

PD-ABN-544

92310



December 20, 1996

Ms. Karma Lively
USAID/BHR/OFDA
2201 C. St. N.W., Rm. 1262 A. NS
Washington D.C. 20523-0008

CC: Mr. Michael Walsh
Ms. Amanda Downing

Dear Karma,

SUBJECT: Final Report - AOT-1005-G-00-6018-00

The Liberia Seeds and Tools Project was generally successful in spite of many adversities. Major accomplishments were that over 17,000 farm families benefited and the subsidized tool sales raised over \$21,000 for community projects. The report will be in three parts:

- LWF/WS Status Report, including list of items looted/destroyed,
- Final project report/evaluation, and
- Final financial report.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have questions or desire further information. Thank you for all your assistance.

Sincerely,

Kenlynn K. Schroeder
Grants Officer



LWF/WS STATUS REPORT

The April 6, 1996 duel between two coalition forces of the so-called "government forces" composed of the NPFL/Ulimo-K and the LPC/Ulimo-J degenerated into a systematic looting spree which left Monrovia and its environs devastated. The looting and destruction spared no one, not even the embassies which are normally protected by international norms and standards. Nor were the international NGOs spared, with their huge reservoir of goodwill through their closer interaction with the people. No one was spared; everyone was a victim.

Lutheran World Federation/World Service was the first international NGO to be systematically looted in addition to the traumatic, life-threatening encounters with the many different fighting groups. From the staff houses at 16th street to the office compound at 12th street, nothing was left untouched. From telephone cables to galvanized roofing sheets, everything was carted away, using the same pick-ups and trucks looted from the LWF/WS compound. In search of "United States Dollars," practically all the files in all the offices were torn, scattered, thrown and destroyed. See attached annex A for details of items looted.

After the U.S. Marines' evacuation, LWF/WS set up an office in Abidjan in the Ivory Coast to continue cross border operations in Liberia. LWF/WS Liberia resident representative Jim Mason then returned to Monrovia to join support staff and set up a limited office at Mesurado Compound, Bushrod Island, Monrovia. Fax: 231 226-262. Tel: 231 226-263. LWF/WS, the WFP and other NGOs teamed up to distribute food in targeted areas. LWF/WS is actively involved not only in the food distribution, but also in the planning and coordination of assistance. Due to LWF/WS' institutional advantage and strong team of committed senior local staff, LWF/WS has not stopped relief assistance even in the most trying circumstances. Exactly one month after the beginning of the fighting, the resident representative and two other international staff travelled to Monrovia to strengthen the local staff.

Until most recently, Abidjan has been the focal point for LWF/WS communication to the outside world. Whatever was salvaged of the financial files -- documents, receipts, duplicates and triplicates or any documentary evidences of transactions -- were moved to Abidjan for sorting and analysis. Substantial time and efforts were exerted to reconstruct the accounts. Financial statements and reports were updated as much as possible.

On October 28, LWF/WS staff at Phebe were harrassed and food, material aid supplies and office supplies were looted. See Annex B for listing.

LWF/WS' present strategy is to continue the emergency and rehabilitation activities whenever and wherever possible while maintaining a "minimum input for a maximum output" approach. coordination with other NGOs on the ground will be improved, bearing in mind the joint strategy of "sharing resources," avoiding capital-intensive outlays or deployment of capital assets in unsecured areas. Advocacy and the fostering of understanding of the humanitarian conditions in Liberia will continue to be supported and enhanced.

Since then, LWF/WS has steadily increased its activities within the international NGO's joint strategy of operation of "life-saving" to "smart relief" interventions. In Bong and Nimba counties, seeds and tools distribution was resumed. In addition, targeted vulnerable group food distribution and the school feeding and food-for-work scheme also resumed. In the area of coordination, LWF/WS has played a leading role in the drafting of the NGO's joint policy of operation, advocacy and various other strategy formulation. ANNEXES A and B Follow.

FROM :

PHONE NO. :

ANNEX A

page 1 of 3

1



L W F / W S LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION DEPARTMENT FOR WORLD SERVICE

HEADQUARTERS: P.O. BOX 2104, ROUTE DE FERNEY 149, CH-1211 GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

LIBERIA PROGRAMME
RESIDENT REPRESENTATIVE - JIM MASON

A MEMBER OF ACT
(ACTION BY CHURCHES TOGETHER)

OUR REF.:

DATE:

TELEFAX

TO: Kenlynn Schroeder
LWR

FROM: Jim Mason/Avelino Batong
LWF/WS Liberia

DATE: 18 November 1996

PAGES: 3

////////////////////////////////////

Dear Kenlynn,

RE: LWF/WS LOSSES IN MONROVIA

During the most recent crisis in Liberia, the Lutheran World Federation / World Service offices in Monrovia were thoroughly looted resulting in the loss of the following properties:

1.1 Vehicles:

Toyota Landcruisers	8
Toyota Hilux	9
Toyota Corolla	4
Toyota Four Runner	1
Landrover 110	2
Toyota Stout	1
Isuzu Trooper	1
Volkswagen Bus	1
Mercedes Trucks (new) unregistered	3
Mercedes Trucks 1113	3
Mercedes Trucks 2624	1
Mercedes Trucks 1513	9
Nissan Patrol	1
Yamaha 120 cc Motorbikes	15
Honda 120 cc Motorbike	12

1/3

4

1.2	Generators:	
	150 KVA	1
	47 KVA	1
	47 KVA	1
1.3	Office Equipment	
	Computers & Accessories-I laptops	11
	- Desktops	12
	Scanner	1
	Typewriters (3 electric 4 manual)	7
	Photocopiers (Canon)	3
	Safe (vault)	2
	Cash counter	1
	ID Card laminating machine	1
	Air conditioners	15
1.4	Training Equipment and supplies:	
	Training equipment for photograph	1
	Training accessories & tools	
1.5	Workshop tools & Equipment:	
	Welding machines	2
	Various heavy equipment tools and machines	
1.6	Spareparts and consumables (including tyres, etc.)	
	Toyota vehicles	
	Mercedes trucks	
	Landrovers	
1.7	Office furnitures & fixtures	
1.8	Office stationeries & supplies	
1.9	Agricultural tools and Vegetable seeds	
1.10	Building materials for our guesthouse & school feed projects	
1.11	Food commodities	
1.12	Cooking pots, utensils, etc. for our emergency milk feeding project	
1.13	School Furnitures for our school assistance program	
1.14	Communication equipment:	
	Handsets	24
	Radio telex	2
	HF Radios	12

FROM :

PHONE NO. :

EBA
3

Telephone sets	36
PABX AT&T 24 lines	1
Satellite phone/ fax- (from AST)	2
Large UPS	4
Small UPS	7
Satellite Telex (Inmarsat-C)	1
1.15 Container of Blankets and used clothes	1
1.16 Cash - USD 3,000 from the second safe LID 20,000	

I hereby certify that the loss of above list of equipment/materiels/vehicles prepared in May 1996 is true and correct.

