially since LWR has not applied for a subsequent Matching Grant, it might be assumed that there is less active interest within A.I.D. to read this report (other than to see what was achieved in the past) than among LWR staff (for whom there can be help in establishing future improvements). For A.I.D. this is a post mortem on a completed grant. But for LWR this is, hopefully, a living evaluation. For this reason the reader may find more conclusions and recommendations addressed to LWR than A.I.D..**

## **VI. OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS**

The evaluators have made various suggestions throughout this report. This section contains their principal recommendations:

### **A. PROJECT FUNDING POLICY**

- 1. Block funding--LWR should review its varied approach to funding partners, and prepare an explicit policy that explains when a block grant is appropriate. As much as possible LWR should provide block grants to partners who have proved capability.**
- 2. Field approval for projects from community organizations--in collaboration with partners LWR should fund directly projects from community organizations. Since these projects will generally require small amounts of resources (\$5,000-15,000), LWR should create a fund similar to the facilitation funds for each region to manage. Field staff should approve these projects within the budgets for each region.**
- 3. Facilitation funds--LWR should expand on the success of the facilitation funds, emphasizing them as tools for furthering partners' institutional development.**

### **B. STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS**

The accumulated barely tapped wealth of experience, the need to consolidate its methodology of partnership, and changes in donor support and leadership all suggest a special effort to intensify LWR's long term planning process. Concrete steps suggested are:

- 1. Regional exchanges--In order to disseminate learning from its projects, LWR should regularly provide opportunities for staff to participate in other region's activities, such as meetings of partners, evaluations and planning conferences. This interchange should be part of its long term planning.**
- 2. Preparation Phase--To achieve consistency LWR should formulate its planning from the field up. Each region should begin a review of its program's impacts, relevance of objectives, and vision for the future together with its partners. These regional contributions should form the basis for an institutional strategic plan.**
- 3. Strategic planning--Since LWR will have no predominant donors outside of its sponsoring churches, it should take the opportunity to create a long-term vision consistent with its roots and partners. This vision should clarify the terms for**

seeking future outside donor support, especially from government sources. A defining moment may be needed where all LWR staff come together with partner representation, but the emphasis should remain on a planning process that continues to help the agency evolve in an ever-changing environment.

### **C. LWR POLICY ADVOCACY ROLE**

As LWR partners involve themselves more in policy advocacy, there should be a closer relationship between program and policy. This relationship is important not only for advocacy regarding specific countries and regions, but also for long term issues concerning the flow and conditions of development resources. There are three specific steps this evaluation suggests:

1. Create an equal two way flow of information with partners on policy matters.
2. Extend advocacy concerns to multi-lateral organizations that more and more determine the environment in which partners work.
3. Dialogue with A.I.D. concerning the appropriate conditions for funding a program dedicated to partnership.

### **D. ADMINISTRATIVE STEPS**

There are a number of specific administrative matters that LWR may wish to consider:

1. LWR should, even where it is providing funding for a specific project, ask for institutional audits and annual narrative reports showing the full picture of what its partners are doing.
2. The Nairobi office has the responsibility of covering East and Southern Africa, though it is referred to as EARO (East Africa Regional Office). Why not clarify its geographical spread and officially call it "ESARO" (East and South Africa Regional Office)?
3. There needs to be more clarity on the policy regarding the amount and currency of the funds LWR commits in its agreement with a partner.
4. The financial report form which LWR asks its partners to submit should show the balance of LWR funds held by the partner.

## **VII. ANNEXES**

### **ANNEX A.1. SCOPE OF WORK**

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

##### **1. SUMMARY**

This is a statement of work for a final evaluation of LWR's activity under Cooperative Agreement OTR-0158-A-00-8158. 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 the extent to which LWR was able to meet the three objectives of the grant (supporting poor communities or groups in their efforts to meet their own needs as LWR partners as they share in the proposal, design, implementation, evaluation and spread of development endeavors; supporting the evolution and strengthening of indigenous organizations and development networks capable of and committed to continuing development facilitation beyond the grant period; supporting, complementing and influencing development activities of developing country governments whenever possible.)

##### **2. BACKGROUND**

**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 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.

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.

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 A.I.D./SOD/PDC-G-0124 ran from 1979 to 1983, and was followed by Cooperative Agreement PDC-0176-G-SS-3162 from 1983 to 1987. In addition, LWR received an OPG (A.I.D.-621-17-110-80-01) from USAID/Tanzania to support a water resource and village life improvement project in that country.

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

- 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;
- To support the evolution and strengthening of indigenous organizations and development networks capable of, and committed to, continuing development facilitation beyond this grant period;
- To support, complement and influence host country governments wherever 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. On October 8, 1992, LWR requested an amendment which would drop Mali, Sudan, Tanzania and Madagascar from the Cooperative Agreement.

### **3. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the extent to which community (sub) project objectives were achieved, to assess how effectively LWR has managed its relationships of support to partner agencies, and to assess how the

Matching Grant affected LWR's institutional capabilities. The evaluation will address the following issues:

- To what extent were the proposal's assumptions accurate?
- To what extent were inputs provided?
- To what extent were outputs produced?

#### 4. EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

Evaluation Methodology The evaluators will employ a methodology based on the logical framework as amended. A set of questions developed from the logical framework will be applied to various sources of information. The evaluators will attempt to quantify output and describe output qualitatively.

Evaluation Data Sources The assessment questions will be asked of two different data sets. The first data source is project documentation, including baseline data sets, project agreements, partner progress reports, annual reports, internal and external project evaluations, partner proposals, project implementation plans, evaluation plans. The second data source is interviews conducted with LWR headquarters and field staff, USA.I.D. in-country staff, project holders, and project beneficiaries.

Evaluation of Program Activity Assessment questions will be asked about each of the grant's objectives:

a) Support poor communities in their efforts to meet their own needs through participation in the proposal, design, implementation, evaluation and spread of development efforts:

i. Indicators

- Number of development assistance projects supported.
- Percentage of individual/community beneficiaries that
  - have formed or strengthened organizations responsible for development activities
  - initiated at least one additional development activity within five years
  - participated in designing and evaluating projects
  - participated in training
  - participated in improving their environment
  - have greater access to existing resources and infrastructures

- demonstrate one or more of: increased food production, income, literacy, access to public services; nutritional intake, reduction of birth and death rates.

ii. Data sources

- LWR Matching Grant annual reports
- Project baseline data
- Partner project reports
- External and internal project evaluations
- Interviews

iii. Data collection and analysis techniques

- Review of documentation at headquarters, field offices
- Interviews with field staff, project holder staff, and with project participants and beneficiaries

iv. Assumptions

The validity of assumptions will be assessed by asking whether

- community level leadership existed or was developed
- community leaders and project beneficiaries recognized the need for change and desired to participate in development activities

b) Support the evolution and strengthening of indigenous organizations and development networks capable of and committed to continuing development facilitation beyond the grant period.

i. Indicators

- Partner agencies have
  - Increased technical capabilities
  - New/improved regularized program management and reporting systems
  - Greater awareness of and contact/work with other similar indigenous PVOs in country/region
  - Demonstrated greater capability to organize the poor majority to take charge of their own development
  - Increased ability to exploit/complement existing resources, technologies and services
  - Moved in the direction of self-sufficiency
  - Replicated project activities when appropriate and possible.

ii. Data Sources

- LWR Matching Grant annual reports
- Project baseline data

- Partner project reports
- External and internal evaluations
- Interviews

iii. Data collection and analysis techniques

- Review of documentation at headquarters, field offices
- Interviews with field staff, project holder staff, and with project participants and beneficiaries

iv. Assumptions

The validity of assumptions will be assessed by asking whether

- Partner agencies desired improved effectiveness in planning, implementing and evaluating development assistance
- Partner agencies were stable
- Qualified partner agency staff were available and trainable

c) Support, complement and influence host country governments wherever possible

i. Indicators

- Successful development activities have been adopted by other communities/organizations and/or have influenced local government policies or programs

ii. Data Sources

- LWR Matching Grant annual reports
- Partner project reports
- External and internal evaluations
- Interviews

iii. Data collection and analysis

- Review of documentation at headquarters, field offices
- Interviews with field staff, project holder staff, project participants and beneficiaries, and local government officials

iv. Assumptions

The validity of assumptions will be assessed by asking whether

- Local and national governments were favorable to the development initiatives
- National and local governments were stable
- Development activities were acceptable and possible under local tradition, culture and economy.

