

PD-ABD-601  
75133

**Lutheran World Relief  
Cooperative Agreement  
#OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00  
Annual Report  
Year Three  
31 October 1991**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Summary	2
I.	Background and Project Context	3
II.	Project Methodology	6
III.	Monitoring and Evaluation	12
IV.	Review and Analysis of Project Results by Country	14
V.	Management	20
VI.	Financial Report	23
VII.	Lessons Learned	24
VIII.	Recommendations	29
	Glossary of Acronyms	31
	Attachments	
	A. Form 1550-11	
	B. Financial Report	
	C. Sample baseline data	
	D. Evaluation summary	

## SUMMARY

This is the third annual report of the Cooperative Agreement (Matching Grant) OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00 between Lutheran World Relief and the Agency for International Development. The period of the report is from September 1, 1990 to August 31, 1991.

The purposes of this grant are to :

--support poor communities or groups in their effort to meet their own needs as LWR partners as they share in the proposal, design, implementation, evaluation and spread of development endeavors.

--support the evolution and strengthening of indigenous organizations and development networks capable of and committed to continuing development facilitation beyond the cooperative agreement period.

--support, complement and influence development activities of developing countries whenever possible.

The grant funds 38 projects in nine countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa. LWR is a facilitating organization; it responds to, rather than initiates, projects that meet its criteria and are submitted by indigenous groups. LWR identifies and accompanies NGOs whose work directly or indirectly involves the participants/beneficiaries.

The midterm assessment was completed during the grant year. The evaluators recommended minor changes in grant language, and found that inputs are in place for the grant to continue.

The budget for the first two years of the grant called for total spending of \$1,500,000 from private and A.I.D. matching funds each. In the first thirty-six months of the grant, LWR has spent \$1,453,423 of private funds, and \$1,438,756 of A.I.D. funds. Cumulative spending to date is essentially on target, though modestly under budget.

## I. Background and Project Context

**Purpose:** LWR's approach to the Matching Grant with the Agency for International Development is based in LWR's policy:

LWR exists to act on behalf of Lutherans in the United States of America to support the poor and oppressed of less-developed countries in their efforts to meet basic human needs and to participate with dignity and equity in the life of their communities; and to alleviate human suffering resulting from natural disasters, war, social conflict or poverty. (Policy 1.10)

**Approach:** LWR is a facilitating organization. In general, it does not implement projects itself, but rather identifies and accompanies or supports local groups whose work directly or indirectly involves the participants. LWR typically responds to requests from groups in marginal communities that have in some way organized themselves for change. In most countries these local groups are indigenous NGOs. In Niger until recently, indigenous NGOs were not permitted and LWR has worked through cognate government ministries.

LWR believes that effective and lasting development occurs best when the poorer groups of developing-country societies directly participate in and benefit from that development. LWR defines development as a process that focuses on enabling marginalized people to meet their needs with dignity and motivation born of self-confidence and a sense of their own potential, by involving them from the beginning and by showing that they are both beneficiaries and participants of programs. Beneficiaries share the responsibility for conceiving, designing, implementing and evaluating development activities. Programs supported by this Matching Grant are based on a sense of ownership, of possibilities and of self-determination which will enable the beneficiaries to continue beyond the immediate project goal to search for other methods beyond their means. Central to the success of this development process is the creating and strengthening of local institutions capable of sustaining development activities and of promoting and replicating activities with a minimum of outside assistance. Without this sense of partnership and empowerment, LWR believes the poor will be forced to continue to depend on the actions and assistance of others.

**Special capability:** LWR's special capability involves working with small, often relatively new, indigenous NGOs (national, regional or local); bringing fledgling NGOs up to where they can stand on their own; supporting larger NGOs with proven records in empowering local marginalized people; and providing technical assistance, for example, in Niger's dry-season gardening program.

LWR works in the context of "accompaniment"--a mutually

respectful, informed and accountable partnership with indigenous NGOs. Accompaniment signifies an approach rather than a technology, sector or geographic region; it includes institution building, with an emphasis on evaluation and on planning, especially in the Andean region.

LWR profits from its ability to respond to developing situations in a timely way. In the Andean region, where all development efforts have been affected by emergency situations, LWR provides emergency assistance to complement its on-going development work. Working with various Andean NGOs, LWR has provided private, non-Matching Grant funds to fight drought, strengthening and complementing longer-term development efforts funded by the Matching Grant.

With money provided under this grant (the third which LWR has received: previous grants were AID/SOD/PDC-G-0124 in 1979 and PDC-0176-G-SS-3162-00 in 1983), LWR funded projects in nine countries in the first three years of the grant (September 1, 1988 through August 31, 1991). A total of 38 projects (held by 29 project holders, or partners) were supported.

In A.I.D. terms, the projects supported by this grant would be considered micro-projects. The yearly budget of the largest of the 38 projects is roughly \$105,000. Average annual expenses of the projects funded by this mechanism are \$25,000. Through a long process, local NGOs met and dialogued with LWR staff or intermediary organizations to develop proposals with good chances of success and which met LWR's criteria.

Socioeconomic-political conditions: Because of this variety of projects, no single set of socioeconomic-political conditions prevails in the nine countries using funds from the agreement. In general, LWR directs its assistance to people not receiving assistance from governments, though some groups receive funding from other NGOs. These populations tend to be among the poorest in their countries.

In each of the nine countries receiving Matching Grant funds, many people lack access to suitable land, which is both cause and effect of the continued depletion of natural resources. In virtually all rural projects supported by the grant, farmers lack access to credit and stable markets for agricultural products. Rural populations frequently lack access to adequate health, education and other basic services.

In Latin America LWR works with partner agencies to help offset the worsening conditions in three countries: Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru. The major sociopolitical conditions affecting the marginalized populations there are the enormous external debt often countered by structural adjustments in economies with negative effects; an unstable political environment; unequal

distribution of productive resources, especially land; economic policies that have favored the urban oligarchy and the commercial class; the "national security state" doctrine that has required huge military expenditures and produced repression of popular organizations and leaders; and civil and military violence. In Peru, structural adjustment policies have meant high inflation, currency adjustments and increased un- and underemployment. Peasants particularly feel this impact in increased costs of agricultural inputs, lack of available credit, and increased costs of basic foodstuffs.

In India and the Philippines, LWR responds to suffering caused by, among other things, overtaking the country's natural resources. Land resources, for example, are either poor by nature or because they have been damaged by overcrowding and overuse.

Certain groups in India and the Philippines benefit less from social or government services. Among these are landless agricultural workers, whose only income is seasonal or from factory work; small and marginal farmers, with little or no food security; rural artisans; harijans or "untouchables"; women; children; and tribal people. LWR responds to requests coming from these marginal communities, focuses on creating awareness of available social and government resources and helps the communities find access to the resources.

A number of interrelated conditions led to LWR's decision to support projects in Africa: deteriorating environmental conditions, economic inequity, illiteracy and governments' inability to meet basic human needs across the continent.

In West Africa LWR's Niger program is a direct response to years of drought and the increased emphasis on self-help groups (cooperatives) involved in dry-season gardening. LWR works there toward reversing environmental degradation, protecting usable land and providing opportunities to take advantage of forest resources. Over half of the Africa projects supported by this grant are in Niger.

In 1986, LWR initiated programs in Senegal and Burkina Faso because of similar climatic, hydrologic and social conditions to Niger, where LWR's wells program is successful. Growing numbers of indigenous NGOs presented the opportunity to strengthen local institutions. The programs in Senegal and Burkina Faso are projects implemented by separate, usually unrelated grass-roots development agencies. It is the existence of these local partner agencies more than anything else that has given rise to LWR's support of these development projects.

The cooperative agreement also allows for project support in Sudan, Madagascar, Tanzania and Mali. To date, LWR has not used funds from this agreement in those countries. In August 1990, LWR

submitted a letter indicating that it would not be applying Matching Grant funding to projects in the Sudan following the closure of LWR's office there.

Available local resources: The most obvious local resource to meet the above needs is people. There are usually sufficient numbers of people available in the communities, NGOs and governments with the right skills, knowledge and ability. The beneficiaries themselves provide their own energies and time. These people, involved in solutions that really work, almost always require external funding. The key, however, is to provide external funding in a way that does not trap the beneficiaries into paying for recurrent costs they cannot afford.

Necessity of external funding: LWR's funding often enables already-existing but underfunded local NGO staff and government workers to deliver goods and services that rural, and occasionally urban people need. LWR's support can often be considered as a lever for government funding. For example, in the Zourbattan project in Niger, an allowance for gasoline, included in the project budget, allows the Ministry of Agriculture extension agent to visit the village, which is 25 kilometers away, more frequently.

External funding is also needed because much of what NGOs do is experimental or because they furnish training or organizational assistance to marginalized groups which could not otherwise afford them. NGOs often substitute for weak or absent government resources.

Another aspect of LWR funding, particularly in Niger, is its ability to provide productive inputs (e.g., cement and reinforcing rod for wells, seeds and tools) that participants reimburse, partially or in full, into a revolving fund that they manage cooperatively for use in other community projects or as a source of credit for small loans. LWR funding serves as a catalyst, making other things possible by promoting a sense of investment and ownership of the projects.

Finally, external funding is needed to help these groups begin a process that, in most cases, will reach a level of sustainability, making funding from LWR or other donors unnecessary.

## II. Project Methodology

Goal: The goal of the Matching Grant is to enable the poor majority of developing countries to develop the ability to meet their own needs while becoming full participants in economically, socially and politically viable communities.

Purpose: As stated in LWR's proposal, the purposes of this cooperative agreement are to:

1) support poor communities or groups in their effort to meet their own needs as LWR partners as they share in the proposal design, implementation, evaluation and spread of development endeavors.

2) support the evolution and strengthening of indigenous organizations and development networks capable of and committed to continuing development facilitation beyond the cooperative agreement period.

3) support, complement and influence development activities of developing countries wherever possible.

Approach: As described in Section I above, LWR's approach to the Matching Grant is that of accompanying indigenous NGOs in their efforts within their own communities. LWR's program may best be described as a mosaic. In a mosaic, an individual tile does not convey the meaning of the entire art work. Only by seeing the interaction of the tiles in the entirety of the mosaic does one understand the meaning. Similarly, a project funded by this Matching Grant through LWR does not explain the variety or direction of LWR projects.

Methodology: LWR's methodology is based on a mutual assessment by LWR and other funders, the intermediary NGO and the community beneficiaries, of the opportunity for change. This assessment takes place in the context of accompaniment, more fully described in the first annual report of the Matching Grant. Accompaniment is based on:

--mutuality: a relationship of openness, dialogue, exchange of points of view;

--solidarity and responsiveness: sensitivity to the struggles, pains and fears of people living in conditions of poverty and oppression;

--contextual understanding: understanding the cultural, religious and technical diversity that characterizes work with people in their various social, economic and political settings;

--accountability: each party has rights and obligations.

LWR's strategy: The strategy used in the Matching Grant is the same as that used in LWR's development programs throughout the world. Essentially LWR seeks partners whose organizational philosophy and operational style are in concert with its own. LWR's strategy is also based on helping people find local solutions to their problems.

In the Andean region LWR is reducing urban projects. The decision is based on the conclusion that LWR has experience and a certain expertise in rural areas; the three project staff all have most of their field experience in rural areas and two have training in agriculture/natural resources. Also, in spite of the increasing trend of urbanization in Latin America, analysis continues to show that there is greater poverty and fewer services in rural areas.

In Asia most of the projects seek to create new levels of awareness of their situation and some of the causes. At the same time the projects include practical income-generating components to put money in the participants' pockets. Normally every effort is made to involve the target groups at the beginning of project planning. Where possible women are involved both as planners and beneficiaries of this planning.