FROM :

PHONE NO. :

ANNEX D. P01

P. 1 of 1

RE: LWF/W/S LOSSES IN PHEBE

Please find below list of stocks (food and non-food items) which were looted from LWF/W/S Warehouse on October 28, 1996:

ITEMS	UNIT	LWR	EU/USAID	LWS	WFP	UNDP	TOTAL
B/WHEAT	MT	0	0	0	127	0	127
PEAS	MT	0	0	0	84.575	0	84.575
VEG OIL	MT	0	0	0	14.895	0	14.895
LAYETTES	CTNS	6	0	0	0	0	6
WALL TENTS	SET	0	0	0	0	3	3
CUTLASSES	PCS	0	62	7	0	0	69
WATERING CAN	PCS	0	0	4	0	0	4
FERTILIZERS	MT	0	0	0.2	0	0	0.2
HOES	PCS	0	8	24	0	0	32
AXES	PCS	0	74	5	0	0	79
BUCKETS	PCS	0	50	0	0	0	50
STICKERS	PCS	0	274	412	5	0	691
CEMENT	50KG	0	0	4	0	0	4
FLASHLIGHT	DOZEN	0	0	1	0	0	1
BATTERIES	BOXES	0	0	2	0	0	2
STENO PADS	DOZEN	0	0	3	0	0	3
STAPPLE MACHINE	PCS	0	0	2	0	0	2
STAPPLE PINS	PKS	0	0	2	0	0	2
SCIENTIFIC CALCULATORS	PCS	0	0	4	0	0	4
STAMP PADS	PCS	0	0	8	0	0	8
SCISSORS	PCS	0	0	4	0	0	4
POCKET CALCULATORS	PCS	0	0	6	0	0	6
STAMP INK	BTLS	0	0	8	0	0	8
POSTAL SHEET	PCS	0	0	24	0	0	24
PAPERS	REAMS	0	0	3	0	0	3
PENS	PCS	0	0	3	0	0	3
ENGINE OIL	GALS	0	0	5	0	0	5
TWO STROKE OIL	QTS	0	0	24	0	0	24
MATTRESSES	PCS	0	0	20	0	0	20
TYRE AND TUBES	PCS	0	0	9	0	0	9

7

XO-ABW-544-A

92311

FINAL REPORT/EVALUATION

The project was evaluated by a team of nine people which included two farmers, the Ministry of Agriculture, CRS, the EU and LWF/WS. In spite of many adverse conditions, the project was generally successful. A major accomplishment toward sustainability was that the subsidized sale of the tools netted over \$21,000 which was used for community projects determined by the people themselves, such as wells, latrines, and rehabilitation of a school.

November 15, 1996

Mr. Douglas J. Mason
Regional Representative
Lutheran World Federation/World Service
Monrovia, Liberia

Dear Mr. Mason:

We are pleased to respectfully submit for your consideration the final evaluation report of the EU/USAID/OFDA sponsored Tools and Seeds Project implemented in Bong and Nimba Counties by the Lutheran World Federation/World Service.

As per the TOR, a draft report was submitted by the team to the project staff at Phebe on October 15, 1996 for their perusal following which we had to reconvene to finalize the draft few days ago.

It is our fervent hope that the findings, lessons learned as well as the recommendation will assist improve the quality and impact of the tremendous rehabilitation and development work your organization continues to render humanity.

Kindest regards.

Faithfully submitted,
THE EVALUATION TEAM

8

OUTLINE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS

THE PROJECT EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MAP OF PROJECT AREA

INTRODUCTION

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

THE OBJECTIVE OF EVALUATION

METHODOLOGY

LIMITATION

FINDINGS/OBSERVATION

LESSONS LEARNED

CONSTRAINTS

CONCLUSION

RECOMMENDATION

APPENDICES

- I TABLE I (A and B)
- II TABLE II (ITEMIZED TOOLS DISTRIBUTION)
- III TABLE III (PLANNED vs ACTUAL INPUTS DISTRIBUTED INTERVIEW GUIDE)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Evaluation Team is highly grateful to the Management of the Lutheran World Federation/World Service, the Ministry of Agriculture, the European Union and the Catholic Relief Services for their assistance in contributing a member each to the team.

The team is very grateful to the two major donors, the office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) Bureau for Humanitarian Response (BHR) United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the European Union (EU) Aid Coordination Office in Monrovia for their financial, material and moral support at this crucial time in Liberian history.

Certainly without such support the thousands of farmers currently rebuilding their lives through agriculture would have probably still be carrying guns or in refugee camps.

We want to equally express appreciation to the staff of the LWF/WS Agriculture Department, Leaders of the Local Non-Governmental Organizations, the Local Government authorities, Community and Farmer Group Leaders as well as the farmers in general for their

kind cooperation and assistance in facilitating this all important exercise.

ACRONYMS

- CARDA - Clan Agricultural Rural Development Association**
- BCADP - Bong County Agriculture Development Project**
- NCRDP - Nimba County Rural Development Project**
- HELP - Humanitarian Emergency Life program**
- CUSD - Community Union for Sustainable Development**
- ERADA - Eastern Region Agriculture Development Association**
- USAID - United States Aid for International Development**
- EU - European Union**
- OFDA - Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance**
- CRS - Catholic Relief Services**
- MOA - Ministry of Agriculture**
- LWF/WS - Lutheran World Federation/World Service**
- LWR - Lutheran World Relief**
- ADPS - Agriculture Development Projects**

THE PROJECT EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

NAME	POSITION	AGENCY
1. Joseph G. Musah	Asst. Minister	MOA
2. William K.C. Kawalawu	Agric. Assistant	EU
3. Isaac F. Mulbah	Sr. F/Supervisor	CRS
4. G. Momo Taweh II	Agric. Proj. Officer	LWF/WS
5. Willie Peters	Asst. Reg. Officer	Bong Co. (MOA)
6. A. Daxenous G. Tuah	Sr. Proj. Officer	LWF/WS
7. Paul W. Gbanyankollie	Farmer Rep.	Bong County
8. John Duo	Farmer Rep.	Nimba County
9. Henry Cagon	Farmer Rep.	Nimba County

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An impact Evaluation Team comprising 9 members representing the Ministry of Agriculture, European Union (EU), Catholic Relief Services (CRS), farmer representatives and Lutheran World Federation/World Service (LWF/WS) were fielded from October 6 to 14th 1996 to evaluate the seed rice and farm hand tools distribution project initiated by LWF/WS in Bong and Nimba counties. The Project is located in three (3) districts in Nimba County (i.e Tappita, Zoe-Geh, and Gbelay-Geh) and one (1) district in Bong County (i.e. Suakoko).

The project was planned to be implemented for a period of six months (January to June) 1996, and would benefit a total of 10,000 farmers. Seed rice and assorted hand tools were to be distributed among the farmers. The tools would be sold at subsidized prices and the proceeds be used by the communities to implement development projects.

* 527,030 Liberian dollars equal U.S.
\$ 21,492

The project which started in February and ended in July 1996 benefitted 1,7095 farm families each receiving 24kg of seed rice and 25kg of bulgur wheat. The total of 29,631 pieces of farm tools which include cutlasses, scratching hoe, regular hoe, shovels, axes, files and buckets were sold at subsidized prices and a total of Liberian dollars 527,030 was realized. This fund is being used by communities on development projects that are identified. The following shows the type and number of projects identified and being implemented by the participating project committees.