The evaluation will also examine the conclusions of the mid-term evaluation, and LWR responses to these conclusions.

The evaluators will use the following protocol as a guide in their meetings with informants.

### **Partner Organizations**

- When and why was your agency established?
- How has your agency mission changed since it was established?
- Please complete the Organizational Typology worksheet
- How do you relate to the communities your program serves? How has that changed over time? Why?
- How do you monitor the progress of the communities/participants carrying out this project?
  - . Who keeps track of program activities? How?
  - . Who keeps track of money and other resources?
- What evaluations have you done?
- How have systems for program management, accounting, personnel and administration evolved in your agency?
- When and how did you come to know LWR?
- What impact has LWR's support/relationship to agency had
  - . In your organizational typology?
  - . In your program ideas or approach?
  - . In your internal management--either through direct help or higher reporting expectations?

### **Community Projects**

- What were the needs that this project addressed?
- Scope of activity:
  - . How many communities/families/persons are participating
  - . How many people were trained
- What activities were planned in the project?
- What did these activities achieve?
- What lasting benefits have there been?
- Have individuals or groups from the community:
  - . Formed or strengthened organizations to be responsible for development activities?
  - . designed or initiated new development activities?
  - . initiated environmental improvements?

- . located and accessed new resources for community activities?
  - Whose idea was this project?
  - How was the plan for this project developed? What was the community/participants' role? What was <<partner agency>>'s role? What was LWR's role?
  - What do you do differently because you have participated in this project?
  - Do you know how other communities deal with the kinds of problems this project addresses?
  - Why and how did you decide to seek LWR's assistance?
  - What difference did LWR's assistance make?
- 

### Organizational Typology Grid

	Pre-LWR	5 years ago	Present
Total Budget			
Sources of Income			
LWR %			
Local Sources			
International Organizations			
Govt			
Staffing (Technical/Total)			

### Geographic Scope

### Type of Governance

---

### Networking

- Extent to which your association has strengthened relations with other NGOs?
- Do you belong to a consortium of other NGO's? Why?
- How do you participate?
- Methods adopted by other agencies?  
(Describe how)
- By example or other ways, how have you influenced government?
- Policies, projects, methodologies adopted by govt?

### A.I.D.'s Impact on LWR

- How have LWR systems evolved over the life of this grant?

- . Project selections process
  - . Project management
  - . Monitoring system
  - . Evaluation system
- How have the following changed during the life of the grant:
- . Total Budget
  - . Sources of Income
  - . Staffing
  - . Geographic scope
- What difference has the Matching Grant made to LWR?

**Evaluation Sites** Matching Grant activities occur in nine countries, divided into five regions (Kenya; India; Philippines; West Africa; Andean Region). The evaluation will be carried out at LWR's New York headquarters and in three regions. One of these field sites (India) will be a region visited by the mid-term evaluation, and will follow up on the conclusions and recommendations of that evaluation. [The Philippines was visited by the project officer in 1989.] The other two regions have not been visited by evaluators or A.I.D. staff during the course of the grant. With this coverage, each zone will have been visited during the course of the grant.

Visits to these three regions provide examples of LWR's various development styles and techniques, cooperating with partners of varying levels of sophistication. In India, project holders have been both large national NGOs and smaller-scale local NGOs. In the Andean Region, Matching Grant partners have been both sophisticated and newer grassroots agencies. In Kenya, through the LWR regional office, partners have been primarily established NGOs with solid reputations.

**Evaluation Survey** In order to collect information from regions not visited, the evaluation team will develop a survey instrument to be sent directly to project holders and to field staff in those countries.

## 5. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of one evaluator named by A.I.D., one evaluator named by A.I.D. from a list submitted by LWR and one LWR representative. The first of these will be project leader. The evaluation team will visit all the regions as indicated above.

## **6. EVALUATION REPORT**

The evaluation report should not exceed 40 pages. Given the complexity of the evaluation and the 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:

- i. Table of Contents**
- ii. Executive Summary**
- I. Introduction/Purpose/Scope/Methodology**
- II. Principal Findings**
  - A. Overview**
  - B. Project Accomplishments**
  - C. Partner Agencies' Institutional Changes**
  - D. LWR & Partner Relationships**
  - E. A.I.D.'s Impact on LWR**
- III. Principal Conclusions**
- IV. Lessons Learned**
- V. Evaluation Issues**
- VI. Overall Recommendations**
- VII. Annexes**
  - A. Scope of Work**
  - B. List of Acronyms**
  - C. Site Visits**
  - D. Persons Interviewed**
  - E. Case Studies**

## **7. TIME FRAME**

<b>TPM meeting</b>	<b>7-9 July 1993</b>
<b>LWR/NY briefing</b>	<b>19-20 July</b>
<b>Andean Region travel</b>	<b>21 July-8 August</b>
<b>Kenya travel</b>	<b>27 July-6 August</b>
<b>India travel</b>	<b>6-20 August</b>
<b>Final draft due</b>	<b>10 September</b>

**ANNEX A.2. Survey instrument**

**LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF  
FINAL EVALUATION OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT  
WITH U.S.A.I.D. MATCHING GRANT**

**SURVEY OF PROJECT HOLDERS**

**Introduction:**

*This survey questionnaire is addressed to all of LWR's project partners included in the U.S.A.I.D. Matching Grant which concludes 31 August 1993. An important part of the final evaluation includes your perspective on what was accomplished during the period covered by this grant. The evaluators would appreciate your taking the time to respond to the questions below. If you have additional comments to make on other sheets, they would be most welcome. Also, if there are annual reports, evaluations, or other documents which you previously submitted to LWR in which you more fully addressed these issues, please cite those references.*

*Please reply by July 2, 1993*

*Thank you for your help.*

**I. Grants received from LWR during past five years:**

**Amounts:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Dates:** \_\_\_\_\_

**II. Beneficiary communities (those reached by your project):**

**A. How many communities \_\_\_ and how many families \_\_\_ would you say benefited by the LWR grants? In what ways did they benefit?**

**B. Did the LWR assistance enable you to introduce new development activities during the past five years? If so, describe.**

**C. Please complete the table below to indicate approximately how many people participated in training activities funded by the LWR grants:**

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Minority community/</u>		
<u>of training</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>ethnic group (name)</u>

**D. In what ways do the project beneficiaries have greater access to resources and infrastructure than they did five years ago?**

**E. Which were the most important results of the work assisted by LWR in these communities?**

- Increased food production
- income
- literacy
- access to public services
- nutritional intake
- reduction of birth rates
- reduction of death rates
- other project objectives: \_\_\_\_\_

Please cite reports where these results have been quantified.