Two Asian projects, Institute for Primary Health Care (IPHC) and Christian Medical Association of India (CMAI), are slightly different. Funding for them enables institution capability-building activities in primary health care to occur between these two apex agencies and smaller NGOs and their communities. In the case of IPHC the expertise it has developed over the years in primary health care will be taught to staff and community health workers of 10 NGOs. CMAI, with LWR funding, is working with 15 hospitals in establishing primary health as part of their overall medical program. These two projects differ from the others in that they are working in a primary relationship with other NGOs rather than with grass-roots communities.

Key inputs: Inputs for the LWR Matching Grant supported programs can be stated in terms of human, financial, material and other resources provided by each of the actors in the program: communities and local institutions, partner agencies, local and national governments, LWR and A.I.D. In the area of human resources, communities provide ideas and proposals for projects according to their self-identified needs. Local leadership (both formal and informal) facilitates development activities and encourages the community to participate in and understand the projects. As the leadership and local organizations are strengthened they are better able to replicate project activities and promote new projects. The financial and material inputs of communities and local institutions are locally raised funds, loans and locally available tools and natural resources.

Specific examples from Africa show that the financial and material resources provided by LWR, with A.I.D. support, included cement, steel rods, seeds and books in various wells projects in Niger. Through their cooperative structures, local communities provided time and labor to the projects.

Partner agencies provide valuable necessary human resources to the program. Their staffs work with local communities to assist

them in all aspects of project activities. For example, partner staff collaborated with hundreds of members of local tribes--the Maasai, Luo and Kuria--to develop an integrated project, contributing not only to improved standards of living but also to a more peaceful environment. Partner agencies also assist LWR with project monitoring and evaluating. Financially, partner agencies provide as much support as possible for their own projects and project administration costs.

Program inputs also come from host country governments, particularly local governments. Local government personnel are involved whenever possible in project activities either directly as project staff or indirectly as sources of expertise and training. The most notable case is in Niger, where the government is the project holder of all LWR projects and contributes staff and financial support to all projects.

LWR human resource inputs to the program involve program, finance and other staff in the field and at New York headquarters. Field staff identify and nurture close working relationships with partner agencies and communities. In India, in the absence of LWR field staff, two major partner agencies, CASA (Church's Auxiliary for Social Action) and ICSA (Inter-Church Service Association), assume the duties usually performed by field staff. LWR program staff in New York maintain programmatic contact and accountability through project review, field visits, project monitoring and maintaining contact with colleague agencies and sources of technical assistance. Finance and administrative staff review financial reports, disburse cooperative agreement funds and respond to finance concerns of project holders.

A.I.D. program inputs consist of funding and project monitoring and evaluating through the review of reports and through field visits. Financially, A.I.D. supports the program with Matching Grant funds. A.I.D. also provides LWR with useful information in the form of studies, research reports and other documents. Of particular use this year was a workshop on gender considerations sponsored by the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation.

Target groups: In each country where LWR works, the target groups are marginalized people. LWR's policy describes marginal communities as:

communities of people who are unable, de facto, to participate beneficially in the dominant economic, social and political systems. Living at the margin of human existence, they are unable to influence or change the systems which effectively thwart their efforts to meet their basic human needs. Such communities are marked by widespread poverty, hunger, malnutrition, illness, unemployment, low life expectancy, high infant mortality, lack of educational opportunity or other

means of improving their condition.

Target groups in India can be divided into two groups of marginalized people: the economically disadvantaged such as small farmers, landless laborers, handicapped and rural artisans, and the socially disadvantaged such as minority tribal groups, lower castes, women and children. Because beneficiaries are often members of both groups, the line between the groups is often blurred and many projects address both sets of needs. In the Philippines, the same applies, with the exception of castes.

In Latin America this translates into rural peasant farm families, with emphases on food production for family needs. Within the rural population, several projects (CASDEC, FEPP, PRE) focus on indigenous peoples. Each of the current projects, with the exception of SENDA, include specific strategies to encourage not only the participation of women in the development process, but also attention to their specific needs and concerns. One project, SENDA, focuses exclusively on youth.

In Africa, most beneficiaries are among their nation's poorest people, often living in the semiarid and arid regions of the Sahel. Specific beneficiary targets are farmers, many of whom are women who have been unable to produce enough food to provide for their families. LWR works with the farmers through local organizations to improve their food-producing abilities, increase their economic status and encourage their involvement in community activities.

Outputs and products: Expected outcomes will vary among projects, as each will be evaluated on the basis of defined objectives. However, general outcomes expected for all benefits are improvement in social, economic and health conditions for beneficiaries; increase in the capacity of community-based organizations and participating families to better meet their basic needs; and increased capacity of communities and base organizations to implement and manage their sustainable solutions to their ongoing problems.

As a facilitating agency, LWR responds rather than initiates. Because the Matching Grant is put into action through a number of indigenous NGOs, LWR's cooperative agreement does not respond well to the guidelines and schedule required. The grant also does not support one project, but rather many projects at many different stages in their project lives.

Involvement of Women: LWR's policy calls for projects to show that opportunity and provision for equitable participation of women is evident in project design. In projects supported by Matching Grant, this participation involves women as both participants and beneficiaries. Examples include:

The IPHC in the Philippines focuses on building capability

through training of trainers and community health workers at a grass roots level, involving women throughout. To date in the project, women have conducted family health education classes; motivated mothers to bring their children for immunization, deworming and regular weighing; motivated families for proper nutrition, environmental sanitation and safe water and to control endemic diseases; provided simple curative and preventive health care; promoted the use of herbal medicines; organized mothers for income-generating projects--vegetable gardens, silk making and herbal medicine preparation--to sustain community health activities; assisted rural health midwives during immunization, prenatal check-up and other activities at the health center; rehabilitated malnourished children through nutrition intervention programs.

The Community Action for Social Transformation (CAST) program in southern India gives special attention to women. It has trained 55 young women in a banana and sisal-fiber production program. More than 100 women are involved in a garment unit. A women's milk cooperative with 20 members was formed and supplies an average of 250 liters of milk. They have elected, among their own group, their board of directors, with a president and a secretary. A most unique program is the sanitation program that involves women as masons. They have taken the lead in working with villagers to produce low cost latrines; currently 100 of them are under construction.

Women's organizations associated with the Indian Rural Reconstruction Movement (IRRM) have been promoted in all 30 villages. These organizations have taken a major role in developing a savings and credit program. Eighteen women's organizations have developed systems and procedures for this and have already raised \$1,200 out of their own resources. Through their representation and lobbying tactics the women's forums have succeeded in solving drinking water problems in two villages; increasing the enrollment in primary schools from 58 percent to 70 percent; raising participation of girls in the elementary education program from 26.5 percent to 41 percent; improving immunization level from 56 percent to 74 percent - a direct result of training offered to 57 local midwives.

Accomplishments: Details of accomplishments during the year are contained in Form 1550-11, Attachment A, at the end of this narrative. Because this grant supports 38 micro-projects rather than one sectoral, single-location project, the program does not lend itself to reporting detailed accomplishments in the requested format. Nonetheless, as a specific example, the following is noted:

In the CIED-Cajamarca project, Peru, the following activities

were proposed and achieved during the grant year:

	Proposed	Actual
Hectares with soil terraces	100	60
Hectares with filtration channels	18	6
Hectares of cultivated pastures	16	17
Hectares of managed natural pasture	160	60
Community veterinary health kits	6	7
Family potato seed storage silos	30	60
Potable water systems	4	4
Improved irrigation canals	4	3

Project leaders in India report impacts on local institutions, local policy and other people outside of the project area. For example, the Christian Medical Association of India project has been important in its work with churches, CMAI members, hospitals and with a wider public to influence health service and health policy.

CCOORR in India reports that there has been an impact in local institutions, particularly in helping them realize the importance of "total development" and seeing health as an entry point for this kind of work. CCOORR cites a half a dozen schools, orphanages and trusts that have been affected by their activities. It also reports that government organizations have worked closely with CCOORR and that the influence on government services has been felt. Beyond the project area, the project has created a positive impression and many agencies in the surrounding region have come to observe the CCOORR project and seek advice.

In Africa, LWR has focused more directly on environmental dilemmas such as drought, famine and flooding, as well as destruction of the existing environment by people, rains, and winds. For example, CNN Soil and Water Management, Nakamtenga, Burkina Faso, has perfected their soil conservation techniques due to repeated technical training and exchange visits to local villages. As a result of the CNN model and other exchange visits, other villages have imported the CNN technology. To date, the project has constructed micro-catchments on 140 hectares of denuded lands, enabling these areas to sustain crops.

Attachment A details individual project accomplishments during the year.

### III. Monitoring and Evaluation

As described in previous annual reports, the Andean Regional Office (ARO) of LWR has committed significant resources to evaluation methodology. This is offered to partner (and other) NGOs, but partners are not required to implement it. The evaluation methodology is proving to be sufficiently flexible and appropriate that it is useful to NGOs of different sizes with

different programs. To varying degrees and in coordination with their particular project cycles most NGOs in the Matching Grant have applied the evaluation methodology.

Andean staff has continued to promote the use of participatory evaluation methodology among its partners. LWR's Bolivian consultant conducted a workshop for the CASDEC staff in the use of a manual prepared by LWR on this subject. LWR project staff in Ecuador have trained and assisted FEPP staff in an evaluation of its Lago Agrio Program. In Peru, staff is working with local consultants in the development of a manual on participatory planning; the initial draft is being tested with local NGOs, including LABOR. Since one of the main problems detected in the evaluation process has been the lack of adequate planning and clear definition of baseline data and indicators, the planning manual responds to a pressing need of partner agencies.

In addition to its concentration on evaluation methodology, especially apparent in the Andean region, LWR and its partner agencies routinely monitor progress of projects supported by the Matching Grant. An example of data from India (CCOORR) comparing baseline data with accomplishments to date is included in Attachment C.

Routine monitoring has revealed some gender concerns that need further attention. For example, Christian Medical Association of India project leaders and beneficiaries feel that more women are needed within the organization itself. Within the participating hospitals where community health programs are being fostered, the concept of women's health needs to be expanded beyond maternity care to a wider range of issues relating to the family, the need for literacy, and socioeconomic status. Communities with women health workers also need to find ways to develop in the community health workers a sense of self-esteem, so that together the health workers and the community can become agents of change for issues larger than just health.

LWR's Africa program has established an internal monitoring system that ensures consistent and accessible support for the projects via regular and frequent feedback. The work of the regional representatives (in Nairobi and Niamey) in communicating and facilitating the partnership between LWR and the field is key to this process. The result is a cohesive relationship that allows for better connections between partners and training facilities.

Evaluation procedures in LWR's Africa projects respond to the individual character of each project. Regional representatives, in conjunction with local partners, address each project and assess its accomplishments and problems adequately.

Midterm assessment: The mid-term evaluation took place from August-November 1990. A.I.D. and LWR agreed that, because of the

geographic scope of this grant and because of LWR's varied styles of work in different regions, two regions should be visited and a questionnaire sent to the others. Both parties also agreed on the value of having one external evaluator who would be able to compare and contrast LWR's work in the different regions.

The evaluation addressed four principal issues: What are the different ways that LWR establishes and maintains partner relations? Are LWR's partners receiving adequate technical and management assistance from LWR to achieve their goals? Is LWR able to strengthen local organizations and communities? Is LWR's program laying the ground work for sustainable local development once the grant is completed? In answering the above issues, the evaluators asked five basic questions of LWR's program: Are the stated objectives of the Grant Agreement being met? Are the assumptions for achieving the desired outputs warranted in light of grant activity to date? Are the original objectives reasonable given the magnitude of the activity and LWR's technical and management capability? and Should the objectives of the grant be re-assessed? Summary answers to these questions are contained in Attachment D.

The evaluators wrote "On the basis of visits to ten project sites in three countries, discussions with partner agency staff and others, and through responses to questionnaires from 18 other partners in six countries, it is clear to the evaluation team that LWR is quite capable of meeting all [three stated Matching Grant] objectives." The team recommended changing the language of the third objective from "support, complement and influence host country governments whenever possible," to "support and complement the development activities of host country governments whenever such activities are in accord with objectives 1 and 2 above." The evaluators also recommended decreasing the number of projects to be included in the Matching Grant. LWR and A.I.D. project staff have agreed that A.I.D. will initiate a request along these lines, to which LWR will respond.