COUNTY	TYPE/# OF PROJECTS	STATUS
Nimba	28 bridges	6 bridges completed
	5 school bench project	1 school bench (53 benches) Proj. Completed.
	12 pit latrines	In progress
Bong	14 pit latrines	6 pit latrines completed
	4 wells	In progress
	1 school renovation	In progress

The project also distributed foundation seeds to farmers for multiplication, a total of 2.25 metric tons of foundation seeds was distributed among 36 farming groups and the total area planted is 60 acres.

It was observed that both upland and swamp land were cultivated in both Nimba and Bong Counties.

The seed rice distributed to farmers, were on a payback scheme and they are to pay at harvest.

The project has an impact on the farmers since there were acute shortages of both seed rice and tools in Bong and Nimba counties.

13

About 85% of the people in the villages in Bong and Nimba counties are engaged in farming and its related activities. The male and female ratio engaged in farming activities are 70% for men and 30% for women.

Due to the shortage of food in both Bong and Nimba counties, farm management and agronomic practices by the farmers can be rated at 50%.

Farmers are enthusiastic about the seeds and tools distribution program, and the program has proven to be a good undertaking in spite of the following constraints:

- inadequate transportation for the Local NGOS, the implementing partners;
- lack of operational funds for the NGOs
- lack of training for both NGO staff and the farmers
- bad road conditions especially in Nimba County
- late arrival of inputs

INTRODUCTION

On the 6th of October 1996 an inter-agency team comprising of MOA, EU, CRS, & LWF/WS arrived at Phebe, Bong County to conduct an impact evaluation of the EU/USAID/OFDA funded Seed rice and Tools Project initiated by the Lutheran World Federation/World Service (LWF/WS) in Bong and Nimba Counties.

The team was briefed by the project staff at Phebe, Bong County, prior to going into the fields. From October 7-14, 1996 the team travelled to districts in Nimba and Bong Counties where the project is located. The team was introduced to the various local NGOs Project Coordinators in Tappita, Zoe Geh, Gbehlay Geh Districts in Nimba County, and Suakoko District in Bong County, who gave briefings about the project. The team visited clans, towns farmers, farms and development projects initiated by committees using tools sale funds.

The following are the objectives of the evaluation, methodology and limitations. These are followed by findings, observations, conclusion, constraints and recommendations.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

In view of the growing dependence on food aid, there was an urgent need to provide essential agricultural inputs to meet short-term emergency needs of the farmers, and to improve the food supply situation in Bong and Nimba Counties (the inputs considered to be urgently needed to support agricultural and food production at village and household levels were seeds, and farm hand tools.)

Based upon this, the Lutheran World Federation/World Service (LWF/WS) took the initiative to institute a project entitled: SEED AND TOOLS DISTRIBUTION PROJECT to be implemented in Suacoco District, Bong County; and Tappita, Zoe Geh, and Gbehlay Geh Districts in Nimba County.

The purpose of the project was planned to benefit a total of 10,000 farm families in Bong and Nimba counties. However, the actual beneficiaries were 17,095. A total of 29,631 pieces of tools, 461.51 metric tons of seed rice, and 388.8 mt of bulgur wheat were distributed among the farm families at an average rate of 25 kg and 24kg per person. The tools were to be sold to farmers at subsidized prices, and the proceeds be used by farmers to implement feasible community development projects. The communities were to identify and implement community development projects using the tools sale funds. The seed rice was distributed on the basis of payback scheme. The project was implemented for a period of six months.

In addition to seed rice distribution, the project was to distribute to selected farmers foundation seeds for multiplication.

In this vein, 60 acres were cultivated using 2.25 metric tons of

15

foundation seeds originating from WARDA/Bouake.

The project was funded by USAID/OFDA through the Lutheran World Relief and implemented by LWF/WS. The project is indeed managed through local NGOs (i.e. CUSD, ERADA, and HELP) as implementing partners in collaboration with Regional Representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture.

The project document proposed that packages of agricultural inputs specific to the emergency needs of household would be procured, transported and distributed to farmers. The packages included seed rice, and hand tools primarily consisting of cutlasses, regular and scratching hoes, axes, shovels, files and buckets. Each beneficiary was to receive/purchase one item each of tools, while 25kg of seed rice was distributed on payback basis.

The rice varieties purchased for distribution in Liberia include LAC-23, ROK-3, IDESA-6, IRAT-170, IAC-165-2 and Foundation seeds such as ITA-328, 402, 326, 312, WAB-638, WITA-3 Suakoko-8, BKE-189.

Bulgur wheat, a UN/WFP donated food commodity was distributed along side seed rice to discourage its consumption. Each farmer was slated to receive 25kg of bulgur wheat.

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

In order to determine the positive impact of the project, on its numerous beneficiaries, in terms of effectiveness in performance and efficiency in coverage, participatory impact evaluation exercise was considered to be carried out by inter-agency team, fielded from October 6-14, 1996 with the following objectives:

1. To ascertain the level of progress achieved in implementation guided by the following:
 - a. How many farm families actually benefited compared to the number planned for?
 - b. Observation of the number of farms initiated or previous farms being expanded.
 - c. Assess the number of farmer committees involved in the project;
 - d. Total amount of money realized from tools sale;
 - e. Number and kind of projects identified and implemented by committees utilizing tools fund.
2. To establish an overall coverage of the project in terms of percentage of farmers served as compared to those not yet served; assessment of seed performance and the expected harvest and potential for a seed payback scheme.
3. To outline major weaknesses, analyze these weaknesses and recommend steps that need to be taken to address those

weaknesses;

4. To come up with the necessary observations and or recommendations in case of the need for an extension of this project.

METHODOLOGY

The method used in the evaluation of seeds and tools distribution projects begins with the interview of the following respondents:

- NGOs Chairman/Farmer Representative
- Individual farmers and/or farming group leaders
- Project Officers and Field Monitoring Technicians (NGOs Personnel) field observations

These were followed by getting access to the major project documents/reports and files which were reviewed, together with briefing meetings held with project officers and the local (NGOs) implementing partners. The team members traveled extensively through the four districts of the project areas in Nimba and Bong Counties with the aim and objective of collecting information/data on project performance from the respondents mentioned above.

The evaluation was conducted using verbally administered questionnaire, in the person to person contact, interviews, discussions, and observations, with respect to receipt of inputs,

activities of farmers, their receptivity to progress and conditions of the farms. In order to operate effectively and efficiently within the given time frame, a random sampling of small size of respondent farmers, areas to travel, and farms/projects were considered. In effect, in each of the four districts, two clans two towns in each clan; two farm/farmers and two special projects and community development projects were randomly selected. For this evaluation 31 farmers, 8 clans, 16 towns and 3 project coordinators were visited and interviewed.

The evaluation reviewed the relative success of the various strategies (seedrice payback scheme, tool sales project, seed distribution etc.) employed in meeting the needs of the target beneficiaries through an analysis of technical as well as social indicators.

The evaluation also drew lessons learned from the experience relevant to future implementation of similar project.