**III. Partner agency (your institution):**

Please indicate on a scale of 1-5 (1 = not at all; 5 = greatly) the extent to which LWR assistance over the past five years has contributed to improving your agency in the following respects:

- A. Increased technical capabilities; (circle one)  
1 2 3 4 5
- B. Improved program monitoring and evaluation, management and reporting systems; 1 2 3 4 5
- C. Strengthened networks with other NGOs in your country or region; 1 2 3 4 5
- D. Demonstrated greater capability to organize the poor and marginalized to take charge of their own development; 1 2 3 4 5
- E. Increased the ability to utilize/complement existing resources, technologies and services; 1 2 3 4 5
- F. Moved in the direction of self-reliance; 1 2 3 4 5
- G. Replicated project activities when appropriate and possible. 1 2 3 4 5

**IV. Host government (local and/or national):**

- A. Please cite 2-3 examples of your agency's successful development activities that have been adopted by other communities or organizations and/or have influenced governmental policies or programs.

**V. Lutheran World Relief**

- A. What was the most important way that LWR assistance helped bring about these improvements? (Be specific)**
- B. What was the greatest shortcoming of LWR's assistance that limited your agency's ability to improve its work?**
- C. How would you compare the assistance (financial and other) received from LWR with that you have received from other partner agencies?**
- D. Additional or concluding comments:**

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

*Thank you for your assistance with this evaluation!*

## **ANNEX B. LIST OF PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER MG-III**

The following chart lists all the projects funded under MG-III as of July 31, 1993. The data includes funds LWR expended as of the above date, the number of communities reached by each partner's program, the number of direct beneficiaries of these programs, the number of persons formally trained as part of these programs, and, finally, the percentage of those trained that were women. In various cases this breakdown was not available and the space is blank. Most of this data was compiled from the survey replies from each partner. In a few cases they were drawn from project documentation. Where the information was not clear or not available, the space is left blank. In some cases the same partner has received more than one project during MG-III for different phases of the same program. In these cases the data is not repeated.

The intention of this data is to convey the approximate scope of each partner's program. The amount expended from MG-III funds often is only part of LWR's total funding for a project. Furthermore, partners reported on their global programs, which in many instances received substantial funding from other sources. Therefore, it is not possible to determine costs per beneficiaries or make other comparisons with considerable further research.

## ANNEX B

## LIST OF PROJECTS -- MG III (Sept 1, 1988 to July 31, 1993)

	TOTAL EXPENDED	No. of Comm's	No. of Benefs	Total Trained	% Women Trained
<b>BURKINA FASO</b>					
CNN SOIL & WATER	19,616.30	15	14,000	150	
CNN SOIL & WATER, II	35,000.00				
IRD DEON	85,274.04	3	500	100	
UNAIS	28,685.00	104	1,000	438	42%
<b>KENYA</b>					
FSK NAKURU	45,680.00	50	500	389	74%
FSK SM FRMR'S	34,972.00				
KMC OGWEDHI	58,110.56	3	7,000	806	63%
KMC OGWEDHI, II	30,000.00				
TOTOTO	87,777.00	2	1,500	4,500	90%
<b>NIGER</b>					
APRN WELLS & GARDENS TAGAZAN	53,300.00	5	400	400	
ASSAYA COOP	13,095.56	2	160	66	
BAHE BOLOUNGA II	26,104.77	2	134	49	
BAHE BOLOUNGA III	7,669.97				
BONI	27,527.79	1	74	150	50%
CONS. HAND AUGERED WELLS	33,369.57	10	400	40	
DADIN KOWA II	45,642.46	10	1,000	60	
DAZGA II	41,571.52	3	1,591	139	4%
GAYA	609,928.27	8	5,000	2,000	
ID NADARA	47,402.67	1	58	50	
YAKAUDA	24,586.81	10	210	180	17%
ZOURBATTEN II	35,926.51	4	444	109	50%
<b>SENEGAL</b>					
ARED LITERACY	81,326.00		460	460	13%
AGRO PASTORAL	17,638.63	1	28	28	54%
Sub Total for Africa	1,490,205.43	234	34,459	10,114	46%
					52%
<b>INDIA</b>					
CAST ECO DEV & HLTH	83,444.48	34	600	2,953	57%
CCOORR IRD THIRUNI	101,474.33	31	6,000	19,748	51%
CMAI PRIM HLTH CARE	213,327.90	42	7,500	648	92%
CMAI - COMM.PRIMARY HEALTH CARE	19,954.00				
CMAI - WOMEN'S HEALTH/FAM.PLAN	40,501.00				
CRHP - PRIM.HLTH. BHNADANDARA	113,994.00	207	6,785	162	75%
IRRM IRD PULCHE	59,850.09	30	1,300	283	70%
IRRM - COMM.BASED DEV.III	10,520.91				

## ANNEX B

## LIST OF PROJECTS--MG III (Sept 1, 1988 to July 31, 1993)

	TOTAL EXPENDED	No. of Comm's	No. of Benefs	Total Trained	% Wom Train
<b>PHILIPPINES</b>					
IIRR-HOLISTIC DEV.,TALIPU 11	59,199.00	3	211	625	27
IPHC PRIM HLTH CARE DEV	261,352.01	95	7,500	1,235	55
SCFI TRIB AGRO TECH	16,087.41	5	200	39	49
SCFI TRIB AGRO TECH II	56,722.00				
Sub Total for Asia	1,036,427	447	30,096	25,693	59
<b>BOLIVIA</b>					
CASDEC AGRO DEV III	113,110.00	10	400	920	40
CASDEC AGRO.FOREST/COMM DEV IV	67,870.00				
FEPAD T'OGO RANCHO	42,500.00	49	3,698	9,430	38
FEPADE REG. RURAL DEV.	70,000.00				
FIDES SUST.FARM SYSTEMS	68,000.00	12	268	1,891	32
SEMTA ALT AGR	15,000.00	45	9,000	5,876	47
SEMTA GLOBAL INSTITUTION	70,000.00				
<b>ECUADOR</b>					
FEPP LAGO AGRIO	184,750.00	123	2,160	3,979	24
FEPP LAGO AGRIO REV.DEV.PROG.	25,000.00				
PRE CAMP DEV II	40,500.00	56	888	191	
PRE-CAMPESINO WOMEN'S PROM.II	7,000.00				
SENDA JUVENIL ARTISAN	59,756.00	10	50	100	50
<b>PERU</b>					
APDES COMM HLTH	13,408.00	5	1,000	400	100
CADEP PEASANT WM'S PROMO	30,000.00	32	1,440	640	100
CASAS RADIO/CAMP HOUSE	35,734.00	412	4,500	9,270	25
CCAIJO CAMP WM	60,800.00	40	1,300		
CESS COOP DEV III	157,420.00	5	1,900		
CIED MICROREG	20,000.00	25	1,603	748	30
CIED MICROREG DEV CAJAMARCA II	140,700.00	32	2,000	2,200	34
CIED WM'S PROMO	50,000.00				
IDEAS AGR. LIVESTOCK III	33,150.00	33	1,672	932	38
IDEAS LIVESTOCK	120,000.00				
IRINEA MICROREG DEV PACA II	96,800.00	8	720	1,311	37
LABOR WM ILO	23,000.00	55	1,652	1,000	100
LABOR WM ILO ii	10,000.00				
Sub Total for Andean Region	1,554,498.00	952	34,251	38,888	50
World Wide Total	4,081,130.56	1,633.00	98,806.00	74,695.00	48

## **ANNEX C. CASE STUDIES**

### **ANDEAN REGION: FEPP LAGO AGRIO REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

**SUMMARY:** LWR began its support of FEPP during the previous MG. The support focussed on one of FEPP's six regional programs, in the Ecuadorian Amazonic basin. LWR approved two projects Phase I, 1988-92 (\$184,750) and Phase II, 1992-95 (\$75,000), which were partly funded by MG-III. Besides project funding, LWR also facilitated a major evaluation in 1990, and funded an interchange of FEPP staff with FIDES in Bolivia.