#### **IV. Review and Analysis of Project Results by Country**

##### Ecuador

In Ecuador, each of the projects is in its final year. The FEPP Lago Agrio project in the Amazon basin has successfully implemented an ambitious program designed to promote the conservation of natural resources among indigenous persons and colonists who have migrated to this area. (See page 27 in Attachment A.)

The PRE Campesino Development, Phase III project has also focused on training in soil conservation and organic agriculture. Both projects have promoted improved primary health care through education, especially among women. (See page 25 in Attachment A.)

The SENDA Juvenil Artisan Workshops project has been less successful in establishing small cooperative businesses among youths. Its goals were apparently overly ambitious given its lack of experience in income generation activities and the fluidity and divergent interests of its target population of marginal youth. Through increased training in management, accounting and marketing, satisfactory results can be expected in a reduced number of businesses. (See page 26 in Attachment A.)

### Bolivia

The only active project in Bolivia under the Matching Grant at this time is CASDEC Agricultural Development, Phase III. CASDEC has been successful in promoting greater awareness and actions to protect natural resources, clearly reflected in reforestation efforts within the target communities. (See page 25 in Attachment A.)

The remaining two projects in Bolivia terminated in 1988. However, both have continued and LWR has renewed its support from non-Matching Grant sources. When FEPADE's Toqo Rancho project period ended, it was integrated into the larger Regional Rural Development Program, which began in 1989. This program combined three regional projects into one global program which will focus on improving agri-livestock production, improving health and nutrition and strengthening base community organizations. This consolidation represents a maturation of FEPADE and should improve program administration, permit better utilization of resources and simplify reporting procedures to funding agencies. SEMTA's Alternative Agriculture project that was in Matching Grant III was also incorporated into a global program. On a larger scale than before, it continues to emphasize ecologically sound farming, agri-livestock production and strengthening organizations. (See pages 23-24 in Attachment A.)

### Peru

Peru continues to be LWR's largest Latin America program, in terms of both amount of resources and number of active projects. Five projects received Matching Grant funds during this period. All, except LABOR, are concentrated in rural mountain areas. The CESS Solidaridad, IDEAS, CIED-Cajamarca and IRINEA projects all contribute to a greater awareness and action to protect the natural environment, while at the same time training farm families in more appropriate agricultural and animal production techniques. Production levels have not consistently met anticipated goals, due to two basic causes: first, chronic drought conditions in the Peruvian highlands over the past three years; second, the impact of Peru's structural adjustment program initiated in August 1990, which resulted in higher costs for agricultural inputs and lower prices for agricultural products. However, each of the projects

continued to strengthen the organizational and technical capacity of community promoters and leaders. (See pages 28-37 in Attachment A.)

The successful efforts of LABOR to promote women's leadership in dealing with their priority problems and issues, is reflected in the steady growth and management capabilities of the two coordinating committees in the project area.

The CADEP project, Peasant Women's Promotion, terminated in mid-1989, and LWR has not renewed funding due to CADEP's ability to secure funding from various sources. The project was generally successful at its principal goal, strengthening community-level women's organizations, but was less successful at economic projects due, in large part, to a severe drought and deteriorating economic conditions in Peru. LWR maintains a close professional relationship with CADEP, collaborating with it in various activities. (See page 35 in Attachment A.)

The Bartolome de las Casas project terminated in mid-1990 and, using other funding sources, LWR supports a continuation project. It includes a bilingual radio program (Spanish/Quechua) and a service center for rural leaders and has been of great service to many farmers in isolated communities in the region of Cuzco. Since its establishment in 1985, the center and radio station have provided legal and health services and information otherwise unavailable to most campesinos. These services complement the training and resource delivery activities of other NGOs in the region. (See page 36 in Attachment A.)

In response to Peru's on-going drought, LWR provided emergency assistance to ten NGOs in during the third grant year. This assistance focused on rehabilitation in terms of working capital (seeds, tools) and agricultural infrastructure (indigenous technologies of terraces and raised beds). While not falling under the rubric of the Matching Grant, these grants were complementary and supportive of the development projects (supported by the Matching Grant) by working through existing structures. Many beneficiaries of the Matching Grant-supported grants were also among the beneficiaries of the emergency grant.

### Niger

Like the other regional programs, LWR's Africa program concentrates mainly on projects that deal with solving problems of basic needs in marginalized communities. The strategy involves working through local partner agencies or grass roots community development organizations such as in Kenya or Burkina Faso. In contrast, LWR in Niger has historically worked directly with government ministries because of the lack of well-established local partner agencies. Although the government of Niger has passed a law making it possible for NGOs to be established, the promise of

NGOs in Niger has not fully materialized. A few fledgling agencies have appeared but their strengths are not yet apparent. For the time being, LWR continues to work through the government to strengthen village organizations.

Currently in the midst of its National Conference, Niger may very well have a different agenda for the development of the country if a new government comes to power. The results of this conference may further encourage the evolution of local NGOs.

In Niger emphasis traditionally has been on water supply and gardening programs. As a natural evolution of successful project implementation, emphasis has now moved to management skills, literacy and record keeping. Due to repayment of extended credit, many projects have established rolling funds and now work at maintaining them.

The final phase of the development process in Niger for many projects has been strengthening a functioning cooperative responsible for earlier phases of the project. In Gaya, the large forestry project in southern Niger, the project work has established a wood-selling cooperative, the real money maker of the forest preserve. LWR seeks to accompany these projects through these most important phases of their evolution-- the phase that will ensure their longevity.

LWR continues to nurture village cooperatives in Gaya, Dazga, Dadin Kowa, Boni, Zourbattan, and Nadara. LWR Niger conducted a retrospective study of cooperatives after LWR support has ended. The study revealed successes and disappointments. Most of the problems center on the revolving loan funds established for project participants' repayment of inputs such as wells, tools, etc. The problems include lack of reimbursements, poor organization, inappropriate use and lack of access to bank funds. Eight of the 18 cooperatives functioning in Niger at this time do not have plans to use their revolving funds in the future. While LWR has no claim on these funds, it is assessing how it can work with the relevant communities to put these funds back into action. The cooperatives have suggested improvements which they will try to implement, such as managing the funds more strictly, encouraging co-op members to reimburse credits and loans and refusing loans to people who have not consistently paid off their loans in the past. Most of the co-ops feel they would be better off if an extension agent were present to lead the villages through these steps.

Forest Management at Gaya, LWR's largest project in Africa, progresses apace. The forest management plan has provided the framework for another 110,000 trees to be planted and 6,000 more cultivated. The cooperative has gained momentum and monthly meetings are well attended. The first income-generating project, cutting and selling dead wood was not very successful; the idea of selling wood was alien to most project participants, and LWR and

project leaders have undertaken to explain the long-term benefits to the project beneficiaries and to the forest itself of selling wood. Additional planning and consultation between the cooperative and LWR staff will seek to learn from this temporary set-back. An accounting seminar was also held for 17 elected co-op officers so that they will be able to run the activities of the co-op. (See page 7 in Attachment A.)

Dazga and Dadin Kowa gardening projects maintained activities in both their gardens and their village cooperatives. In Dazga a cooperative village purchase of peanut seeds was fully paid back along with 50 percent interest. (See pages 8 and 9 in Attachment A.)

In other villages--Zourbattan, Boni and Nadara--dual aspects of literacy and cooperatives were emphasized. LWR experience has shown that projects frequently face management problems unless cooperative members are literate. Projects aim now to acquaint cooperative members with numbers and record-keeping in these literacy classes as well as a familiarity with reading signs and books. (See pages 10, 11 and 14 in Attachment A.)

Overall, the Niger program demonstrates expertise in two main areas--well construction and grass-roots "animation". These animators, or extension agents, are experienced in teaching agricultural skills and cooperative development.

#### Burkina Faso

Two of three Burkina Faso projects continued under the Matching Grant this year. At Deou, where AMURT's Integrated Development project is underway, eight wells were constructed and 50 kgs. of potato seeds were planted, though the yield was affected by both theft and rotting plants. CNN Nakamtenga expanded their area of land rehabilitation with more rock bunds and micro-catchments; 5,000 millet plants were started in the accompanying holes. (See pages 2 and 3 in Attachment A.)

The health care project, operated out of Sanguie, was not active this year though the previously trained village health care workers continued to apply the skills learned under the auspices of the project. This project suffered from changes in personnel of the Ministry of Health, the project holder. As changes in personnel were made, LWR and project beneficiaries were unable to control the direction of the project; it consequently never got entirely back on track. (See page 1 in Attachment A.)

#### Kenya

With two of the projects in Kenya ending this past funding year, Matching Grant activities concentrated mainly on the Ogwedhi-Sigawa project. Substantial material gains were cited during the

year: ten wells dug and seven fitted with hand pumps, digging of fish ponds, expansion of health facilities, establishment of one primary health school and improvement of crop yields. In addition to the material accomplishments, though, the project increased inter-ethnic cooperation in a strife-ridden area. Components of the project brought together three Kenyan tribes--Luo, Maasai and Kuria--and helped establish a harmonious relationship between these factions, who had previously only warred. (See page 4 in Attachment A.)

In the conclusion of the Jisaidie Industries project in Kenya. final activities demonstrate the positive empowerment of women participants as a result of their income-generating activities. The projects undertaken by the women were varied, initiated by the individuals according to their area of interest. Some women chose to start bakeries, poultry houses, nurseries or handcraft stores. They were taught bookkeeping skills, management techniques and investment schemes. (See page 6 in Attachment A.)

### India

In India the CMAI project, Primary Health Care, supports village-level health programs through its constituent hospitals. These programs are reasonably well established and efforts are being made to reach women and children. Regular meetings with micro-projects staff, training sessions and follow up visits have helped to overcome some organizational and technical problems that CMAI has observed. CMAI has worked to build the confidence, capacity and skills of the project holders for greater success in community development activities. Some hospital managements have not adequately understood, accepted or implemented the project due mainly to their curative and institutional disease-centered bias. CMAI seeks to give more regular small-group contacts with hospital leadership to help explain and share its vision for primary health care. (See page 17 in Attachment A.)

CAST, holder of the Economic Development and Health Care project, reports that most rural women do not go for higher education because of their economic backgrounds. Economic circumstances often force women in this area to take up low-paying jobs such as cigarette-making. This project is trying to wean them away from such work by substituting other small income-generating plans such as garment-making, handicrafts, food preservation and fiber handicrafts, and at the same time helping in the marketing of these items. CAST believes that it has helped not only in changing some social patterns, but has also increased incomes through this project. (See page 16 in Attachment A.)

The IRRM project tells of significant breakthroughs and increasing participation of the target community in planning, decision making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation by working with networks of 10-12 families. Through these family

networks and through a people's parliament strategy, a new awareness has been created on the social issues of untouchability and inequalities. Micro-enterprise development in the areas of horticulture, dairy and sericulture have begun. Thirty-five traditional birth attendants have been trained. With active participation, women's organizations, thrift associations and other non-formal banking assistance have begun. Credit programs have not only succeeded in this area but they have also been replicated in 400 villages by other NGOs in that district! (See page 18 in Attachment A.)

The CCOORR project, Integrated Rural Development, has concentrated on improving the living standard of low-income women in Tamil Nadu. Health activities have served as the contact point with project beneficiaries. Awareness education and continuing education have helped to bring the project closer to the people, especially women. Community banks have helped to set up people in small vending businesses. Family planning, pre- and post-natal care, immunization of children, and the gradual decrease of mortality rate of mothers have made an impact, particularly on women.

CCOORR also targeted other groups as well. Youth have received job counseling. Other activities have involved self-employment schemes, library programs, and employment-generating plans, such as poultry, fishery, tailoring, waste-metal recycling. Besides youth programs, child development centers are functioning after the normal school hours, and help give children an added boost in their readiness to further education. The disabled have participated in goat banks with the assistance of CCOORR. In most CCOORR activities more women are involved than men. At the start of the project only 11 percent of project participants were men. During the course of the project, men have increased their participation to 13 percent. (See page 19 in Attachment A.)