The evaluation focused on areas related to the implementation of the program - the process of the program implementation, operational considerations and the expected impact of the program on household food security. In examining these areas, the performance indicators applied in the evaluation examined technical, managerial, social and institutional issues. The technical evaluation focused on the quality and appropriateness of seed type. Management indications were applied to examine both process and operational aspects of seed and tool

distribution. Social indicators considered the expected program impact of target beneficiaries. Institutional performance indicators considered the prevailing security situation in which the program was implemented, as well as various measures of collaboration at the community, clan, district and county levels.

LIMITATION

The seed rice and tools project is located in Bong and Nimba Counties covering three districts in Nimba County (i.e. Tappita, Zoe-Geh and Gbehlay-Geh); and one District in Bong (i.e. Suacoco). A total of 10,000 farm families were planned to benefit from these projects (i.e. 7,000 in Nimba and 3,000 in Bong). The actual number of farmers benefitting from the project was approximately 17,000 farm families.

Thus, the evaluation was limited to the areas where the projects are located. However, due to the time, areas, and number of beneficiaries to cover within the limited time, a comprehensive coverage of the total project area was not possible. Rather, a random sample of smaller sizes of area; farmers, farm and projects were considered.

In effect, two clans per district instead of all six or seven clans per district, were selected. In each of the two clan per district, two towns and two farmers each were selected and visited. Time and bad road conditions were the major limiting factors in the comprehensive coverage of the areas. However, the terms of reference was closely followed as given.

Distanced between farms and villages were other factors that limited visiting many more farms.

The participatory nature of the evaluation called for some form of workshop or training of participants in evaluation/and or appraisal techniques, but was unfortunately not conducted.

FINDINGS

The major findings of the evaluation are as follows:

A. Project Management/Implementation

1. The project was managed by qualified and experienced national staff. Most of them have worked with ADPs (NCRDP, BCADP, etc.) and the Ministry of Agriculture. A total of 31 national staff was recruited and stationed on the project.
2. LWF/WS reorganized and worked through local NGOs and Clan Committees (CARDAs) in order to increase farmers and community participation (capacity building).
3. Working relationship between local NGOs and the Clan Committees were not very cordial. The level of

information sharing and coordination of activities was very low. Infact, each organization appeared not to know its role in the distribution process.

4. Distribution of inputs was carried out by three local NGOs; CUSD (Zoe-Geh and Tappita District) and ERADA (Gbelay-Geh District) in Nimba County and HELP (Suacoco District) in Bong County. In collaboration with the Clan Committees, LWF/WS monitored the distribution process.
5. Distribution statistics collected from the field did not, in most instances, corroborate with those reported by LWF/WS. For example, it was reported that 509.69 metric tons of seed rice and 422.4 metric tons of bulgur wheat were distributed to a total of 19,037 farm families (see table IA), but field data revealed that only 456.33 metric tons of seed rice and 388.8 metric tons of bulgur wheat actually reached the beneficiaries (see table IB)
6. Contrary to report that a total of 598 beneficiaries were served 14,950kg (14.95mt) seed rice and 14,950kg (14.9mt) bulgur wheat in the Gblor and Gbee Clans of Tappita District, Nimba County, field data recorded from the district office revealed that farmers in the aforementioned clan did not benefit from seed rice and bulgur wheat distribution.
7. Due to the late arrival of the seed rice (May-July), about 29% of the farmers admitted eating portion of their ration while 35% exchanged theirs with local lowland varieties.
8. According to the seed and tools project report compiled by LWF/WS, a total of 31,285 pcs. of assorted farm tools comprising cutlasses, axes, files, hoes (regular and scratching), and buckets, were distributed/sold to farmers in project area. However, distribution statistics recorded from the LWF/WS implementing partner district offices revealed that only 29,741 pcs. of the total consignment received was actually distributed. Considering that 289 pcs. of tools were lost, a difference of 1,255pcs. of tools are not accounted for. (See table II).
9. The Local NGOs did not adhere to their distribution plans. Some admitted catering to farmers not previously registered, while others adjusted their plans to match with additional quantity of inputs received.
10. Record keeping at the distribution center were not organized. Distribution statistics were recorded on flying sheets.

11. In some areas, the official price list of the TSP was not used, while in other areas an additional price list was prepared and used along side the official price list. For example, in Nimba County, a cutlass was sold at \$40.00 JJ in Zoe-Geh district and \$75.00 JJ in Gbehlay-Geh District, respectively. In Gbehlay-Geh District, members of farming groups bought their tools at the fixed official price (\$20 for a cutlass) while individual farmers bought their tools at exorbitant price (75.00 for a cutlass).
12. LWF/WS succeeded in the formation of local farming groups in the project area. About 70% of evaluation respondents were representatives of farming groups. The average groups size was 15. Approximately 40% of this amount are women.
13. A total of \$527.030 (Liberian dollars) was generated from tool sale.
14. Farmers were very thankful for the inputs received. Few of them, however, expressed reservation about the height of IDESA-6, growing to 54 cm in height. All of the tools were said to be of good quality except the scratching hoes, which were locally produced.
15. Provision of extension services to farmers in the project area was very minimal. This may be attributed to the lack of transportation, high farmer/extension agent ratio and bad road condition. In fact, training opportunities were not provided for farmers groups leaders in technical, management and leadership skills as stipulated in revised project document.

Timing of the distribution of farm inputs did not correspond with the farming activities in the project area. For example, upland farming activities commence in December - January, while swamp farming activities commence in April - May. Farmers usually secure their inputs time in advance, otherwise they will be engaged in late farming which results in low yields.

16. Some previously earmarked inputs like rice milling machines, agro chemicals and the like have not yet been supplied.

B. GENERAL FARM CONDITION

1. Due to past swamp development activities of ADPs in the project area, 80% of the farming activities are centered around group farmers in the lowland ecology.
2. Majority of the swamp (85%) under cultivation in the project area (especially in Zoe-Geh district, Nimba County) were properly laid out.

3. About 51 groups in Nimba are cultivating swamps ranging in size between 0.5 to 4 acres.
4. In the upland fields, farmers reported having farm sizes ranging from 1 acre to 3. The Upland rice is inter-cropped with cassava, corn, sorghum, millet, and vegetable, while in the swamp areas rice is grown as a monocrop.
5. Farmers claimed that the quantity of seed rice distributed per farmer (24-25kg). Only covered 1/3 to " of the area cleared.
6. About 60% of the rice field (both upland and lowland) were not well maintained. Cultural practices, especially weeding were not carried out. This can be attributed to farmers dividing their time among too many activities, and the lack of food during the peak of farming season.
7. Approximately 25 - 30% of farm planted to early-maturing varieties were being harvested while those planted to medium and late maturing varieties were in their vegetative and reproductive stages.
8. Generally, farms that were well maintained (40%) were doing fine. Crop performance was very good (vigorous growth, good tillering and good panicle development, all of which indicate that the prospect for harvest is good.
9. Ground hog, birds, termites, leech, rice bugs, inadequate seed rice and tools, coupled with lack of food at the height of the planting season were enumerated as major production constraints. Insecurity at the onset of the planting season posed serious problems for effective farming activities.