**PROJECT ACHIEVEMENTS:** The Project had six objectives: 1. Promote reforestation and other environmentally sound practices, 2. Introduce alternative agriculture, 3. Help market products and purchase basic inputs, 4. Construct small scale community infrastructure, 5. Train campesinos in organization, legal rights and small scale enterprise, and 6. Provide legal services to defend native cultures. FEPP maintained a team in the region to provide training and manage a credit program with second level campesino organizations.

Although FEPP had started to work from its Quito office with colonist and indigenous organizations as soon as petroleum exploration opened up the region in the mid-80s, the regional office experienced difficulties early. Demands, particularly from colonists swamped the small team. FEPP concentrated on organizing key colonist groups into a Federation, but its dependency on FEPP grew. A severe coffee blight heightened interest in alternative crops, but overdue credit payments grew to 35% of the portfolio.

LWR suggested FEPP undertake a thorough self-evaluation in the middle of Phase I. FEPP readily agreed, and asked LWR to work with a member of its headquarter staff to facilitate the process because the regional team needed an external perspective. In an unusual step, the associate director of LWR's regional office spent about thirty days over four months in 1990-91 working with the Lago Agrio team. The methodology followed the manual LWR had recently produced, and took so long because of the need to fix measurable indicators and to gather reliable information.

The evaluation resulted in a major reorganization of FEPP's program. The objectives were maintained, but they were defined more carefully to constrict FEPP's workload. A new Director added two more technical members to the team and organized the program around four zones, each of which had their own federations that balanced both colonist and indigenous interests. The evaluation team arrived after about 18 months of experience with the new approach.

The FEPP team compared their planning for each objective with accomplishments over the past year. Except for reforestation targets, all other targets had been surpassed or were more than 80% achieved. The strengthening of second level organizations in each zone, and giving them responsibility for managing credit had paid off. A key indicator of improvement was that late payments had decreased to 5%. FEPP had enlisted the assistance of another Ecuadorean NGO specialized in marketing to experiment with coffee exportation. FEPP had resolved nearly 80% of legal land title cases raised by campesinos.

The strategy for the next year centered on getting full legal status for the various second level campesino organizations in the four zones. This accomplishment would make them eligible for government and other resources, and less dependent on FEPP

**PARTNER AGENCY EVOLUTION:** Although LWR's funding was significant in starting the Lago Agrio regional program, it was never a large part of FEPP's overall budget. In 1988, LWR's grant amounted to 5% of FEPP's annual budget. In 1991 FEPP organized a program to finance land purchases for campesino and indigenous communities through a debt swap that expanded its annual budget from \$1 to \$5 million dollars. As a result LWR's grant fell to less than 1%. Even so FEPP highly values LWR's support. The Lago Agrio experience convinced FEPP's leadership to use other variations of the self-evaluation approach in all but one regional office. The methodology contributed to a greater decentralization of its regional programs at a time when the growth of its program required a different management approach.

LWR has not had a significant impact on FEPP's institutional strategy or its ability to mobilize resources. In part because of its size FEPP has not been active in fostering cooperation among local NGOs. It is cautious in pressing the Ecuadorean government to improve development policies even though the debt swap carried out with the local Catholic Bishops Conference marked a brake through in cooperation with the GOE. On an international level FEPP has recently joined the ALOP initiative to create a financial arm to press multi-laterals to fund NGOs.

**CONCLUSION:** FEPP is the largest NGO LWR funds in South America. Even so LWR has had an influence far beyond its financial support. On the other hand FEPP clearly does not fit the mold of a fledgling NGO that ordinarily LWR should assist. LWR should consider this case a success, but not likely one it will replicate.

## **ANDEAN REGION: LABOR: WOMEN'S REGIONAL PROMOTION**

**SUMMARY:** LWR first supported LABOR with a \$28,000 emergency grant in 1983-85 for a feeding program in Ilo, a port city in Southern Peru. In 1985-86 LWR funded a small (\$23,000) community health project. The first phase of the women's promotion program, 1988-90, involved a \$69,000 grant followed by a second phase, 1991-93, with a \$75,000 grant. MG-III funded \$33,000 of these phases. Labor also participated in LWR's learning conferences on women and development in 1986 and 1993. In addition, LWR in 1991-92 provided four ADFP grants to carry out a regional environmental campaign, a micro-regional planning forum and a strategic planning consultancy. The total LWR financial support amounted to \$202,500.

**PROJECT ACHIEVEMENTS:** LABOR in the mid-1980's focussed in three areas: worker's socio-cultural needs, women's organizations and environmental concerns. LWR supported LABOR's efforts to organize women's organizations, at local and regional levels. The project had four central objectives: 1. promote a regional women's movement starting in Ilo; 2. establish a leadership training school; 3. provide assistance in women's self-management; and 4. provide health and legal services.

LABOR helped start the Federation for the Promotion and Defense of Women in Ilo (FEPRODEMI) in 1983 with five affiliates. The Federation grew in spurts, first in 1987-88 and then in 1992-93 until it affiliated 23 organizations. FEPRODEMI carried out feeding programs for women and children throughout Ilo during the economic crisis of the mid-eighties. LABOR helped organize regional meetings of the eating centers to plan and evaluate. In 1989 the government decreed its regionalization plan. The women's organizations took the lead in the popular sector to organize a regional planning effort that united the altiplano of Puno with the port of Ilo. As the need for feeding programs diminished, about half the FEPRODEMI affiliates are suffering a decline in their organizational life.

The priority training themes were civil rights, family planning, nutrition, and leadership. LABOR organized in 1988-90 short courses for 1500 women. With UNICEF support it collaborated to train 50 health promoters and 66 leaders who work throughout the Ilo region. A concrete impact has been the inclusion of these women in leadership roles in all principal regional development organizations established after 1989. FEPRODEMI organized two regional meetings of women with 200 participants from the entire region. Most recently, two conferences for couples have contributed to solving family problems resulting from women's activism.

LABOR maintains two health clinics and a legal aid service for women. Between 1986-93, the clinics carried out 15,000 consultations and the legal aid service helped 1200 women. A major impact is the increased use of family planning.

The growth of the women's movement through this project is evident. It also produced institutional problems that led LABOR to replan its intervention in the past year. One result is that LABOR has distanced itself somewhat from PRODEMI.

**PARTNER AGENCY EVOLUTION:** From its inception, LABOR's board consisted of the Mayor, labor and community leaders. In the early 1980's the return to democracy created a surge of activism that soured with the economy. By the mid-1980's, the women's support program became important in part as a response to the economic crisis. As LABOR realized the importance of a regional perspective to deal with the social problems of Ilo, environmental issues came to the forefront, particularly because of the degradation that rapid urban growth and expanded copper mining had produced. By 1990, these changes and the new political climate, particularly the collapse of the leftist parties that had dominated local government, created an identity crisis for LABOR that required a profound replanning at an institutional level.