### The Philippines

The two Filipino projects report good progress on meeting goals. The South Cotabato Foundation Inc. (SCFI), in its agro-forestry program, reports not only being on track with its objectives, but that target groups have evidenced increased participation and involvement in community activities. Beneficiaries have increased awareness on environmental issues, have developed a growing concern for their own socioeconomic situation and strengthened a closer relationship among themselves and the community, and have given new expression to their collective work. (See pages 20-21 in Attachment A.)

## **V. Management**

Project Planning: As an integral part of LWR's development program, potential projects to be included in the Matching Grant

are reviewed, along with all other projects, on an "as needed" basis, typically once a month. Field staff, project holders and proponents are constantly developing, reworking and submitting proposals for consideration by New York staff. This project planning activity continued on a normal basis.

Through workshops, individual consultations and the distribution of the LWR-produced evaluation manual, ARO has provided training in evaluation to most partner NGOs in the Andean region, including those funded under the Matching Grant. This assistance on evaluations will continue and probably expand to other related topics throughout subsequent years of the grant period.

LWR's modus operandi in Asia differs somewhat from that of the other regions. Rather than have regional offices, as in Nairobi, Niamey, Quito and Lima, LWR works through intermediary agencies. As discussed in the first annual report, in India, LWR benefits from the offices of ICSA, which not only helps identify potential projects for LWR support, but also monitors and accompanies the project and project holders.

In the Philippines PHILDHRRRA, a consortium of more than 50 development organizations, plays a similar role, but with an added dimension. As a consortium organization, PHILDHRRRA is able to tap the expertise of various member NGOs and thus help transfer knowledge across a broad spectrum of agencies. For instance, one member agency is expert in auditing; another in community organizing. Thus the IPHC, through its membership in PHILDHRRRA, makes it possible for other member agencies to improve their capabilities in primary health care.

Staff resources: The third year of the Matching Grant saw several changes in staff resources in Africa. The country director in Niger completed her contract in August 1991 and her responsibilities have been incorporated into the West Africa Regional Representative's job description. Monitoring of Niger projects will continue at the same level as before, under the auspices of the regional representative.

In the second annual report, LWR reported that Africa regional representatives would take a more active role with project holders as their direct correspondents. During the year, LWR regional representatives have consolidated relationships with the Niger, Burkina Faso and Kenya projects. Communication between the offices is consistent, project site visits are frequent and projects are up to date on their financial and activity reports. The close contact further enhances the partners' ability to try out ideas and look for answers or suggestions. Technical exchanges or workshops can be set up more easily and can have rapid follow-up.

In Latin America, the number of staff positions and tasks

assigned to each remained the same. In February, the Latin America program director assumed the position of regional representative in the Andean Regional Office. His replacement, Ms. Kathryn Wolford, joined the headquarters staff in New York.

Training: The coordinator (male) of LWR's Matching Grant participated in A.I.D.'s workshop on gender considerations. Andean regional staff (two men) participated in several regional conferences, including one on agro-ecology and ecology and livestock management. One staff member (male) at headquarters attended several management courses; another (female) attended computer workshops.

Technical support: In general, LWR attempts to keep field staff apprised of technical options that may be relevant to their regions. As an example, material produced at the A.I.D. workshop on rapid, low-cost data collection techniques has been circulated to appropriate field staff.

In Niger, where LWR is most "operational," headquarters staff provided field staff with background material in developing a low-cost method of drilling hand-augered wells. In a less successful experiment, LWR headquarters staff supplied field staff with the necessary material to test a windmill that would pump water.

Project fund raising and marketing: LWR's policy calls for its supporting national churches to fulfill these roles. LWR produces essentially development education and promotional material, which the two churches incorporate in their fund raising and marketing.

Role of the board of directors: The board of directors of LWR focuses on policy rather than administration, providing oversight, not management. In that context, LWR's board examined at its annual retreat the role of family planning in development, and of the need for reconciliation activities. As a consequence, the board instructed LWR to ascertain that the following characteristics are considered in development projects:

"that family planning activities be considered in the context of an integrated program of community health and development, and in a way that is consistent with the policies of the supporting [LWR] church bodies;"

and that projects:

"provide a reconciling and healing ministry in situations where the aspirations of the poor and oppressed in less developed countries are frustrated by social conflict and war."

Development Education: Two interns in journalism from Visions

in Action, an American volunteer organization, assisted LWR in development education during the third grant year. In both Kenya and then Niger, these interns worked with LWR staff to learn about LWR projects. The result of their work has been vignettes on project activities, in particular the project of the Kenya Mennonite Church.

During the year, LWR produced a 13-minute video entitled "Partners in Hope", available free to its constituents. This video shows how LWR supports its partner agencies around the world in their efforts to develop in a sustainable manner. LWR also produced a booklet, "Little Miracles," to inform church audiences about some issues and solutions facing LWR partners, such as environmental degradation, appropriate technology, accompaniment and community empowerment.

## **VI. Financial Report**

The budget for the first thirty-six months of the cooperative agreement called for total spending, including indirect costs, of \$1,500,000 from both private and AID funds. In the first thirty-six months, LWR has spent \$1,453,423 of private matching funds and \$1,438,756 of AID funds. Therefore, cumulative spending is essentially on target, though modestly under budget.

An overview of the spending for this grant is shown in Attachment B, page 1, "Spending by Program Sectors". It shows how spending has been applied to the various program sectors. The actual spending by sector is shown according to whether the spending was from private matching funds or AID funds, as well as the sum of the two. To emphasize that the budget is based on the sum of the two sources, no entries have been made under the AID and LWR columns in the budget section of the table.

An organizational overview is given in Attachment B, page 2, "Lutheran World Relief--Sources of Funds." This table shows the funds drawn down from this cooperative agreement during the agreement year in the line "AID/W MG 3". Private source support is broken down into cash and in-kind value. The "Other AID Funds" section lists all current agreements for which support was received during the period. This section represents grants that are for emergency responses and need therefore to be categorized separately. The on-going nature of Ocean Freight Reimbursement requires that it be listed separately.

LWR receives the largest part of its private financial support from its constituent church bodies: the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. LWR's policy states that the "initiative for generating cash resources for LWR from Lutheran congregations and their organizations and members rests with the churches. LWR may receive but shall not solicit funds from such sources." As a result of this policy, LWR

shares reports and information with the church bodies, which they disseminate to their congregations. (Because of these policies LWR cannot expect or claim to increase its ability to increase its private sector income as a result of this cooperative agreement.) In addition to these resources, LWR receives unsolicited donations from the public. Church body support has been stable over the past three years. There is no indication that this support will weaken.

## **VII. Lessons Learned and Long-Term Project Implications**

### Estimates of project costs and benefits

Because Matching Grant supports 38 widely-ranging projects in eight countries, a standard estimate of project costs and benefits is difficult to compile. The three projects supported by the Matching Grant in Burkina Faso provide examples of the range of costs and benefits. In Deou, a total of \$85,274 was expended over the project life in three villages. The relatively high cost of this integrated rural development project came from the large number of concrete wells that were sunk. The changed life style in the dry season where gardening is now feasible has had long-term impact. Meanwhile, in a soil and water management project in Nakamtenga, Burkina Faso, \$19,616 was spent over the project life that significantly improved 140 hectares of degraded terrain, belonging to approximately 100 farmers. In a \$123,041 grant (of which \$26,685 applied to Matching Grant) to a primary health care and sanitation project in Sanguié, this comprehensive health care, with its training aspects, provided elementary health care on the community level to 101 villages through village health workers, 39 percent of whom were women.

### Institution building assessment

The Andean Regional Office of LWR has continued to place emphasis on institutional development, especially in terms of evaluation methodology. For example, staff in Ecuador participated with FEPP in an internal evaluation of the Lago Agrio project, providing assistance in the methodological design of the evaluation process. This case is particularly interesting as FEPP uses a different style of evaluation for each of its regional programs. The Lago Agrio evaluation placed the greatest emphasis on internal participation. This experience should assist LWR-ARO and FEPP to identify strengths and weaknesses of the methodology which LWR promotes.

In addition, this year LWR staff in Peru began to work with local consultants to develop a Planning Manual for use by local partner organizations. This initiative emerged from a need identified in LWR's work with evaluation: a key weakness in evaluation was the lack of adequate planning, with clearly identified indicators, baseline data, etc. The initial

methodological design was tested with LABOR in developing a new phase of its program.

In India, the IRRM's Integrated Rural Development Project has successfully promoted organizing of the poor, including Harijans, Tribals and the Backward community people. A regional forum has developed the capacity to build pressure on local political structures and administrations. The forum has developed a working partnership with various other fora at the larger regional level, and has been active in safeguarding the rights of the underprivileged.

In Africa, Gaya Forestry Project, represents the evolution of LWR's institution building strategy in Niger. The responsibility of cooperative members have grown as this project has evolved. With the groundwork laid for forest preservation, the co-op has put into action plans to make the forest productive, with the surrounding village cooperative members as the driving force of this productivity. Agents trained in cooperatives have been holding meetings in villages near Gaya. These institutions--the Gaya Forestry Cooperative as well as others in Dazga and Bahé Bolongou--have evolved with LWR's aid, and are taking on increasing responsibility.

#### Estimate of sustainability

LWR places much emphasis on the ecological sustainability of its work. In the Andean region for example, IRINEA and CIED-Cajamarca work with local farmers' groups to promote soil management through soil terraces, live tree barriers and reforestation. Several of the projects promote composts or animal wastes to reduce dependence on purchased inputs, especially chemical pesticides and fertilizers. In Burkina Faso, rock bund technology, supported through the CNN project, has spread throughout the country as an appropriate way to control erosion.

In terms of economic sustainability of project activities, a key problem is the lack of control by local groups or communities over macroeconomic decisions. For example, the structural adjustment policy initiated in Peru in August 1990 ("Fujishock") resulted in sharp increases in agricultural inputs, a reduction of governmental credit for agricultural production and reduced prices for the goods produced by small farmers. These elements affect not only the immediate economic prospects of the project participants, but also reduce their ability to assume greater financial responsibility for subsequent project activities.

In terms of institutional sustainability, training in accounting, management, organization and technical aspects has resulted in the communities' ability to design and implement their own development activities. For example, in the CIED-Cajamarca project, over time the staff has shifted from a more direct

intervention in decision-making to an advisory role in proportion to the cooperatives' increasing ability and willingness to assume the primary responsibility for its projects. Through training the participants in the LABOR project have developed the capacity to manage a rotating fund and a warehouse for their community kitchens. A key challenge in this regard is fostering the local groups' confidence and negotiating skills in accessing resources for their projects from public and private sources.

### Local participation

Before approving any development project, the LWR project screening committee looks for evidence of local contribution. This contribution may be in the form of labor, leadership, or resources such as land, buildings, or food. LWR has found that this participation by the community increases the sense that the project is an investment by the community, and thereby increases the rate of success. In most cases, a "beneficiary" in an LWR project is also a "participant," in that LWR projects seek to empower beneficiaries.

In Burkina Faso, women, men and children participated in the rock bund technology; women comprised 39 percent of the village health training participants at the Sanguié project. In Niger, certain village co-op gatherings did not show a woman's face, while others such as Zcurbattan, had a mixture of both sexes. In Zourbattan, though, women were the sole participants in mat weaving as an income generator. Literacy classes in six villages near Gaya resulted in two literate women and 40 literate men. In Kenya, 41 savings clubs for women at the Tototo project were initiated and functioned independent of male participation. The clubs had on average a membership of 30 women. In the Nakuru dairy project ninety-five percent of the 82 recipients of dairy cattle were women.