C. PAYBACK SCHEME/EXCHANGE

1. Most of the farmers interviewed (95%) indicated having knowledge on payback scheme and are willing and prepared to cooperate.
2. About 10% of the farmers interviewed will exchange seed rice for bulgur wheat, while 15% will sell seed rice
(source of income for the family).

D. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

1. Local NGOs played a predominant role in community project identification to the dissatisfaction of the Clan Committees. The NGOs spearheaded project implementation and served as custodians of fund generated from the tool sale.
2. Community projects were identified after the sale of

tools. The following projects were initiated; 26 latrines, 28 bridges, 5 school benches (53 per project) 4 wells, and 1 school renovation. Of the total projects initiated the following were completed; 6 latrines, 6 bridges, and 1 school bench (53 benches).

E. GENDER ISSUES

1. While the project incorporated gender issues into the initial planning, a combination of failed recruitment of female monitoring staff and overall logistics demands reduced gender to a secondary consideration in the project implementation and monitoring phases.

F. EXOGENOUS FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM

1. Excessive rains in the project area negatively affected the program; road access was restricted.

G. LAND ACCESS

1. Access to land influenced, to a greater extent, farmers concentrating either on the upland or lowland ecologies. Due to land tenure ship most farmers in Nimba County make their upland farms far away from the towns/villages.

H. LABOR

1. A lack of household labor was considered a major constraint to agricultural production in the family sector in the surveyed areas.

LESSONS LEARNED

Untimely supply of inputs to farmers has a negative impact on production.

Local tool production without taking socio-cultural behavior into consideration will have a negative impact on the farmers.

In spite of these factors, the farmers in Bong and Nimba counties are enthusiastic about the project. Nearly everybody in these areas is engaged in farming and its related activities.

There were more farmers in need of farm inputs, especially the tools, than planned for. This explains why the inputs were distributed thinly among the farmers.

Grouping farmers, supplying them with inputs and supervising their activities, is a cost effective method of implementing a project.

It was impressive to have both men and women in the same group, with no sex discrimination and division of labor.

The Farmer Development Association (FDA) that were organized under Nimba County Agricultural Development project (NCADP) and Bong County Agricultural Development Project (BCADP) still exist, and these are operating under this project.

Monitoring of project was ineffective this give rise to the sale of tools at prices higher than subsidized prices.

Area targeted was not adequately covered.

The amount of acreage small-scale farmers cultivate is proportional to the amount of inputs available (seeds, tools, labor, etc.) to them. This is the reason why small-scale farmers continue to produce subsistant crops (for home consumption).

It is very much necessary to plan and follow it correctly, if not the tendency will be an indiscriminate reduction of activities or services which will result in under-estimation or over-estimation.

CONSTRAINTS

One of the major constraints facing the project s implementation partners (Local NGOs) is the lack of transportation. Given the high farmer/extension agent ratio (almost 500:1), it is difficult for extension agents to reach all farmers without transport.

- Bad road condition and bad bridges also caused severe setbacks to the movement of project officers in the field.
- Land ownership is a constraint both in Nimba and Bong Counties. This explains why most upland farms are found deep in the forest.
- Local NGOs lack the financial resources and trained manpower to carry out their planned activities, unless they are guided and supported by International NGOs.

The roles of CARDA with local NGOs is not clear, and well understood.

- There is no Memorandum of understanding between LWF/WS and the (NGOs) implementing partners.

The evaluation team experienced problems with local NGOs in the identification of accurate record keeping in almost all the project areas.

- Distance between villages/towns and farm as well as between one farm and the other farm, coupled with bad roads impeded our movement.

CONCLUSION

It could be said that this project has a potential to succeed, inspite of all its short comings i.e. late arrival of inputs and their subsequent distribution, among farmers; and the ongoing civil crisis. Nearly all the farmers in the villages are engaged in farming and its related activities.

Many farmers were in need of tools and seed rice, which is a clear indication that farmers are really interested in the project. It is therefore expected that many farmers will participate in the project during the planting season if they are given the needed assistance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the constraints and limitations set in the way of implementing the project, the evaluation team hereby recommends the following measures to be taken:

1. The project should continue for at least one or more planting seasons, with at least the distribution of farm hand tools. Farmers who benefitted last season should not be served during the next distribution.
2. It is recommended that LWF/WS organize a training workshop to help train the local NGOs; field staff in proper record keeping, farm budget preparation, simple techniques in project monitoring and evaluation, and community development initiatives.
3. Seed rice collection exercise must begin at once in order to avoid farmers delinquency to repay. Resources (collection materials, scale, tarpaulins, transportation, funds) must be made available on time.
4. Subsequent distribution of inputs should be timely to correspond with the farming activities in the areas.
5. The role of CARDA and (NGOs) operating partners need to be clearly defined and the system of handling the funds generated from the sales of tools be instituted to show which group should handle the project fund.
6. There is a need to improve the delivery system and to support the Local NGOs in the distribution of inputs through proper guidance on the quantity, quality, the location and training of specific input required, to ensure an adequate supply to target areas and groups.
7. It is strongly recommended that LWF/WS seek donor assistance for the funding of this project as a matter of urgency. LWF/WS would also build the capacity to coordinate the implementation of the project and monitor the activities thoroughly. Given the state of the country's economy, external assistance would be required to establish such a capacity.

**LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION/WORLD SERVICE
IN PARTNERSHIP WITH USAID
GRANT NO. AOT-1005-G-00-018-00
LWR TOOLS & SEEDS DISTRIBUTION PROJECT
STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE
(In US Dollars)**

EXPENDITURE	EXPENSES					TOTALS TO
	BUDGET	JAN-FEB	MAR-APR	JUN-JUL	AUG-SEP	DATE
I. PERSONNEL						
NATIONAL STAFF SALARIES:						
Senior Field Supervisor	2,400	800	800	800		2,400
Field Supervisor	1,500	500	500	500		1,500
Sr. Monitors/Agr Ext Workers	6,660	2,220	2,220	2,220		6,660
Local Monitors/Registration & Distribution Clerks	12,000	4,000	4,000	4,000		12,000
Data Processor/Clerk	1,110	370	370	370		1,110
Warehouse Supervisor	1,500	500	500	500		1,500
Asst Warehouse Supervisor	1,110	500	400	210		1,110
Warehouse Guards	1,600	800	400	400		1,600
Drivers	1,800	600	600	600		1,800
Subtotal Personnel	29,680	10,290	9,790	9,600		29,680
II. WAREHOUSE AND OFFICE COSTS:						
Warehouse/Office Rental						
Tubmanburg & Ganta/Pheve)	800	600	100	100		800
Communication Equipment						
HF Radios & Installation	3,000	2,350		650		3,000
Desktop Computer w printer ...	3,000	3,000			4,750	7,750
Office supplies	1,500	500	500	500		1,500
Subtotal Warehouse and Office Costs	8,300	6,450	600	1,250	4,750	13,050
III. ACCOMMODATION/SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES:						
Lump sum for staff (per diem, etc)	9,645	3,200	3,200	3,245		9,645
Subtotal	9,645	3,200	3,200	3,245		9,645
IV. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAVEL						
Vehicle Rental (4WD Pickup)	24,000	4,000	8,000	12,000		24,000
Motorcycles Rental	18,000		18,000			18,000
Diesel for Pickups	1,200	200	200	800		1,200
Gasoline for Motorcycles	900		600	300		900
Subtotal	44,100	4,200	26,800	13,100		44,100
V. SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS:						
Materials/Tools for Agr Ext Workers	2,700		2,700			2,700
Subtotals	2,700	0	2,700	0		2,700