LWR was supporting a declining portion of LABOR's program in Phase II. The evaluation LWR facilitated in 1990 showed the women's project had achieved useful results, but institutionally LABOR was in crisis. The LWR representative took the unusual step of intervening in a partner's institutional life by funding LABOR to contract a consultant that could help them go through a replanning process, and accompanying closely each step. The first step was for staff to prepare an institutional history to clarify their self-image. Then the difficult reconstruction of a vision began, which produced dramatic changes. LABOR split, and the portion more directly related to the labor movement became an autonomous NGO. A new board redefined LABOR's mission

as to improve the effectiveness of regional development and environmental initiatives, both governmental and private, to improve the quality of life.

The revised operational plan for 1993 included objectives for improving social organizations' management capability, reconciling local development and environmental initiatives, promoting entrepreneurial initiatives to improve the environment, and generate studies and pilot agro-ecological activities that can lead to economically viable programs. The evaluators short visit verified significant activities in each of these areas.

**CONCLUSION:** As the LWR Peru representative put it, LWR could either have maintained its usual reserve and watch LABOR possibly collapse or intervene to salvage it. Since LABOR is not an isolated case, and many NGOs in the region are facing similar crises, the precedent is important for the accompaniment methodology. If LWR is to maintain its program in tune with the needs of its partners, strategic planning is a vital tool. The question that is more difficult to answer is how to use it.

## AFRICA REGION: FARMING SYSTEMS KENYA

**SUMMARY:** After large tracts of land previously owned by white farmers had been divided up and distributed to Kenyan farmers by the Government of Kenya, there was insufficient training and extension follow-up to help them succeed on their new farms. Farming Systems Kenya (FSK) was established to help meet this need. LWR provided \$148,791 during its first phase (1987-1989), and has budgeted \$119,467 for the current phase (1991-1995) of funding support for a portion of FSK's extension activities.

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE NGO:** After the repartition of land, some of the intended beneficiaries, particularly those with small plots in semi-arid areas, had ended up selling their land to wealthy large landholders to meet their immediate needs, and then looked for work as hired hands in other people's farms, or in urban areas. Those who stayed on the plots they had acquired lacked training and other resources to make much of a success out of their farming. FSK was established in the early 1980's to provide services to the small scale farmers of Nakuru District.

During the early period of FSK's development the founder and Director, Paul Mugo Maina, with a degree in Agriculture from Cal Poly, was pretty much the only technically qualified staff person. Since then, however, other staff have been encouraged and enabled to gain academic degrees, thanks mostly to an exchange program with Cal Poly which Maina was instrumental in setting up. (This also brings American students to FSK as interns. Eleven have come so far, helping with such things as nutrition surveys.)

The development of FSK is seen in the following typology grid:

	1987	1991	1993	1995 (projected)
Total budget	\$88,000	\$298,000	\$259,000	\$207,000
LWR portion	60%	13%	13%	20%
USA.I.D./Nairobi		51%	36%	0%
Canadian LWR		13%	13%	28%
Technical staff	4	8	9	9
Total staff	6	13	14	14
Communities reached	26	27	27	

**ACHIEVEMENTS:** Objectives included in the first LWR-supported project included:

- Enable 225 families to increase food security through training and supervision of field preparation, seed selection, storage, planting and proper use of soils. Emphasis will be on maize, beans, cabbage, tomatoes and potatoes. Loans will be provided for specific farm inputs and repaid at harvest time.
- Provide loans of pregnant heifers to 96 poor families selected by village committees. Training and supervision will precede and follow the arrival of the animals.

At the end of this first phase, an evaluation was conducted by W.T. Wamani, a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Education and Extension at Egerton University in 1990. According to that evaluation, 82 farmers had been provided with incalf heifers, and 200 farmers with the growing of maize, beans or tomatoes. These farmers were provided with training and monitoring on a weekly basis by FSK extension agents. Those interviewed expressed appreciation that they had been able to meet most of their financial obligations, including children's school fees, clothing, and other domestic needs. Those who had been helped with livestock were taking advantage of the manure to fertilize their fodder and food crops. Not all were experiencing success, however. Farmers who planted corn and beans did not feel they had gained as much from FSK's aid, due to the expense in obtaining sufficient labor, the effect of the weather on their yields, and the instability of the market for their products.

The 1990 evaluation concluded that FSK had been successful in providing support to farmers in the form of inputs as well as knowledge and skills which improved their farming practices, and thus improved the economic and social status of the beneficiaries. Though it cited a high repayment rate by farmers, it supported FSK's request to LWR to "subsidize the diminishing revolving loan fund" because of inflation and "increased costs of support services." (There seems to be some confusion between a loan fund and operating costs.)

Though the evaluation recommended that LWR fund another phase "in order to put FSK in a position that it could afford to sustain the project without need for external funding," it is hard to see how such sustainability could be achieved. FSK is providing valuable extension services, but they will continue to need subsidies, from external sources if not the government. In an attempt to develop a source of internal funding, FSK has proposed to establish a subsidiary business ("Farming Food Industry Company") which would process and market farmers' produce. A building is under construction for this purpose. It is hoped that such an enterprise could (a) actually be successful in marketing produce, (b) really include farmers as partners in a cooperative arrangement, and (c) not divert so many of FSK's financial and human resources and energies that the extension program suffers.

It appears that FSK has catered to real or imagined preferences of donors by establishing separate projects for each. Thus nine of the 27 communities covered are referred to as the "LWR farmers." Separate projects are identified as the "USA.I.D. project" and the "Canadian LWR project." The problem is that FSK itself does not seem to maintain an over-all perspective with annual program reports and audits which cover all it is involved with. This certainly is needed for internal management, and should be insisted on by the donors, who should each ask for such over-all reports.

FSK appreciates the partnership with LWR, but sees LWR mainly as a source of funds. Much of the correspondence in the EARO files has to do with financial reports. FSK has been reprimanded for going more than 5% over some line items in its budget, though the exchange rate has more than doubled and inflation has impacted some line items more than others. Though LWR can make mid-phase budget modifications, it is not clear what the formula is for doing so. FSK would like to receive the original dollar amounts for each of its budgetary lines. (It was this example which prompted the recommendation in the current evaluation for LWR to establish clearer guidelines for handling such financial matters.)

**CONCLUSION:** Though LWR/EARO refers to this as a "service project," and recognizes the need for it to include more community and leadership development along with its technical services, it did decide in 1991 to fund another five-year phase. There are impressive results, evident in visiting some of the successful (women) farmers, who are keeping their own farm records for project monitoring and self-management. Though FSK has difficulty in summarizing them in meaningful ways, it does have lots of data. Director Paul Maina has assisted LWR in evaluating other partners, and is a leader in the Kenya network. So there is potential for LWR to help this partner improve its work even further.

## **ASIA CASE STUDY: COMPREHENSIVE RURAL HEALTH PROJECT (INDIA)**

**SUMMARY:** This world famous program has been operating for 22 years. LWR has been a partner with CRHP for 15 of those years. Current LWR funding is focused on an outreach of the program in the Bhandardara area, a tribal and "backward" area in the *ghats* (hilly area at the edge of the plateau) of western Maharashtra. LWR's has agreed to provide \$174,200 over 3 years for this project (1991-1994). LWR is also currently working out the details of a proposed joint program between CMAI and CRHP which would utilize the services of CRHP in Jamkhed to train selected teams and then assist them in setting up new community-based health care programs.