While most LWR projects involve grassroots participants, several work more closely with umbrella organizations to increase institutional development. In these cases, local participation is less clear. Christian Medical Association of India reports that local participation requires the commitment of the hospitals in the microproject areas to secure adequate participation at the grass roots level. In some areas this is good, particularly when the chief executive officer is behind it; when this occurs there is good understanding, involvement and leadership for each community-based microproject. Generally, this has not been adequate. It points to the need for some reorientation of hospital and microproject staff, a matter that will be emphasized in the coming year.

### Leadership development

In step with LWR's focus on empowering local communities and

institutional development, most projects contain an emphasis on leadership development.

In the Indian Rural Reconstruction Movement project, women's leadership has emerged to a significant extent, increasing by more than 15 percent during the grant year. The participation of women is significantly higher than that of men; there are 585 women actively participating in village-based organizations, in contrast to 480 men.

In the IPHC project in the Philippines, participants, especially women, expressed the view that their leadership skills were developed through their involvement in activities. They are now selected as leaders not only in health, but also in other community initiated activities.

Leadership training is an important aspect of all the Andean projects. For example, CASDEC, PRE and IDEAS all emphasize training of community promoters in project/technical areas such as health, animals or agricultural production. There does not seem to be a consensus on whether a "blanket approach", i.e. lots of short courses, or a longer, intensive training is more effective. CIED-Cajamarca has reflected on this, based on its school for promoters and has opted for a more intensive approach. They acknowledge, however, that this has limited the participation of women, who have less possibility to stay away from their household responsibilities for extended periods. They are experimenting with how best to meet women's training needs.

Men continue to be the predominant group in agricultural training, with the exception of vegetable gardens. Women are the predominant group in training on health care and nutrition. In terms of project activities and training, the women's group tends to work best on its own. A few women have taken leadership roles in mixed groups, but the majority tend to defer to men in public setting.

Leadership development was championed in the KMC project in the East Africa region. There, older respected men of the community were gradually encouraged to come to meetings to work through their problems with other tribes. LWR also used non-Matching Grant funds to enable project partners to engage in workshops that brought together 14 project partners in groups in Kenya and Tanzania. These participants gained valuable project management skills such as planning, evaluation of goals, improving job performance, problem solving and decision making. LWR also attended and supported a general assembly of Burkinabe NGOs, of which members from CNN participated; 214 members attended in total of which 21 were women.

#### Innovation and technology transfer

In many cases, the adoption of new practices among the project participants is evidence of technology transfer. In terms of agro-ecological practices such as crop diversification, terracing, etc., "seeing is believing" seems to be the norm. This explains the use of demonstration plots, for example by CASDEC and SEMTA, as a way of enabling the participants to gauge the practical effects of the methods employed. While LWR does not have specific data on this, it has noted instances where non-project participants also adopt the new technologies, as they see their neighbors' crop yield or animals' health improving.

In terms of health care, participants have adopted practices such as growth monitoring, proper use of medicinal plants, oral rehydration salts, adequate disposal of human wastes, maintenance of potable water systems. All the projects working with women's groups have made positive advances in one or more of these areas.

In the Puno region of Peru, CIED has revived ancient technologies of waru-waru and andenes. In the first, raised garden beds are separated by small canals; this technology creates a micro-climate by helping the soil retain moisture, while not subjecting crops to freezing temperatures. Andenes are soil terraces with stone walls to prevent erosion. Both technologies had been lost over the years, but are now being renewed, with the discovery of their appropriateness for the region.

In Niger, "LWR wells" technology was transferred to specially trained teams in the Nadara region of Niger. Cooperative management techniques and skills were transferred from surrounding cereal co-ops in the Boni region to the Boni representatives themselves.

### Policy implications

There is a growing concern among partners in the Andean region for systematizing their experiences in development at the "micro" or community level. In part, this is to improve their own institutional effectiveness. However, this is also an effort to link the problems and solutions at the local level to the "macro" policy level, which may be regional or national. In Peru, one aim is to promote ecologically sustainable agricultural production plans at the level of climatic regions or sub-regions. For example, CIED-Cajamarca together with local organizations, seeks to develop and promote the coherent use and management of three distinct climatic areas, each bordered by water sources. Together the NGO and local groups advocate with the regional government to support this plan. CESS Solidaridad and IDEAS are involved in similar efforts.

### Collaboration/networking

Collaboration and networking is generally a priority of LWR

partners. The Christian Medical Association of India, for example, works with the government with the Voluntary Health Association of India, the Christian Health Association of India and others, and encourages each microproject to do the same on a local basis. CCOORR has played a strong role in a partnership of regional partners in the south that relate to LWR. It has gained the credibility of the central and state social welfare boards, both at Delhi and Madras, to work together with CCOORR in a collaborative way.

Collaboration and networking takes place at two levels in the Andean Region. First, LWR-ARO (like each of LWR's other regional offices) has a small fund available to facilitate interchanges among partner agencies on topics of mutual interest such as soup kitchens or soil management. This has proven to be one of the most dynamic aspects of LWR's work in the region. The opportunity for NGO staff or local project participants to come together to grapple with very practical issues or problems has produced a variety of results: renewed energy levels, solutions to seemingly intractable problems through exposure to another group's work, networking, etc.

The second level is among international private voluntary organizations. LWR-ARO staff is in frequent contact with dozens of North American and European agencies for the exchange of information and publications and co-funding of projects.

#### Replication of potential of project approach and activities

Many of the project activities are replicable, especially those which relate to training and the adoption of new technologies. This is less clear when one refers to irrigations systems or other major infrastructure, where the infusion of outside resources will be essential. One example of replicability is the development of a sub-regional "Integral Health Plan" which emerged from a series of workshops with health promoters, coordinated by IDEAS in Peru. What began as training and health services among a limited population of project participants is now extended to the entire population in that area.

LWR's project holders, as well as LWR, seek to encourage project activities that are replicable. To meet this goal, CMAI believes that the project should be small. It strives to have small hospitals, and other NGOs take up the model of community-based primary health care and in that way become not only replicable, but sustainable by the community.

CCOORR has seen the various activities within its project, (such as fisheries, community banking and the community health worker program) as particular activities that have become models for others to pick up.

#### **VIII. Recommendations**

LWR recommends, both to itself and to other PVOs, continuing its style of accompaniment and partnership with local NGOs, as opposed to direct intervention model. The appropriateness and effectiveness of this style, most fully developed in the Andean region, was reaffirmed by partners in an evaluation of the Andean Regional Office which was completed in November 1990. Partners expressed satisfaction with the responsiveness of LWR in assisting them to carry out their programs. The model has been especially successful in facilitating exchange among local organizations and in promoting their institutional development. Within the context of accompaniment, LWR should continue its focus on strengthening capacity of NGOs in the areas of planning and evaluation.

With an eye toward the linkages between environmental degradation, poverty and hunger, all actors in development--LWR, other PVOs, NGOs and A.I.D.--should continue to focus on agro-ecology as a means to increase food production without compromising the environment.

LWR also recommends continuing a focus on health based on need. In various projects in each of the LWR regions--Africa, Asia and Latin America--health appears to be a key entry point for work with women.

#### **IX. Attachments to annual reports**

- A. Form 1550-11 for each project, followed by country summary sheets
- B. Financial reports
- C. Sample baseline data
- D. Evaluation summary

## GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

ARO: Andean Regional Office of Lutheran World Relief  
CADEP: Andean Center for Education and Promotion (Peru)  
CASA: Churches' Auxiliary for Social Action (India)  
CASDEC: Social Action Center for Community Development (Bolivia)  
CAST: Community Action for Social Transformation (India)  
CCAIJO: Promoters' Association "Jesus Obrero" (Peru)  
CCOORR: Christian Council for Rural Development and Research (India)  
CESS: Center for Social Studies "Solidaridad" (Peru)  
CIED: Center for Investigation and Development (Peru)  
CNN: Comite Nongtaaba de Nakamtenga (Burkina Faso)  
FEPADE: Ecumenical Development Foundation (Bolivia)  
FEPP: Ecuadorian Fund for Human Progress (Ecuador)  
ICSA: Inter-Church Service Association (India)  
IDEAS: Center for Investigation, Documentation, Education, Assistance and Services (Peru)  
IPHC: Institute for Primary Health Care (Philippines)  
IRINEA: Regional Institute for Andean Ecology (Peru)  
KMC: Kenya Mennonite Church (Kenya)  
LABOR: Center for Popular Culture (Peru)  
LWR: Lutheran World Relief  
NGO: Non-Governmental Organization (here, used as a non-American agency)  
PHILDHARRA: the Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas (Philippines)  
PRE: Ecuadorian Rural Pastors' Association  
PVO: Private Voluntary Organization (here, used as an American agency)  
SCFI: South Cotabato Foundation, Inc. (Philippines)

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

<b>PVO Type</b>	<b>Project Number</b>	
<b>Appropriation</b>	<b>Level</b>	
<b>Country Code</b>	<b>Fund Type</b>	<b>Technical Code</b>
<b>Project Office</b>	<b>Key 1</b>	<b>Key 2</b>

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

<b>Name of Organization</b> Lutheran World Relief		<b>Grant/Contract Number</b> OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
<b>Start Date</b> September 1, 1988	<b>End Date</b> August 31, 1993	<b>AID Project Officer's Name</b> Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

<b>FY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>	<b>FY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>

LOP

**Activity Description**

Establish a more effective and integrated primary health-care service; transform the nine departmental centers from purely curative to primary-health training centers; strengthen 140 primary health-care posts at the village level; improve the management of health-care supplies.

**Status**

Project ended in this third year of Matching Grant. Health trainings have been of continuous help to the surrounding villages. The health center operates effectively, with activities including: a 45 day training session and exchange visits to other health facilities; baseline study concerning health issues conducted in 101 villages; 38 persons selected to receive further training; 16 male nurses and eight female nurses acted as social action managers; 11 women trained as midwives, three as birth attendants; 400 people (39 percent women) trained in basic health care; small health projects encouraged; latrines dug and well aprons constructed; one health center renovated and infrastructures of eight health centers examined.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

<b>Country</b> Burkina Faso	<b>Location in Country (Region, District, Village)</b> Sanguie
<b>PVO Representative's Name</b> John Soloninka	<b>Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency</b> Provincial Health Department, Sanguie

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>Grant Year 1</b>	<b>Grant Year 2</b>	<b>Grant Year 3</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>AID \$</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>PVO \$</b>	28,685	0	0	28,685
<b>TOTAL</b>	28,685	0	0	26,685

32

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>		Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>	AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Work with the Indian NGO AMURT in three villages (total population of 3,000) in the Department of Deou (Oudalan Province) to promote food self-sufficiency through developing dry-season gardening and agroforestry. Project goals are to provide a hydraulic infrastructure through the construction of 22 LWR-style wells for gardening; provide training in agroforestry and reforestation; create a departmental nursery; introduce new and improved gardening techniques; organize a departmental development committee.

**Status**

Project terminated in this third grant year. Eight wells constructed; 50 kg of potato seeds planted; produced large quantities of cabbage; purchased cart and donkey; forestry committee formed of nine village representatives; three local representatives follow village activity.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Burkina Faso</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Deou</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>John Soloninka</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Amanda Marga Universal Relief Team (AMURT)</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	66,612	4,500	5,721	76,833
<b>PVO \$</b>	6,941	1,500	0	8,441
<b>TOTAL</b>	73,553	6,000	5,721	85,274

32

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

A Burkinabe village association, Comite Nongtaaba de Nakamtenga, is administering this project in four villages (total population 17,294) of Oubritenga Province in order to increase crop yields through the promotion of soil conservation and water control techniques. Project goals are to provide training in the construction of rock bunds to harvest rain water and to prevent erosion, to construct rock bunds on 140 hectares and to plant 14,000 trees along the bunds.