EXPENDITURE	EXPENSES					TOTALS TO
	BUDGET	JAN-FEB	MAR-APR	JUN-JUL	AUG-SEP	DATE
VI. DISTRIBUTION OF SEEDS AND TOOLS						
Cost of seed rice distribution	37,500			37,500		37,500
Cost of tools distribution	30,000			24,000		24,000
Subtotals	67,500			61,500		61,500
VII. TRAINING						
Refresher Training for Project Staff	1,075		1,075			1,075
Workshop for arm Group Leaders	9,000		7,000			7,000
Subtotals	10,075		8,075			8,075
VIII. SUPPORT TO LOCAL NGOs						
Assistance in registration, distribution & monitoring + seed pay back scheme	8,000		4,000	4,000		8,000
Subtotals	8,000		4,000	4,000		8,000
IX. AUDIT						
Auditor's fee					3,000	3,000
Subtotal					3,000	3,000
X. INDIRECT COSTS @.095	17,100	2,293	5,241	8,806	736	17,076
	197,100	26,433	60,406	101,501	8,486	196,826
						196,826

Notes

1. The computer expenses in the Aug-Sep column are replacement of equipment lost in the April 6 civil disturbances and associated looting.

ANNEX I

TOOLS DISTRIBUTION SUMMARY REPORT

LWF/WS-USAID-LIBERIA PROGRAM, 1996

DISTRICT: ZOE-GEH

CLAN	CUTLASSE	AXE	SHOVEL	BUCKET	R. HOE	S. HOE	FILE	LOSSES (PCS.)	TOTAL SALE	NO. OF BENE	COMMENTS
NYOR	480	50	0	20	12	53	20	13	12,160	360	LOOTED
ZOE	1,310	161	68	50	136	45	0	0	39,095	1,730	
NIKWA	360	50	0	20	12	53	20	145	9,760	383	LOOTED BY FIGHTERS
GBOR	500	50	0	65	12	53	80	0	14,060	1,247	
GBAO	500	50	0	65	12	53	80	0	14,060	959	
YAO	1,200	176	42	30	152	178	580	0	41,830	1,605	
TOTAL	4,350	537	110	250	336	435	780	158	130,965	6,284	

ANNEX I

TOOLS DISTRIBUTION SUMMARY REPORT

LWF/WS-USAID-LIBERIA PROGRAM, 1996

DISTRICT: SUACOCO

CLAN	CUTLASSES	AXE	SHOVEL	BUCKET	R. HOE	S. HOE	FILE	LOSSES (PCS.)	TOTAL SALE	NO. OF BENE.	COMMENTS
SUACOCO	840	160	0	110	130	400	200	0	30,950	800	
GAIYEA	600	144	60	120	240	240	100	0	27,100	600	
ZEANZUE	720	144	60	120	120	120	100	0	26,500	700	
TONGBEYAH	540	130	0	120	100	300	150	7	23,510	600	
YEINDAWOUN	600	130	0	120	100	300	150	0	23,650	600	
KPATAWEE	600	130	0	120	100	300	150	7	23,510	600	7 PCS OF CUTLASSES USED FFW
KPORYORQUELLEH	600	130	0	120	100	300	150	14	23,150	600	STOLEN DURING DISTRIBUTION

ANNEX I

TOOLS DISTRIBUTION SUMMARY REPORT
LWF/WS-USAID-LIBERIA PROGRAM, 1996

DISTRICT: TAPPITA

COUNTY: NIMBA

CLAN	CUTLASSES	AXE	SHOVEL	BUCKET	R. HOE	S. HOE	FILE	LOSSES (PCS.)	TOTAL SALE	NO. OF BENE	COMMENTS
QUILLA	1,750	144	60	485	124	123	523	0	58,720	2,267	
DOE	500	50	0	65	12	53	80	0	14,060	604	
BOE	360	50	0	20	12	53	20	0	9,760	360	
YOURPEA	360	50	0	20	12	53	20	43	9,760	360	FORCIBLY TAKEN BY FIGHTERS
TOTAL	2,970	294	60	590	160	282	643	43	92,300	3,591	

62

ANNEX II

LWF/WS-USAID SEEDS & BULGUR WHEAT DISTRIBUTION SUMMARY

LIBERIA PROGRAM - 1996

COUNTY	DISTRICT	NGO	SEEDRICE	WHEAT	TOTAL	L O S S E S	
						(KG)	(KG)
BONG	SUACOCO	HELP	258,785	187,375	9,401	3,920	
NIMBA	GBEHLAY-GEH	ERADA	76,275	71,350	3,051	360	300
NIMBA	ZOE-GEH	CUSD	87,100	86,100	3,480		
NIMBA	TAPPITA	CUSD	77,525	77,550	3,101		
SUB-TOTAL			499,685	422,375	19,037		
FOUNDATION SEEDS			2,247				
GRAND TOTAL			501,932	422,375	19,037	4,280	300

5/13
30

ANNEX III

DISPLACED CAMPS, SCHOOLS, CHURCH FARM PROJECTS
LWF/WS-USAID LIBERIA PROGRAM-1996
SUACOCO, BONG COUNTY

NO.	NAME OF PROJECT	LOCATION	TYPE	ACREAGE	TOTAL	STATUS/PRESENT
1.	HARRIS' HILL DISPLACED FARM	PHEBE, SUACOCO	UPLAND	5	76	BUDDING
2.	SANOYEA DISPLACED FARM	CUC, SUACOCO	UPLAND	5.5	130	WEEDING, VIGOROUS GROWTH
3.	CUC DISPLACED FARM	CUC, SUACOCO	UPLAND	10		WEEDING
4.	GBONDOI DISPLACED FARM	GBONDIO, SUACOCO	UPLAND	5	75	WEEDING
5.	G.W. GIBSON DISPLACED FARM	SINYEA, SUACOCO	UP AND LOWLAND	5	60	PLANTING AND WEEDING
6.	COMMUNITY SCHOOL	PHEBE	UPLAND/PADDY	10	341	WEEDING COMPLETED
7.	KAYATA PUBLIC SCHOOL	KAYATA	UPLAND/PADDY	3		N/A
8.	UNITED METHODIST SCHOOL	SIONYEA	UPLAND/PADDY	1.5		VERY POOR, HARDLY NO RICE
9.	BETHANY SCHOOL	SUACOCO	UPLAND/PADDY	1.5		N/A
10.	ST. LUKE'S PARISH ARG. PROJ.	SUACOCO	LOWLAND	1.8		BOOTING
TOTAL				48.3	682	