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE NGO:** In 1970 Dr. Rajanikant Arole and Dr. (Mrs.) Mabelle Arole established the Society for Comprehensive Rural Health Projects in Jamkhed, a drought-prone, poor area in central India. They wanted to develop a low-cost primary health system accessible to the poorest and weakest sectors of the society. Their intention was to empower the people to manage their own affairs, not just in the matter of health, but in every sector of their lives. Health problems in the rural areas of India are attributable to inadequate food intake, lack of safe drinking water, chronic infections, and the denial of social justice to persons of low status, including women and persons of low caste. So they wanted to develop a program with a holistic approach in which socio-economic development is integrated with health care.

Beginning with their personal funds, the Aroles eventually secured funding from external sources to operate their project. Over the years the major donors have included the Church of North India, the United Church Board of World Mission (USA), LWR, American Leprosy Mission, Swiss Development Corporation, United Church of Canada, Church Auxiliary for Social Action (India), and ICCO (Netherlands). These funds are used for special projects, including socio-economic programs, training, food for work, and leprosy and TB programs. The general program, including the staff and operations of two hospitals, and nutrition program, are managed entirely with internal resources, mostly patients' fees. The GOI subsidizes the family planning program.

Special programs run by CRHP include a mobile unit for orthopaedic appliances, a tuberculosis control program, a leprosy rehabilitation and eradication program, food for work (used to support persons working in tree nurseries, afforestation, land development, etc.), a socio-economic development program (including drinking water, training for women's and farmers groups, appropriate technology), and the community health training program (for local Village Health Workers and for outsiders wanting to

learn from this project).<sup>4</sup>

**INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT:** In response to a request by this evaluation team for information for the "organizational typology grid", the administrator of CRHP provided the following data:

	1978	1980	1988	1993
Total budget (Rupees X 1000)	1,260	1,526	3,150	5,836
Percentage from LWR	0%	8.4 %	9.9 %	21.1 %
Other international	55.5%	29.9 %	25.8 %	25.8 %
Local sources	43.4%	60.0 %	60.4 %	52.5 %
Govt. of India	1.1%	1.6 %	4.0 %	0.6 %
Technical staff	43	48	50	55
Village-level staff	200	300	300	300

This program started in 8 villages with a total population of 10,000 in 1971. By 1985 the number of villages had increased to 200, with a population of 250,000. The Aroles decided that it was time to start withdrawing the program's direct intervention in so many villages, so that by 1993 80 villages are visited on a weekly basis; the staff still keep in contact with another 140 villages through monthly visits.

---

<sup>4</sup> Some of this information was obtained by an impact study of the Jamkhed program by the University of Amsterdam on behalf of ICCO in 1991.

**PROJECT ACHIEVEMENTS:** The statistics indicating the impact of CRHP were reported in the body of this evaluation report. But they are so impressive they are repeated in this case study:

	1971	1993
Birth rate (per 1,000 live births)	40	20
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000)	180	19
Immunizations	0.5%	91%
Deliveries by trained persons	1%	90%
Eligible couples practicing family planning	1%	60%
Cumulative total of TB patients visited		6,992
Total leprosy patients		4,446
Artificial limbs and calipers provided		8,000
Women's Clubs		75
Young Farmers' Clubs		60
Tubewells for safe drinking water		168
Plant nurseries (villages)		25
Trees planted		4,500,000
Land leveled (acres)		3,214

In addition to all of these remarkable accomplishments in the project area, or rather because of them, the Aroles have had a significant influence on government policy at the state and national levels in India, and in other countries. A recent World Bank publication, World Development Report 1993: Investing in Health, was recently presented in Bombay. The people who wrote it had visited Jamkhed and were obviously influenced by what they saw there. Dr. Raj Arole was on the panel to speak in support of it. Dr. Mabelle Arole has recently been appointed to a high position in UNICEF for Asia, and will be based in Kathmandu. So their influence continues to spread in a wide way.

Other examples of their impact on policy include the introduction of the Community Health Guide for programs of the Government of India's Ministry of Health; the

**involvement of women in social forestry in Maharashtra; the provision of loans to women for income generation programs; and the participation of communities in health programs adopted by many NGOs.**

**RELATIONSHIP WITH LWR: In Dr. Mabelle Arole's reply to the survey questionnaire, she listed new development activities helped by LWR's assistance as the empowerment of women by organizing Mahila Mandals (women's clubs), where they share knowledge and skills that enable them to start income generation programs, address environmental issues such as afforestation and watershed management, and have community-based health programs in each village and hamlet.**

**Though one may ask how much influence LWR actually had on CRHP's ability to achieve these results, the new project at Bhandardara was started with LWR funds. This has enabled CRHP to appoint a doctor, social workers and paramedical workers in this area to initiate the community-based health program there. The Aroles give very high marks to the form of assistance provided by LWR. "There are no limitations in the assistance given by LWR... We are thankful to LWR for being partners with us for the past 15 years. The leadership in LWR has enabled us to start many new activities. We look forward to continued partnership as we extend our work into new areas of health and development."**

**As mentioned elsewhere, LWR's Asia Director has been an active initiator of getting CRHP and CMAI together for a new program of training and follow-up support for small teams of (2-3) persons who have the interest and potential to start community-based health programs in the target areas of Orissa and Bihar, some of the poorest areas of India.**

**CONCLUSION: LWR not only picked a "winning horse" to back in funding CRHP, it has enjoyed a good partnership and has had an important influence on the development and spreading of this good work. This is certainly a real success story, for both partners.**

**ANNEX D. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND PLACES VISITED**

**Washington DC, July 7-9**

**Agency for International Development**

**Tom Leonhart, Consultant for Team Planning Meeting,**

**Mary Herbert, Program Analyst, USA.I.D./FHA/PVC**

**Sallie Jones, Chief of Matching Grants, USA.I.D./FHA/PVC**

**New York, July 19-20 and August 30-31**

**Lutheran World Relief**

**Norman Barth, Executive Director**

**Joseph Sprunger, Director for Finance and Administration**

**Frank Conlan, Program Director for Africa**

**Gene Thiemann, Program Director for Asia**

**Kathryn Wolford, Program Director for Latin America (Executive Director-Designate)**

**Jeff Whisenant, Assistant Program Director for Africa (formerly Executive Assistant)**

**Robert Busche, (Formerly Senior Policy Advisor and Program Director for Latin America)**

**ECUADOR: July 21-25 and August 6-7**

**LWR/ Andean Regional Office**

**Thomas Edwards, Andean Regional Representative**

**David Padilla, Program Assistant for Andean Region**

**U.S. Agency for International Development**

**Michael Jordan, Acting Mission Director**

**Pastoral Rural Ecuatoriana (PRE), Quito**

**Isidro Freile, President**

**Gilberto Bautista, National Coordinator**

**Victor Vaca, Adviser**

**Fondo Ecuatoriano Populorum y Progreso (FEPP), Lago Agrio**

**Xavier Villa Verde, Regional Coordinator**

**Arturo Proano, Agricultural Specialist**

**Vitte Richard Rojas, Livestock Specialist**

**Alberto Cevallos, Forestry Specialist**

**Jenny Cango, Women's Program Coordinator, Accountant**  
**Pablo Mindo, Trainer for Community Development**  
**Nelson Reino, Administrator**  
**Miriam Cansino, Administrative Assistant**  
**Reyna Minda, Administrative Secretary**

**Rafael Yiyocuro, President of the Cattle Project of the Sionas, Parliamentarian of Organization of the Siona Indigenous Nation (ONISE)**  
**Jorge Puano, President of UOCAN (Campesino federation), Aguas Negras**  
**Members of the Board of UOCAN**