**Status**

Project terminated in this third grant year. Rock bund and micro-catchment construction continue for altering the flow of water in 140 hectares of denuded areas; 5,000 millet plants grown on the newly rehabilitated land.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country	Burkina Faso	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Nakamtenga
PVO Representative's Name	John Soloninka	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	Comite Nongtaaba de Nakamtenga

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	12,421	0	(7,126)	5,295
PVO \$	7,262	0	7,059	14,321
TOTAL	19,683	0	(67)	19,616

24

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>		Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>	AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Organize local courses for farmers and community cooperative in health components, agriculture, animal husbandry and reforestation; assist four farmers to set up model farms in strategic areas chosen by the community; provide credit to purchase livestock, land and fodder; give training in agriculture and animal husbandry; drill boreholes for central complex; and dig 20 concrete wells with sanitation aprons and animal watering troughs. Total beneficiaries number 7,000.

**Status**

Project terminated in this third grant year. Ten wells were dug and seven were fitted with handpumps; pilot fishponds established; health facilities expanded and a community-based health-care program under way. There has been a noted improvement in crop production with the Maasai tribe. A primary school has been established and children of all tribes participate; atmosphere of peace established.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Kenya</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Suna-Migori</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Sigurd Hanson</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Kenya Mennonite Church (KMC)</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	12,375	28,126	2,689	43,189
<b>PVO \$</b>	1,892	6,902	6,128	14,922
<b>TOTAL</b>	14,267	35,027	8,817	58,111

25

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Promote self-sufficiency among 321 rural poor families in the Nakuru area through a loan program for agricultural supplies and dairy animals; provide training to increase farm production.

**Status**

Project terminated in second year of Matching Grant. Project status at end of second year: Within the small-scale farmer support program, 82 farmers purchased heifers and 200 received agricultural training in gardening techniques. They successfully produced corn, beans and tomatoes, resulting in increased income for themselves.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country	Kenya	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Nakuru
PVO Representative's Name	Sigurd Hanson	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	Farming Systems Kenya, Ltd.

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	19,315	0	6,000	25,315
PVO \$	9,657	6,000	(6,000)	9,657
TOTAL	28,972	6,000	0	34,972

36

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

<b>PVO Type</b>	<b>Project Number</b>	
<b>Appropriation</b>	<b>Level</b>	
<b>Country Code</b>	<b>Fund Type</b>	<b>Technical Code</b>
<b>Project Office</b>	<b>Key 1</b>	<b>Key 2</b>

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

<b>Name of Organization</b> Lutheran World Relief		<b>Grant/Contract Number</b> OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
<b>Start Date</b> September 1, 1988	<b>End Date</b> August 31, 1993	<b>AID Project Officer's Name</b> Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

<b>FY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>	<b>FY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>

LOP

**Activity Description**

Assist 900 low-income rural women in the coastal area to participate in cooperative groups and activities; participants plan and implement their own income-generating and maternal- and child-health programs.

**Status**

Project ended in October 1990. Project status at end of second year: Since the program began, 101 groups have been involved with business and leadership training. In the past year, 15 new groups of women established savings clubs. Most groups have been running income-generating savings clubs and have received credit. All participants received training in leadership, project planning, group organization and business management skills. Savings clubs activities for the past year included poultry keeping, goats, renting houses, shop and posho mills, water project and bakeries. The staff of the project received training in accounting, management and group skills.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

<b>Country</b> Kenya	<b>Location in Country (Region, District, Village)</b> Mombasa area
<b>PVO Representative's Name</b> Sigurd Hanson	<b>Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency</b> Jisaidie Cottage Industries (Tototo)

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>Grant Year 1</b>	<b>Grant Year 2</b>	<b>Grant Year 3</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>AID \$</b>	43,398	36,635	(14,034)	65,999
<b>PVO \$</b>	0	7,384	14,394	21,778
<b>TOTAL</b>	43,398	44,019	360	87,777

31

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description** Restore an 8,000-hectare government forest reserve's productivity by planting indigenous species of trees and grasses where needed, protecting restored areas from use for two years; develop management plan to ensure that all its benefits and products can be used indefinitely while maintaining forest's overall productivity; form forest cooperative from interested inhabitants of surrounding villages. Government of Niger will give cooperative right to manage forest in perpetuity according to management plan through controlled sale of permits for wood-cutting, pasturage, hay-cutting, and agroforestry.

**Status** 110,000 tree seedlings produced; 85,000 trees planted in the Gorou-Bassounga forest; remainder for other reforestation work in the area. 6,000 pots of perennial grass produced for experimentation purposes. Literacy classes held again this year in six villages; Fulani language center opened, a first in the area. 128 people attended the different centers. 40 men and two women reached a level of literacy. Cooperative established regular monthly meetings to discuss and plan activities. Harvest of dead wood in the forest began with cutting 1,047 cubic meters this year. Cutting permits sold by co-op, which then purchased the wood for sale to people in the area. All of the wood sold, giving the co-op a profit of \$900. 17 elected co-op officers attended 15-day course in accounting in preparation for the purchase and sale of wood.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country	Niger	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Gaya
PVO Representative's Name	John Soloninka	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	Government of Niger

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	63,434	79,680	36,064	179,178
PVO \$	30,400	36,071	82,540	149,012
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>93,834</b>	<b>115,751</b>	<b>118,604</b>	<b>328,190</b>

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

<b>PVO Type</b>	<b>Project Number</b>	
<b>Appropriation</b>	<b>Level</b>	
<b>Country Code</b>	<b>Fund Type</b>	<b>Technical Code</b>
<b>Project Office</b>	<b>Key 1</b>	<b>Key 2</b>

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

<b>Name of Organization</b> Lutheran World Relief	<b>Grant/Contract Number</b> OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00	
<b>Start Date</b> September 1, 1988	<b>End Date</b> August 31, 1993	<b>AID Project Officer's Name</b> Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

<b>FY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>	<b>FY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>

LOP

**Activity Description**

Continue cooperative activities begun in an earlier phase while encouraging villagers to take charge of their own development in the Dazga region; provide a means for villagers to transport their produce to market; provide cooperative training and encourage use of the revolving fund established in the first phase of the project. Beneficiaries number 1,600.

**Status**

An extension agent trained in agriculture and cooperatives provided support to the cooperative; co-op members made significant reimbursements to their rolling fund, used in 1990 to purchase peanut seeds for distribution on credit to interested members; seeds were 100 percent reimbursed in kind, along with 50 percent in interest. 65 men trained in literacy classes.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

<b>Country</b> Niger	<b>Location in Country (Region, District, Village)</b> Matameye arrondissement
<b>PVO Representative's Name</b> John Soloninka	<b>Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency</b> Government of Niger

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>Grant Year 1</b>	<b>Grant Year 2</b>	<b>Grant Year 3</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>AID \$</b>	5,392	15,823	(8,939)	12,276
<b>PVO \$</b>	16,176	2,071	11,020	29,267
<b>TOTAL</b>	21,567	17,894	2,081	41,543

151

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	CTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Continue cooperative activities begun in an earlier phase while encouraging villagers to take charge of their own development in the Dadinkowa region; provide a means for villagers to transport their produce to market; provide cooperative training and encourage use of the revolving fund established in the first phase of the project. Beneficiaries number 100 farmers.

**Status**

Project terminated in second year of Matching Grant. Status report at end of second year: Twenty-eight wells were completed for a total of 144. The gardening cooperative maintained a healthy balance due to timely payment of advanced credit. Fertilizer was purchased with this fund for resale to cooperative members. Gardeners visited Agadez to see true effects of desertification and gardening efforts that are possible. Six oxcarts were purchased to transport garden produce and gravel.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country	Niger	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Matameye arrondissement
PVO Representative's Name	John Soloninka	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	Government of Niger

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	24,536	22,328	(1,069)	45,796
TOTAL	24,536	22,328	(1,069)	45,796

4/0

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>	Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>
AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>	

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Provide a reliable supply of water for irrigation in Boni; improve and diversify garden production; protect the perimeter from blowing sand and animal damage; train the population to assume responsibility for all development activities on site; improve the health of the people in the area; increase and improve animal production. Beneficiaries number 74 farm families.

**Status**

The project ended in this third year of Matching Grant. Cooperative members visited three other co-ops to learn about how to organize and successfully operate a cooperative store and cereal bank; Boni cooperative opened store to sell such popular items as millet, manioc flour, sugar, dates, salt, oil, tea, batteries and soap. The Ingoul cooperative opened a cereal bank.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Niger</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Tillaberry arrondissement</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>John Soloninka</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Government of Niger</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	11,379	8,083	2,732	22,194
<b>PVO \$</b>	0	4,460	2,519	6,979
<b>TOTAL</b>	11,379	12,542	5,251	29,173

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)

Name of Organization Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date September 1, 1988	End Date August 31, 1993
AID Project Officer's Name Loreta Williams	

AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

Activity Description

In the Zourbattan Valley, improve the availability of raw materials for handicrafts and basic necessities for the village; intensify animal husbandry to increase the population's revenue; improve and diversify agricultural production; improve garden protection against animal and wind damage; enhance health of the Zourbattan Valley inhabitants; encourage the population to take responsibility for its development. Beneficiaries number 150 farmers.

Status

Project ended in this third year of Matching Grant. A library of reading material in the Hausa language and a village press were provided and villagers trained in their use. These activities offer men and women who had learned to read earlier in the project the opportunity to use their newly acquired skills. Cooperative operated a cereal bank and store, making possible the local purchase of needed items; additional training provided in record keeping, but this co-op has been slow to master the necessary skills. Women continued the cooperative purchase of raw materials for their artisan work; materials were then sold locally to women who weave colorful mats. Two extension agents in Zourbattan assisted both men and women with their cooperative activities.

COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)

Country Niger	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) N'konni arrondissement
PVO Representative's Name John Soloninka	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency Government of Niger

COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	5,734	5,954	(1,163)	10,525
PVO \$	17,174	3,677	4,550	25,402
TOTAL	22,908	9,631	3,387	35,927

4/2

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>		Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>	AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

In the region of Yakaouda, provide permanent wells for gardeners; protect the environment through the use of wind breaks; promote adult literacy; promote cooperative activity through the creation of a rolling fund; provide training in methods of preserving garden produce. Beneficiaries number 105 farmers.

**Status**

Project ended in second year of Matching Grant. Status at end of second grant year: The cooperative made a small profit selling cowpeas. Women were trained in food preservation, including demonstration of solar drying and processing of cassava root into manioc flour. Twenty wells were constructed. An animal fattening project was initiated.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Niger</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Magaria arrondissement</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>John Soloninka</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Government of Niger</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	17,156	6,909	522	24,587
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17,156</b>	<b>6,909</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>24,587</b>

43

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization, <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>	Grant/Contract Number, <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date, <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date, <b>August 31, 1993</b>
AID Project Officer's Name, <b>Loreta Williams</b>	

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Increase the availability of water at Bahe; reinforce gardening skills; provide better protection of the sites against wind and animal damage; revitalize the cooperatives; increase the literacy level of the cooperative members and prepare them to keep their own cooperative records. Beneficiaries number 238 gardeners.

**Status**

Project ended in second year of Matching Grant. Status at end of second grant year: Trained cooperative leaders in record keeping. Held literacy classes in Djerma for cooperative members. Placed additional books in village libraries. Held training in tree production at two village nurseries. Instituted a refresher course for village health workers. Used a rolling fund for cereal bank and animal fattening projects. Items sold were manioc cuttings, cowpea seeds, salt, sugar, millet and sorghum.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Niger</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Tillabery arrondissement</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>John Soloninka</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Government of Niger</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>PVO \$</b>	18,136	7,998	39	26,173
<b>TOTAL</b>	18,136	7,998	39	26,173

44

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>		Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>	AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Guarantee the availability of water to irrigate 60 hectares of gardens in Nadara; introduce improved gardening techniques and a wider variety of fruits and vegetables to the area; increase and improve the level of local animal production; furnish a financial means by which the gardeners' cooperative can undertake activities to improve the commercialization of their produce. Beneficiaries number 58 gardeners.