ANNEX III

LWF/WS-USAID LIBERIA PROGRAM-1996
 COMMUNITY PROJECTS
 TAPPITA & ZOE-GEH DISTRICTS, NIMBA COUNTY

NO.	NAME OF PROJECT	MEMBERS	TYPE	ACREAGE	LOCATION	CONDITION
1.	VORPEA AGRICULTURE PROJECT	135	LOWLAND	4.5	LORPLAY	TRANSPLANTED
2.	KOYEAN FDA	85	LOWLAND	2.5	LORPLAY	TRANSPLANTED
3.	LOODOAH FARMERS ASSOC.	23	LOWLAND	2	BAHN	TRANSPLANTED
4.	NYNUE KWADOE F.D.A	20	LOWLAND	2.5	FEINPLAY	TRANSPLANTED
5.	GBOR-GBAIN F.D.A	61	LOWLAND	2.5	PAYEE	TRANSPLANTED
6.	GBOR FAMILY FARMER	40	LOWLAND	2	TAYLAY	TRANSPLANTED
7.	BUUTUO AGRI. PROJECT	15	LOWLAND	2	BUUTUO	TRANSPLANTED
8.	UNITED SWAMP DEVELOPMENT	10	LOWLAND	2	DIAPLAY	TRANSPLANTED
9.	FAMILY FARMER ASSOCIATION	15	LOWLAND	4.5	BEADATUO	TRANSPLANTED
10.	TIAPLAY GBUNDLAH	67	LOWLAND	4	TIAPLAY	TRANSPLANTED
11.	PAYEE SELF-HELP PROJECT	50	LOWLAND	2	PAYEE	TRANSPLANTED
12.	LOKWASEE FARMERS	35	UPLAND	4	GBARLAY	TRANSPLANTED
13.	TROPLAY KWADO KWAKOU	90	LOWLAND	5	GBARLAY	TRANSPLANTED
14.	ZOEGON DEAN AGRICULTURE	25	LOWLAND	2	MAINPLAY	TRANSPLANTED
15.	ZIAH KWA-DO FARMER	14	LOWLAND	2	EGNLIH	TRANSPLANTED
16.	GUNDIAH FARMER CORP.	23	LOWLAND	1.5	SUNFURPLAY	TRANSPLANTED
17.	ZRE-KWA DOE FDA	28	LOWLAND	4.5	GWEHLAY	TRANSPLANTED
18.	BENWEA COMM. FARM GROUP	17	LOWLAND	4	WEA BEA WEA	TRANSPLANTED
19.	SOH KWAS DO FARMER ASSOC.	14	LOWLAND	3	MANPLAY	TRANSPLANTED
	TOTAL	767		56.5		

132

ANNEX III

LWF/WS--USAID LIBERIA PROGRAM--1996
 COMMUNITY PROJECTS
 SOLLAY CLAN, GBEHLAY--GEH DISTRICT, NIMBA COUNTY

NO.	NAME OF PROJECT	LOCATION	TYPE OF PROJECT	NO. OF MEMBERS	ACREAGE	COMMENTS
1.	KEI-KWALOKWALEA	KEHPLAG	PADDY & VEGETABLE	23	4	TRANSPLANTING
2.	ZURLAY UNITED CLUB	GEILAY	PADDY	18	8	TRANSPLANTING
3.	LOR-ZORAWIAH UNITED	KPAIRPLAY	PADDY	24	4	TRANSPLANTING
4.	UNITED CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION	GEILAY	PADDY	16	4	TRANSPLANTING
5.	LEO-ZODO	LOLAY	PADDY	20	4	TRANSPLANTING
6.	BOUNKWADO FARMERS CORP.	KPAIRPLAY	PADDY	25	4	TRANSPLANTING
7.	GARGOUN YOUTH CORP.	SLANGONPPLAY	PADDY	16	2	TRANSPLANTING
8.	KOYEAN FARMERS	LOOLAY	PADDY	70	3	TRANSPLANTING
9.	WAILAY FDA	VAYANGLAY	PADDY	26	4	TRANSPLANTING
10.	ZUAKEN-BAH	PATUAH TOWN	PADDY	67	7	TRANSPLANTING
11.	KARNBELL WALEE	SEHNLAY	PADDY	67	7	TRANSPLANTING
12.	GEILAY FARMERS ASSOC.	GEILAY	PADDY & HIGHLAND	35	5	TRANSPLANTING
13.	KWA QUADOO	SHENLAY	PADDY	61	10	TRANSPLANTING
14.	KWA-LO-KWALEE	KEIPLAY 4	PADDY & HIGHLAND	66	-	TRANSPLANTING
15.	KPAIRPLAY ZOKUWN	KPAIRPLAY	PADDY	36	6	TRANSPLANTING
16.	SLAGON-NOR	GLANOPLAY	PADDY	65	10	TRANSPLANTING
17.	KPHENTWO FARMERS	KPENTWO	PADDY	23	5	TRANSPLANTING
18.	KARKERWON FDA	SEHNLAY	PADDY	11	4	TRANSPLANTING
19.	CHRISTIAN COMM. ACADEMY	VAYANGLAY	PADDY, POULTRY, VEG.	33	6	TRANSPLANTING
20.	DEDOR FARMERS	ZEHGLAY	PADDY/OILPALM	18	5	TRANSPLANTING
21.	SYDA	SENLAY	PADDY	24	5	TRANSPLANTING
22.	MARKPAH LOQUOH	LOOLAY	PADDY	11	3	TRANSPLANTING
23.	DALAH FARMERS	ZEGGLAY	PADDY & VEGETABLE	19	2	TRANSPLANTING
24.	TOU-DORDEELAR	VAYANGLAY	PADDY	25	5	TRANSPLANTING
25.	WABEALAAH	ZEHGALY	PADDY	11	5	TRANSPLANTING
26.	YARGARGEE	SEHNLAY	PADDY/HIGHLAND	13	-	TRANSPLANTING
27.	TEAH-QUADOE	VAYANGLAY	PADDY/OILPALM	18	2	TRANSPLANTING
28.	YOUHN NOR	VAYANGLAY	PADDY	19	4	TRANSPLANTING
29.	ZODO FARMERS ASSOCIATION	YOURLAY	PADDY	-	7	TRANSPLANTING
30.	H.H. COMMUNITY PROJECT	LUELAY	PADDY	-	5	TRANSPLANTING
31.	KAMLOKUAH	KAMPLAY	PADDY	-	4	TRANSPLANTING
32.	BOANOR FARMERS ASSOCIATION	YOURLAY	PADDY	-	6	TRANSPLANTING
	TOTAL			860	150	