**PERU, July 25-31 and August 5**

**LWR/sub-Regional office (ARO), Lima**

**Pedro Veliz, Andean Sub-regional Coordinator**

**U.S. Agency for International Development, Lima**

**Harry E. Wing, Chief, Office of Rural Development**

**Centro de Investigacion, Educacion y Desarrollo (CIED), Lima**

**Juan Sanchez Barba, President**

**Martin Vega, Director of Equipo de Desarrollo Agropecuaria Cajamarca (EDAC)**

**Fredy Guevara, Director of CIED Puno**

**Centro de Investigacion, Documentacion, Educacion, Asesoramiento y Servicios (IDEAS), Lima**

**Alfredo Stecher, President**

**Jose Cetraro, Executive Director**

**IDEAS, Piura**

**Francisco Espinoza, Director**

**Esperanza Castro, Sub-director**

**Luis Gomez, Research Director**

**Juana Jimenez, Administrative Officer**

**Luz Gallo, Team Director for Serron/Malacasi**

**Rocio Pilar Puente, Health Coordinator**

**Luis Bartolo, Intern, Demonstration Farm**

**Julio Olivera, Team Director for Quemazon/Andanjo**

**Martha Antezana, Agro-Livestock Development Coordinator**

**Ernulfo Cunayque, Community Promoter**

**Jose Manchay, President of the Development Committee of Cilia**

**Margarita Chingual, Vice-President of the Mothers' Club of Cilia**

**Catalino Concha, Agriculture Promoter of Cilia**

**Jose Reyes, Agro-Livestock Promoter of Cilia**  
**Agustin Guerrero, Agro-Livestock Promoter of Cilia**  
**Aura Yong and Gladys Espinoza, Representatives of the Women's Network of Salitral and Bigote**  
**Gabriel Chungo and Ever Montalban, Representatives of the Irrigation Commission of Malacasi and Serran**

**Central Peruana de Servicios (CEPESER), Piura**  
**Elsa Fung, Executive Director**

**LABOR: Asociacion para el Desarrollo, Ilo**  
**Jose Luis Lopez, Director**  
**Maria Marcela Aguilar Cuadros, Director of Program of Social Promotion**  
**Angela Gutierrez Claros, Promoter**  
**Getza Nunez Ramos, Women's Health Promoter**  
**Judith Constantinides Grajeda, Social Worker**  
**Doris Balvin Diaz, Consultant**

**RUTAS: Asistencia al Desarrollo Sostenible, Lima**  
**Sebastiao Mendonca Ferreira, Managing Director and Consultant on Institutional Development**

**BOLIVIA: August 1-5**

**US Agency for International Development**  
**Gene Szepesy, Deputy-Director**  
**Hector Medina, PVO liason**

**Servicios Multiples de Tecnologias Apropriadas (SEMTA), La Paz**  
**Oscar Aguilar, Executive Director**  
**Jaime Rossell, Director of Planning and Operations**  
**Estela Marcani, Administrative Officer**  
**Gumercindo Benavides, Director of Rural Development**  
**Victor Ramos, Coordinator Caquiari Region**  
**Joel Alvarado, Coordinator Comandu Region**  
**Sergio Zarate, Field Promoter**  
**Juana Benavides, Field Promoter**  
**Genaro Quisbert, Rural Construction Advisor**  
**David Choqueticilla, Communications Coordinator**

**Fundacion Ecumenica para el Desarrollo (FEPADE), Cochabamba**

**Wilfran Hinojosa, Executive Director**  
**Rodrigo Aramayo, Program Director**  
**Iris Alandia, Planning Officer**  
**Willy Terceros, Health Officer**  
**Felix Huanca, Regional Field Promoter**

**Emigido Figueroa, General Secretary, Campesino Workers Sub-Central**  
**Albina Mejia, Health Promoter**  
**Gonzalo Cossio, General Secretary, Provincial Central of Tiraque**

**Centro de Accion Social para Desarrollo (CASDEC), Cochabamba**

**Gilberto Hinojosa, Director**  
**Elmer Velarde, Regional Director**  
**Celia Garcia, Health Promoter**  
**Justo Almaraz, Social Promoter**  
**Aida de Vargas, President of the Women's Center of Lava Lava**  
**Hilarion Villarroel, Secretary of the Water Committee of Lava Lava**  
**Victor Vargas, Treasurer of Water Committee of Lava Lava**  
**Eugenio Cruz, President of the Cooperative Integral Cosa Lomas**  
**Augustina Terceros, President of the Women's Center of Piusilla**  
**Lucia Rojas, former President of the Women's Center of Piusilla**  
**Primitiva Rojas, former President of the Women's Center of Piusilla**  
**Zemigio Sandoval, Director of the Sindicato of Piusilla**

**KENYA: July 27 - August 5**

**LWR/East & Southern Africa Regional Office, Nairobi**

**Sigurd Hanson, Regional Representative**  
**Moses Sika, Program Coordinator**  
**Samuel Kiragu, Project Assistant**

**USA.I.D., Nairobi**

- **Victor Masbayi, PVO Project Manager**
- **Nancy Gitau, Project Specialist**

**Ogwedhi-Sigawa Community Development Project, Mugori**

**Barack Ogolla, Project Manager**  
**Morris Olemioko, Peace & Reconciliation Worker**  
**Thomas Olenisiria, veterinary extension worker**  
**Wife of Olekitiya (Maasai farmer)**  
**John Osaboua (Luo farmer)**

**Farming Systems Kenya, Nakuru**

**Paul Mugo Maina, Managing Director**  
**Mania Waiganjo Mwangi, Technical Manager**  
**Dr. Nelson Elly Ojango, Veterinary Officer**  
**Francis Shadrack Oloo, Technical Assistant**

**Tototo Home Industries, Mombasa**

**Elvina Mutua, Executive Director**  
**William K. Gitau, Deputy Director, Finance & Administration**  
**Margaret Beja, Assistant Director, Programs**  
**Margaret Belewa, Coordinator, Impact Assessment & Evaluation**

**INDIA: August 6 - 27**

**USA.I.D./New Delhi, August 20**

**Dr. B.R. Patil, Evaluation Specialist**

**Comprehensive Rural Health Project (CRHP), Jamkhed, Maharashtra**

**Dr. Rajanikant Arole, MD, Director**  
**Dr. Shobha Arole Jerold, MD**  
**Dr. Jerold Moses, MD**  
**Mrs. Mukta Pawal, Village Health Worker (among others)**

**Christian Medical Association of India (CMAI), Southern Area office**

**Dr. P.C. George, MD, Area Manager**  
**Dr. K.I. Alexander, MD**  
**Mr. V.K. Mani**

**Hoskote Mission & Medical Center, Hoskote, Karnataka**

**Rev. Dr. K.P. Mathai, Missionary**  
**Dr. T.C. Abraham, MD**  
**Mr. K.J. Thomas**  
**Mrs. Ammini Dennis & husband**  
**Mrs. Aleyamma Matthew**

**Indian Institute for Rural Construction (IRRM), Pulicherla, Andhra Pradesh**

**Dr. G.N. Reddi, IRRM President**  
**Mr. Prabhakar Reddy, Project Coordinator**  
**Mr. K.V. Dinesh Babu, Agricultural Coordinator**  
**Miss Alice Rani, Women Development Coordinator**  
**Ms. Sharatha, Health Coordinator**  
**Mr. Srinivasalu Reddy, Veterinary Coordinator (among other staff)**

**Inter-Church Service Association (ICSA), Madras**

**Dr. Manikam Balakrishnan, Head - Project Unit (accompanied Evaluation Team  
August 10-19)**

**Prof. D. Yesudhas, Executive Director**

**Christian Council for Rural Development and Research (CCOORR), Thiruninravur, Tamil  
Nadu**

**Dr. Ravi Raj William, MD, Director**

**Christian Medical Association of India (CMAI), New Delhi**

**Dr. Daleep S. Mukarji, General Secretary**

**Dr. Bimal Charles, Head of Community Health Department & Training**

**Dr. Deepak Meshram, Senior Program Coordinator**

**Dr. Alfred Edwards**

## **ANNEX E. REFERENCES**

### **United States:**

*Partners with the Poor: An emerging approach to Relief and Development*, Jerry Aaker, Friendship Press, New York, 158 pp. 1993.