53

ANNEX III

LWF/WS-USAID LIBERIA PROGRAM-1996
 COMMUNITY PROJECTS
 SUACOCO, BONG COUNTY

NO.	NAME OR PROJECT	LOCATION	TYPE	ACREAGE	STATUS/PRESENT
1.	DULUMU COMMUNITY FARM	DULUMU	UPLAND	4	WEEDING
2.	SINYEA COMMUNITY FARM	SINYEA	UPLAND	3	WEEDING
3.	SUACOCO COMMUNITY FARM	SUACOCO	UPLAND	5	WEEDING
4.	GBONKONIMAH COMM. FARM	GBONKONIMAH	UPLAND	4	WEEDING
5.	GBORNGBINA PROJECT	ZEANZUE	LOWLAND	0.5	TRANSPLANTING
6.	GANKORMAH COMM. FARM	GANKORMAH	LOWLAND	2.4	WEEDING
7.	HELP PILOT PROJECT	GBARNGA	LOWLAND	4.3	BOOTING/WEEDING
8.	TAYLOR'S TOWN PROJECT	GAIYEA	LOWLAND	3.2	TILLAGING
9.	KPATAWEE/TOWN	WATER FALL	LOWLAND	2.5	TILLAGING
10.	POPE'S FARM/NAFF	SUACOCO	LOWLAND	2	TILLAGING
11.	GBONDOI/CLARKE'S FARM NAFF		LOWLAND	2	WEEDING
TOTAL				32.9	

34

ANNEX IV

LWF/WS--USAID LIBERIA PROGRAM--1996
 SEED MULTIPLICATION PROJECTS
 SUACOCO DISTRICT, BONG COUNTY

NO.	NAME OF PROJECT	LOCATION	# OF BENE	A C R E A G E		STATUS
				LOWLAND	UPLAND	
1.	SUFA	SUACOCO	70	5	--	TRANSPLANTED 3 ACRES
2.	BOKOMUE	SUACOCO	40	3	--	TRANSPLANTED 1.5 ACRES
3.	GOOTOR	SUACOCO	13	3	--	PREPARATION OF PLOTS
4.	BALAMA FARMERS ASSOC.	BALAMA, BONG CO.	26	2	--	TRANSPLANTING COMPLETED
5.	LWF/WS SEED MULTIPLICATION	CUC	LWF/WS	3.5	--	NURSERY AND LAND PREPARATION
6.	LWF/WS--KPATAWEE	KPATAWEE	LWF/WS	20	16.5	LAND PREPARATION, WEEDING & FENCING
7.	PETER SABAH FARMING PROJECT	SINYEA, CUC	10	2	--	NURSERY AND LAND PREPARATION
8.	TAIKAI METHODIST SCHOOL	SUACOCO	50	2	--	NURSERY AND LAND PREPARATION
	TOTAL		209	40.5	16.5	

55

ANNEX IV

LWF/WS – USAID LIBERIA PROGRAM – 1996
SEED MULTIPLICATION PROJECTS SUMMARY
NIMBA COUNTY

NO.	NAME OF PROJECT	LOCATION	BENE.	ACREAGE	TYPE	STATUS	VARIETY
1.	KARLEA GBUNDIAH	MIAPLAY – B	34	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	SUACOCO – 8
2.	CHRISTIAN ZOEKARDEPEA	BAHN	44	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	SUACOCO – 8
3.	MAZOLAY FARMERS	GBLAH	15	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	SUACOCO – 8
4.	GAITAY FARMERS	BAHN	20	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	ITA – 326
5.	TEAHWON YANIC	BAHN	15	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	ITA – 326
6.	GBORKAR KERSEH	ZOUPLAY	54	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	SUACOCO – 8
7.	KWADOE FARMERS	ZAYPLAY	26	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	SUACOCO – 8
8.	KARBARKKER GROUPS	ZONTUO	28	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	ITA – 328
9.	KWALEE	ZONTUO	23	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	ITA – 328
10.	FEINPLAY FDA	FEINPLAY	27	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	ITA – 328
11.	TAYQUADORGBAY	TAYLAY	20	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	ITA – 328
12.	YOUHN FARMERS	KPAGLAY	28	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	SUACOCO – 8
13.	YIANPEA	GUEKPANAH	50	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	SUACOCO – 8
14.	KPANTEE	GUEKPANAH	40	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	ITA – 328
15.	MENDUABOR	GUEKPANAH	50	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	ITA – 328
16.	ZOEBIN KARLOKIAH	NYENPEA	27	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	SUACOCO – 8
17.	GOLEH KWADO	GORPLAY	40	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	ITA – 328
18.	SEHNY GROUP	GORPLAY	35	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	SUACOCO – 8
19.	GLARLAY OIL TOWN	GLARLAY	40	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	BKE 189
20.	DEANKARSEH	BAHN	40	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	BKE 189
21.	GBOUNPEA	BAHN	28	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	BKE 189
22.	KOKOLOU GROUP	ZONTUO	27	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	BKE 189
23.	ZOEGBA PEAGBAN	NYENPA	20	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	BKE 189
24.	GBLAH YIKALEH	GBLAH	18	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	BKE 189
25.	ZLANTUO DEVELOPMENT ASSOC.	BAHN	20	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	BKE 189
26.	ZEAGBAIN DARLLAH	NEPENPA	50	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	BKE 189
27.	GBONDIAH FDA	SARNGAPLAY	25	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	BKE 189
28.	KOYAN PROJECT	LORPLAY	75	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	ITA – 328
29.	NYENTEE FARMERS	LORPLAY	7	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	BKE 189
30.	KERPER FAMILY	LORPLAY	15	N/A	LOWLAND	TRANSPLANTING	ITA – 328
	TOTAL		941				

26

ANNEX V

LWF/WS-USAID LIBERIA PROGRAM-1996
 TOOLS SALE FUND PROJECTS SUMMARY
 BONG AND NIMBA COUNTIES

PROJECT	# OF UNITS	# COMPLETED	50% COMPLETED	COMMENTS
PIT LATRINE	24	4	16	NO WORK HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT ON THE 4 UNITS
WELLS	4	2	2	ROADS ARE NOT GOOD TO TRANSPORT MATERIALS TO COMPLETE WORK
BRIDGES	14	5	0	SAWING OF TIMBERS FOR BRIDGES IN PROGRESS
SCHOOL ROOF PATCHING/RENOVATION	1	1	0	ROOF WAS PATCHED AND BLACKBOARDS WERE MADE
SCHOOL BENCHES	150	100	50	FIVE SCHOOLS WILL BENEFIT FROM THIS PROGRAM
TOTAL	193	112	68	

57

ANNEX V

LWF/WS – USAID LIBERIA PROGRAM – 1996
 TOOLS SALE FUND PROJECTS – BONG & NIMBA
 SUACOCO DISTRICT, BONG COUNTY

CLAN	T Y P E O F P R O J E C T			COMMENTS/PROGRESS
	PIT LATRINES	WELLS	OTHERS	
GAIYEA	3	0	0	TWO UNITS COMPLETED
ZEANZUE	3	0	0	TWO UNITS COMPLETED
KPATAWEE	1	2	0	TWO WELLS DUG, PIT LATRINE NOT DUG
SUACOCO	0	0	0	COMMUNITY HAS NOT STARTED ANY PROJECT
TONGBEYAH	2	1	0	TWO UNITS PIT LATRINES DUG
KPORYAQUELLEH		1	SCHOOL RENOVATION	WELL DUG AND SCHOOL RENOVATION IN PROGRESS
YEINDAWOUN	1			PITS DUG BUT STRUCTURE NOT COMPLETED
TOTAL	10	4		

38

12/10