A Process Approach to Evaluation: A Manual for Development Practitioners, LWR Andean Regional Office, Gretchen M.Dursch, Jerry Aaker (English draft).

LWR Projects System Manual, Doc #1134B, including Development Strategy Guidelines revised November 10, 1975.

Policy of Lutheran World Relief, Inc., January 1, 1985, as amended September 27, 1991.

LWR Strategy Statement for 1988

LWR Strategy Statement for FY 1993

Strategic Planning, Defining a Strategy for ARO by Jerry Aaker, January, 1988.

Declaracion de Estrategia de LWR, Region Andina (1988-1992).

### **Bolivia:**

Bolivia Strategy, ARO/LWR, February 1988.

Resumen Ejecutivo, Evaluacion Externa 1992 de SEMTA, October 1992.

Evaluation Summary, Phase III, CASDEC, October, 1991.

### **Ecuador:**

Iglesia, Compromiso y Servicio, Pastoral Rural Ecuatoriana, 1986

Evaluation Summary, Phase II, FEPP, 1990.

Project Report, Jan.-June, 1993, FEPP.

### **India:**

**Comprehensive Rural Health Project: "Jamkhed: Flowers in the Dust: Impact Study" by Rensje Teerink, Philip Viegas and Loes Schenk-Sandbergen, Centre for Asian Studies, University of Amsterdam. March 1991.**

**Indian Rural Reconstruction Movement: "Project Evaluation Report: IRRM's Pulicheria Programme" by Evaluation Team lead by M.P. Vasimalai, PRADAN (Professional Assistance for Development Action), February 1991.**

**Christian Medical Association of India: "Report of the Community Health Department, presented to the Community Health Committee," 28th July, 1993, by Dr. Bimal Charles, Head, Dept. of Community Health.**

### **Kenya:**

**Tototo Home Industries: "End of 1987 Project Report," Compiled by M. Beja, written by E. Mutua.**

**Ogwedhi-Sigawa Community Development Project: "End of Project Status Report as of May 1991."**

**Farming Systems Kenya: "Evaluation Report of the Small Scale Farmers Support Programme Under Farming System Kenya, Ltd. (FSK), Nakuru," by W.T. Wamani, Ph.D., Senior Lecturer, Department of Education & Extension, Egerton University, Njoro, Kenya. June 1990.**

### **Peru:**

**Planificacion para Organizaciones de Desarrollo, by Sebastiao Mendonça Ferreira and Jorge Arroyo Moreno, RUTAS/IPES, 1993.**

**Hacia la Recuperacion Economica y Social, edited by Juan Sanchez and Gonzalo Pajares. PRES, 1993.**

**Summary Report of the External Evaluation of Agro-Livestock and Community Development Project, 1990/92, IDEAS, Piura, 1992.**

**Evaluacion de Asociacion Civil LABOR, by Maruja Barrig and Magdalena del Valle, March, 1993.**

**Plan de Readecuacion Institucional, 1993-95, LABOR, 1993.**

**Balance de la Experiencia Institucional, 1981-1991, LABOR, 1992.**

## **ANNEX F. LIST OF ACRONYMS**

<b>ADDF:</b>	<b>Andean Development Facilitation Fund</b>
<b>A.I.D./ USAID:</b>	<b>United States Agency for International Development</b>
<b>ALOP:</b>	<b>Latin America Association of Promotional Organizations</b>
<b>ANC:</b>	<b>National Association of Centers (Peru)</b>
<b>APDES:</b>	<b>Association for Promotion and Social Development (Peru)</b>
<b>ARO:</b>	<b>Andean Regional Office of Lutheran World Relief</b>
<b>CADEP:</b>	<b>Andean Center for Education and Promotion (Peru)</b>
<b>CASA:</b>	<b>Churches' Auxiliary for Social Action (India)</b>
<b>CASDEC:</b>	<b>Social Action Center for Community Development (Bolivia)</b>
<b>CAST:</b>	<b>Community Action for Social Transformation (India)</b>
<b>CBPHC:</b>	<b>Community Based Primary Health Care</b>
<b>CCOORR:</b>	<b>Christian Council for Rural Development and Research</b>
<b>CESS:</b>	<b>Center for Social Studies "Solidaridad" (Peru)</b>
<b>CIED:</b>	<b>Center for Investigation and Development (Peru)</b>
<b>CLADES:</b>	<b>Latin American Development Consortium</b>
<b>CMAI:</b>	<b>Christian Medical Association of India (India)</b>
<b>CRHP:</b>	<b>Comprehensive Rural Health Project</b>
<b>CRS:</b>	<b>Catholic Relief Services</b>
<b>CWS</b>	<b>Church World Service</b>
<b>EARO</b>	<b>East Africa Regional Office</b>
<b>FEPADE:</b>	<b>Fundacion Ecumenica para el Desarrollo</b>
<b>FEPP:</b>	<b>Ecuadorian Fund for Human Progress (Ecuador)</b>
<b>FIS:</b>	<b>Social Investment Fund</b>
<b>FOLADE:</b>	<b>Latin American Development Fund</b>
<b>FONAMA:</b>	<b>National Fund for the Environment (Bolivia)</b>
<b>FSK</b>	<b>Farming Systems Kenya</b>
<b>FVA:</b>	<b>Food and Voluntary Assistance, office of A.I.D.</b>
<b>ICSA:</b>	<b>Inter-Church Service Association (India)</b>
<b>IDEAS:</b>	<b>Centro de Investigacion, Documentacion, Educacion, Asesoriamiento y Servicios</b>
<b>IPHC:</b>	<b>Institute for Primary Health Care (Philippines)</b>
<b>IRRM:</b>	<b>Indian Rural Reconstruction Movement (India)</b>
<b>LABOR:</b>	<b>Center for Popular Culture (Peru)</b>
<b>LWR:</b>	<b>Lutheran World Relief</b>
<b>MCK:</b>	<b>Mennonite Church of Kenya</b>
<b>MG:</b>	<b>Matching Grant</b>
<b>MG-III:</b>	<b>Matching Grant OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
<b>NGO:</b>	<b>Non-Governmental Organization</b>
<b>OSP:</b>	<b>Ogwedhi-Sigawa Community Development Program</b>

**PHILDHARRA:** Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas  
**PRE:** Ecuadorian Rural Pastors' Association  
**PVC:** Private and Voluntary Cooperation  
**PVO:** Private Voluntary Organization  
**SCFI:** South Cotabato Foundation, Inc. (Philippines)  
**SEMTA:** Center of Multiple Services for Appropriate Technology (Bolivia)  
**UNAIS:** United Nations Association-International Service (Burkina Faso)