**Status**

Project ended in this third year of Matching Grant. Thirteen concrete gardening wells constructed this year, making a total of 57 wells completed since the beginning of the project; project participants satisfied with the wells and the possibility they offer to increase garden production. Village library and press provided to give people who had learned to read and write during the project the opportunity to practice their skills; local villagers trained in their use.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Niger</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Illela arrondissement</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>John Soloninka</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Government of Niger</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	29,064	9,570	9,667	48,301
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29,064</b>	<b>9,570</b>	<b>9,667</b>	<b>48,301</b>

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

A small village group of non-migratory Fulbe people (originally herders) will use new agriculture and livestock technologies and a new form of organization to exploit the agropastoral potential of their environment. Milk and meat production will be increased by harvesting grasses while they are still green--and thus more nutritional--and by using animal traction to cultivate forage crops to feed the animals. A credit system will be established to facilitate the individual use of cattle feed supplements produced in Senegal. These improvements will serve to increase village foodstocks and revenues by creating commercial activities.

**Status**

The project ended in second year of Matching Grant. Status at end of second grant year: Thirteen bulls were purchased and distributed. Three plows and one horse were purchased to facilitate planting of participants' fields. A commission of two people was sent to purchase seed necessary for cattle feed.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country	Senegal	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Ndianda Peulh
PVO Representative's Name	N/A	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	Groupement des Eleveurs de Ndianda Peulh

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	17,639	0	0	17,639
TOTAL	17,639	0	0	17,639

- 4/6

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

To help 600 families in 34 villages increase income and improve health.

**Status**

Current phase of project involves introducing or strengthening income-generating schemes and modifying the program of primary health care. Women have begun constructing latrines, a job traditionally held by men. Ten women are trained as masons. Although men initially resisted the "intrusion" of women into this field, they are now amazed at how well six of those women are doing. Primary health-care work was modified toward selecting traditional health workers to work in the communities, as they already have solid acceptance by the villagers. Other aspects of program train women in handicrafts, food preservation, tailoring, dairy farming, sheep and goat tending and organize or develop day-care centers. All these income-generating projects are being developed with an emphasis on improving the health of 600 families via a primary health-care system that encourages families to grow vegetables and fruits

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country	India	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Tamil Nadu
PVO Representative's Name	N/A	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	CAST

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	4,621	26,185	17,153	47,959
TOTAL	4,621	26,185	17,153	47,959

47

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

To improve the health status of 150,000 villagers, with special emphasis on the survival and health of children through augmentation of the healing ministry of Christian hospitals.

**Status**

Community-based primary health-care program assistance helped 15 member institutes to design and implement community-based primary health-care plans to serve approximately 10,000 persons each; emphasis is on decreasing the infant mortality rate, childhood morbidity and the birth rate. Focus is on strategy of child survival, using a package of low-cost, effective and appropriate interventions called FIONA (F=Family planning; I=Immunization for mother and child; O=Oral rehydration and therapy; N=Nutrition for mother and child; and A=Vitamin A supplement). Project's impact on local institutions has been significant because it provides technical, managerial and training assistance to participating hospitals and, along with funds, encourages them to develop community health-care projects. LWR's support is part of a larger program in which approximately 125 women have attended training sessions in community health care to help reach 200,000 in various parts of rural India. CMAI also works to coordinate with national, state and local governments.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country	India	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	north and Central India
PVO Representative's Name	N/A	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	Christian Medical Association of India

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	60,174	87,741	49,240	197,155
TOTAL	60,174	87,741	49,240	197,155

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

To assist exploited families to organize at grass-roots level through an integrated program which promotes awareness, improved resource utilization, employment generation and health and nutrition.

**Status**

Twenty-eight village-based organizations have developed a people's forum to achieve solidarity and increase their pressure-building capacity. 585 women and 480 men participate in village based organizations. The forum, through constant interaction with government officials, helped the local community solve burial ground problems for untouchable communities in four villages. It succeeded in obtaining house sites for 85 members, Twenty-six acres of land that had been occupied by powerful landowners has been released and distributed to Harijans. Through solidarity efforts of the people and through the project's program of legal education and trade-union work, daily wages in the project area have risen from Rs. 7 to Rs. 12, as opposed to Rs. 9 in surrounding, non-project area.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country	India	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Pulicherla Mandal
PVO Representative's Name	N/A	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	Indian Rural Reconstruction Movement (IRRM)

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	6,942	31,210	9,489	47,641
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,942</b>	<b>31,210</b>	<b>9,489</b>	<b>47,641</b>

- 49 -

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>	Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>
AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>	

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

To develop awareness and organizational skills and to help poor families in skilled training, employment, health care, farming and social forestry. Special focus will be on youth, women and marginal farmers.

**Status**

During the past year, LWR support has helped continue awareness education, strengthen a new primary health-care network, support youth activities, focus attention on needs of women and children and do some modest work in agriculture. A total of 5,545 people attended village organizational meetings; 216 attend continuing education classes. Sixteen leadership training programs were arranged with 97 leaders attending. Village health workers served 21,600 persons and conducted 243 out of 286 deliveries in the area, with only six incidents of newborn mortality. 123 jobs were found for youth; 12 fisheries are in operation and the youth helped build 2854 toilets. 86 women have found tailoring opportunities, while 20 have begun dairy farming projects. During this period eight day care centers, begun by the project, have been handed over to the government. Alternative agriculture has been started on nearly seven acres, with soya bean and hybrid drum stick (a plant) cultivation.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>India</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Tiruninravur</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>N/A</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>CCOORR</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>PVO \$</b>	13,466	31,147	12,419	57,033
<b>TOTAL</b>	13,466	31,147	12,419	57,033

50

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization, <u>Lutheran World Relief</u>		Grant/Contract Number, <u>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</u>
Start Date, <u>September 1, 1988</u>	End Date, <u>August 31, 1993</u>	AID Project Officer's Name, <u>Loreta Williams</u>

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Work for land security by acquiring "land stewardship agreements" that will give 110 families 25-year renewable land leases for a total of 170 hectares; improve agricultural productivity by involving 110 families in adopting erosion control barriers and engaging in diversified farming and training 40 farmers as technicians to assist others; enhance marketing potential by improving and maintaining trails and establishing a buying station to sell crops and products at better prices; organize four village councils to plan and supervise the above program service.

**Status**

38 Certificates of Stewardship Contract awarded during this period, bringing the total to 124; two cooperatives are functioning; a total of 118 hectares has been rehabilitated with sloping agricultural land technology as an effort to improve agricultural productivity and to provide soil erosion control barriers. During this past year 40,000 assorted seedlings were cultivated. Three on-site seminars in agricultural cooperative development were held with 89 participants attending. A functioning marketing cooperative sells cash crops for a small profit. Five village councils are functioning.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <u>Philippines</u>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <u>South Cotobato</u>
PVO Representative's Name <u>N/A</u>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <u>South Cotobato Foundation Inc. (SCFI)</u>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	4,709	4,449	9,158
PVO \$	0	439	2,614	3,053
<b>TOTAL</b>	0	5,148	7,063	12,211

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)

Name of Organization Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date September 1, 1988	End Date August 31, 1993
AID Project Officer's Name Loreta Williams	

AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

Activity Description

Increase institutional development by training 50 health workers in the staffs of 10 NGOs in the concepts of primary health care and in the supervision of such a program and by training 250 primary health care volunteers who work in the respective communities of the 10 NGOs. These workers will help about 7,500 families with their basic health needs.

Status

Ten NGOs have improved their capability in primary health care through training by IPHC. A total of 53 trainers have been trained--three more than projected. So far, 233 community health care workers at grass-roots level have received training. Through this training program, family health education has increased; mothers have been motivated to have their children immunized, dewormed and weighed; basic curative and preventive care has been offered; herbal medicines have been promoted; mothers have organized themselves for income-generating activities such as community gardening, herbal soap making and herbal medicine preparation; rural midwives have been assisted; and malnourished children have been rehabilitated. In one participating NGO site, 78 percent of children 0-6 years old were malnourished at start of project; that rate now down to 50 percent.

COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)

Country Philippines	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) Davao
PVO Representative's Name N/A/	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency Institute for Primary Health Care (IPHC)

COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	35,472	48,530	84,002
PVO \$	0	11,703	16,300	28,003
TOTAL	0	47,175	64,830	112,005

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)

Name of Organization <u>Lutheran World Relief</u>		Grant/Contract Number <u>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</u>
Start Date <u>September 1, 1988</u>	End Date <u>August 31, 1993</u>	AID Project Officer's Name <u>Loreta Williams</u>

AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

Activity Description

Emphasize technical and organizational training to community organizations in preparation for transfer of the majority of program responsibility. 700 families in 10 communities will benefit from agricultural package including irrigation systems, revolving seed fund, promoters' training, livestock improvement, reforestation, establishment of small food-processing businesses; improve health conditions using a health post, education and promoters; support women by establishing women's centers, providing training and productive projects; strengthen local organizations through training and support of local leaders and promoters.

Status

Agri-livestock: Three-year drought subsided, but crop and agricultural production not yet recovered. Trained 25 agri-livestock promoters; improved goats and sheep through breeding with improved stock, four pasture areas and deworming in three communities; Forestry: New tree nurseries with three women's groups; planted 7,000 trees on 38,000 sq. m. of eroded land; total of 13 trained promoters; Health: Health campaign for vaccination and fluoride treatment for 300 children; 185 women in seven communities educated on hygiene, nutrition, first aid. Social Organization: Strengthened organizations in 10 communities through training of 40 leaders and 56 promoters.

COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)

Country <u>Bolivia</u>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <u>Varies</u>
PVO Representative's Name <u>Tom Edwards</u>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <u>Social Action Center for Community Development (CASDEC)</u>

COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	30,916	31,715	22,202	84,833
PVO \$	10,304	4,905	13,068	28,277
TOTAL	41,220	36,620	35,270	113,110

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>		Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>	AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Improve food security in 30 rural communities by increasing agricultural and animal production through research and promotion of alternative agricultural technologies; training farmers; collaborate with farmers' unions; promote women's role in agriculture and organizations; publish educational materials.

**Status** Matching Grant funding terminated, but project activities continue with other funding. Status at end of second year of Matching Grant: Completed province-level development plan to be implemented with community organizations and public and private institutions. Held 110 training sessions in livestock raising, gardening, unionism and constructing alternative technologies; conducted experiments on new crops and techniques in two stations and 23 demonstration plots; constructions included windmills, hothouses, solar collectors, handpumps and wells increasingly accepted by farmers. Published manuals on horticulture and medicinal plants and three books; held workshops on subjects including small income-generating projects for campesino women, accounting systems; established unit to consolidate different methodologies of SEMTA and more thoroughly integrate research and applied activities. Transferring management of revolving fund to communities delayed by poor return rate due to national economic crisis.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Bolivia</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Pacajes</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Tom Edwards</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>SEMTA</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	15,000	0	0	15,000
<b>PVO \$</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	15,000	0	0	15,000

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)

Name of Organization, <u>Lutheran World Relief</u>	Grant/Contract Number, <u>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</u>
Start Date, <u>September 1, 1988</u>	End Date, <u>August 31, 1993</u>
AID Project Officer's Name, <u>Loreta Williams</u>	

AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

Activity Description

Assist FEPADE in its work with 255 families in eight rural communities to increase agricultural production, improve health conditions and strengthen local organizations; introduce new crop varieties and implement a rotating fund to facilitate access to fertilizers; improve health conditions through vaccination campaigns, training community-appointed health promoters and midwives, implementing maternal and child health control and equipping four health posts.

Status Matching Grant funding terminated, but project activities continue with other funding. Status at end of second year of Matching Grant:  
Agriculture: Introduced strawberries, apples and cherries as cash crops to 50 farmers; continued constructing small catchbasins to supply water during dry season, now operated by beneficiaries; increased number of trained promoters; provided agricultural supplies on credit through locally managed stores. Livestock: Introduced 108 pure-bred sheep and improved forage; held campaigns to vaccinate against parasites. Health: Trained health promoters; carried out activities including courses for 100 families in four communities on sanitation; monthly attendance at health posts has increased. Social organization: Sub-central now assuming more responsibility for local infrastructure projects; women's centers initiated projects including sewing, weaving and household gardens; promoted cultural events to stimulate production activities.

COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)

Country <u>Bolivia</u>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <u>Cochabamba</u>
PVO Representative's Name <u>Tom Edwards</u>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <u>FEPADE</u>

COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	21,500	21,000	0	42,500
<b>TOTAL</b>	21,500	21,000	0	42,500

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)

Name of Organization, Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number, OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date, September 1, 1988	End Date, August 31, 1993
AID Project Officer's Name, Loreta Williams	

AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

Activity Description

Assist families in 36 rural communities to diversify and increase food production, improve family health and strengthen organization through training and technical support with the active participation of local churches; train local promoters to conduct courses and provide technical assistance in agri-livestock production; develop health plans for each community based on participant surveys; health plans will include training of local health promoters and traditional midwives; conduct leadership training and exchanges to assist local organizations.

Status Matching Grant funding terminated in grant year 2. Status at end of second grant year: Social Organization: Local organization, through leadership training and technical assistance, obtained government assistance for infrastructure agriculture projects; reinforce traditional organizations. Agriculture: Through a revolving credit fund, initiated family- and community-level farming projects including family gardens and commercially viable crops, reinforced by training and assistance from promoters; signed agreement with Ministry of Agriculture and CARE to train small-scale farmers in environmentally appropriate agriculture. Health: Shifted program from midwives to health promoters, who received series of courses in basic preventive health; in cooperation with Ministry of Health, initiated projects in sanitation, potable water and nutrition.

COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)

Country Ecuador	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) Highlands
PVO Representative's Name Tom Edwards	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency Ecuadorian Rural Pastors Assn. (PRE)

COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	20,000	10,250	10,250	40,500
TOTAL	20,000	10,250	10,250	40,500

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>		Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>	AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Develop employment opportunities for 2,000 youths in 80 groups from marginal areas in and around Guayaquil; establish small businesses through training in skills, including graphic and plaster arts and crafts and in aspects of small-scale business administration; establish a revolving fund to purchase materials and capitalize youth centers; sponsor exhibitions for products; educate youth on values, ethics and social organization.

**Status**

Carried out study of socioeconomic situation of areas where small businesses were installed. Reduced support from 12 to six workshops due to unsatisfactory, non-sustainable results according to production, marketing and organizational criteria. Focused efforts on improving quality and follow-up in marketing plan as well as increased training in bookkeeping and management skills. Added four new groups to reach a total of 50 young persons who produce clothing, shoes, graphic arts, pigs, etc., as well as working as locksmiths.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Ecuador</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Guayaquil</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Tom Edwards</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>SENDA Juvenil</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	25,000	15,625	4,192	44,817
<b>PVO \$</b>	0	9,375	5,564	14,939
<b>TOTAL</b>	25,000	25,000	9,756	59,756

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number		
Appropriation	Level		
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code	
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2	

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>		Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>	AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Assist local groups representing more than 2,000 Indian and settler families to increase food production through technical assistance and training in the use of local resources, mixed cropping, small-animal husbandry and fish farming; promote environmentally sound agricultural practices; improve marketing of crops through training and establishment of communal stores; promote local organization through training leaders and strengthen links with secondary organizations; promote the formation of women's organizations and cultural survival, civil and land rights.

**Status**

Program continues to emphasize training, technical assistance and credit to promote agricultural diversification and marketing of crops. 570 different activities were carried out with more than 110 community groups and nine second level organizations on themes such as conservation of natural resources, leadership development, legal recognition of peasant organizations and defense of land-related claims. Women's participation encouraged through training of health and nutrition promoters and assistance in sanitation, disease prevention and production projects. A small rice mill and coffee toaster were installed and materials provided for small infrastructure works such as roads, bridges and wells. Three-year evaluation undertaken at the end of 1990.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Ecuador</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Lago Agrio</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Tom Edwards</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Ecuadorian Fund for Human Progress (FEPP)</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	43,500	53,249	41,813	138,562
<b>PVO \$</b>	14,500	17,751	13,937	46,188
<b>TOTAL</b>	58,000	71,000	55,750	184,750

56

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>		Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>	AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Assist APDES in its work among 13,000 slum dwellers. Activities include training of health promoters; a health program concentrating on vaccination, nutrition, sex education and sanitation; training of women in handicraft, clothes and toy manufacture; establishment of communal workshops; and leadership training for women designed to increase community participation and to strengthen women's groups.

**Status** Project terminated during second grant year of Matching Grant. Status at end of second grant year: three neighborhood women's schools have become viable organizations. Activities carried out at schools: Health and Nutrition: Established 2 health committees; trained 36 more health promoters; promoters completed first survey of health conditions in Comas; held 10 health campaigns: children's nutritional status (2 with 450 children), children's rights (3 with 320 parents), first aid (2 with 182 persons), sex education (3 with 192 women); held 10 courses in preparation of traditional Andean foods for 170 women. Small-Business Enterprises: Assisted 58 women to establish food processing businesses--poor results due to limited financing; continued successful seamstress training for 120 women and trained classes in administration; 160 women participated in new program for training and equipping women in haircutting. Community Organization: Held workshops to identify, address local problems; workshop for 54 leaders on transfer of project responsibility.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Peru</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Comas District, Lima</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Tom Edwards</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>APDES</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	13,408	0	0	13,408
<b>PVO \$</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	13,408	0	0	13,408

59

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>	Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>
AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>	

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

In this third phase, assist 400 farm families to increase agriculture production by strengthening the capacity of four local and regional peasant organizations by: providing technical assistance in production and management to officers and membership leaders; establishing rotating funds for production of subsistence and cash crops; planting experimental plots to test and produce new seed varieties and techniques; increasing irrigated land; with local universities, creating development plans for the four organizations and agricultural zones; supporting women's integration and development through income-generating activities and organizational training.

**Status**

Agricultural production was less than expected due to lack of water and access to credit. Gains made in crop diversification, especially from rice to sorghum. Technical assistance provided to reduce use of insecticides and promote reforestation. 187 fruit trees produced and tree nurseries for other varieties installed with a production goal of 1,000 seedlings. Revolving fund of one cooperative increased its capital by 93 percent monthly during the second half of 1990 but faced liquidity problem in first half of 1991. An organizing committee was formed for a departmental federation of cooperatives. Two new mothers' clubs focusing on family health and nutrition and three new peasant groups were established.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Peru</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Chancay Valley</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Tom Edwards</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Center for Social Studies "Solidaridad" (CESS), Chiclayo</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	30,706	38,805	48,554	118,065
<b>PVO \$</b>	10,234	22,935	6,186	39,355
<b>TOTAL</b>	40,940	61,740	54,740	157,420

60

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type		Project Number	
Appropriation		Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code	
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2	

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>		Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>	
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>	AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>	

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Enable 500 women in nine communities in two zones to increase their income by providing training and technical assistance in agriculture, establishing small-animal production units and promoting craft production; improve health by giving nutrition courses and establishing communal feeding centers, providing maternal/child medical assistance, promoting environmental sanitation through discussions and construction of latrines and implementing vaccination campaigns; strengthen women's organizations through courses on leadership and organization, conducting courses on basic literacy and math and promoting exchanges among local and regional groups.

**Status** Matching Grant funding terminated in second year of grant, but project activities continue using other funding. Status at end of second grant year: Because of severe economic crisis and violence in the area, emphasis was placed on short-term and social assistance activities, mainly communal feeding centers. More than 2,000 children were fed during the period, much of food supplied from communal gardens. Women have taken a lead role in organizing and implementing these centers and increased their participation in community activities. Some of 11 weaving groups that received technical training in processing and weaving wool are capable of self-management. They also receive training in livestock production, vegetable gardens, nutrition and social organization.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Peru</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Ocongate and Andahuaylillas</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Tom Edwards</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Promoter's Association "Jesus Obrero" (CCAIJO)</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>PVO \$</b>	11,100	39,200	10,500	60,800
<b>TOTAL</b>	11,100	39,200	10,500	60,800

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)

Name of Organization <u>Lutheran World Relief</u>		Grant/Contract Number <u>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</u>
Start Date <u>September 1, 1988</u>	End Date <u>August 31, 1993</u>	AID Project Officer's Name <u>Loreta Williams</u>

AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

Activity Description

Through two regional subprojects, assist 30 peasant's and 32 women's committees to increase agricultural production and improve animal husbandry through training, extension and ecologically appropriate methods; improve health through health posts and promoters; improve organizational development through the training of promoters and community leaders, developing small industries and workshops and producing microregional development plans in two areas.

Status These two regional subprojects completed after receiving bridging grants in '89 and '90; project activities incorporated into CIED's regional programs. Status at end of second grant year: Cajamarca: Recuperation and improvement of agricultural lands through conversion, reforestation, organic farming methods, irrigation; promoters for agri-livestock and forestation supervising project implementation; consolidation of the central committee which assumed increasing responsibility for local projects; increasing awareness by farmers of concepts and practices of ecologically sound agriculture. Puno: Increase in agri-livestock production through revolving fund and continuous technical assistance; improvement in genetic quality of livestock and training of promoters; strengthening of communal organizations; revitalization of traditional farming techniques. Weakness in both regions was lack of research.

COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)

Country <u>Peru</u>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <u>Puno and Cajamarca</u>
PVO Representative's Name <u>Tom Edwards</u>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <u>Center for Investigation, Education and Development (CIED)</u>

COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	40,000	0	0	40,000
TOTAL	40,000	0	0	40,000

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-C0
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

Activity Description

Assist families in 40 communities in two neighboring valleys to increase agricultural production and improve quality of life through the use of a package of ecologically sound techniques, training and strengthening local organizations; improve soil quality and productivity through conservation, use of organic methods, reforestation and irrigation; strengthen capacity for self-management by training local promoters and leaders of key organizations; promote women's participation in health and income-generating projects; assist central committee to make development plan for the valley and conduct research on needs and alternative solutions.

Status

The construction of small warehouses for potato seeds minimized farmers' losses when drought and a severe cold wave struck the area. Achievements on agro-ecology included the construction of 60 new hectares of soil terraces and 70 hectares reforested. Seven new tree nurseries bring total to 22 village-based nurseries with native varieties. Four potable water systems built to benefit 600 families. Women's clubs developing more businesslike approach to artisan work, improving quality and building capital. Increased health education and promoted latrine construction in response to cholera outbreak. Central Committee of Porcon Valley improved administration of grain mill through additional training.

COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)

Country	Peru	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Cajamarca
PVO Representative's Name	Tom Edwards	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	Investigation, Education and Development (CIED)

COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	22,500	37,450	29,806	89,756
PVO \$	7,500	7,500	14,919	29,919
TOTAL	30,000	44,950	44,725	119,675

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>	Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>
AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>	

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Support three key aspects of work with women in five slum communities: strengthening local organization, educating women on legal status and rights and providing education in family planning. Train and orient representatives and leaders of local organizations on management and bookkeeping, women's rights, general health and nutrition; promote coordination among women's groups and secondary organizations. Provide legal representation to women's groups; promote women's legal rights; train community legal promoters.

**Status**

Project completed during this period, but project activities continue with other funding. Organization: FEPRODEMI, coalition of eight women's groups, received legal recognition; Provincial Coordinator of Glass of Milk (CPVS), with 55 committees, is in same process. Both are democratic forums for training and providing services; they manage rotating fund and warehouse for community kitchens. Legal Assistance: Majority of cases on food supplements when abandoned by husbands who physically abused them. Weekly radio program on women's rights and legal recourse. Family Planning/Health: Over life of project, one clinic attended 1,950 cases, 63 percent for family planning; second clinic 1,847 cases, 75 percent for family planning; both provide education and follow-up.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Peru</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Ilo, Moquegua Province</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Tom Edwards</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Center for Popular Culture (LABOR), Lima</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	23,000	0	0	23,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23,000</b>

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OIR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

**LOP**

**Activity Description**

Enable 1,500 families in 12 communities to improve levels of agri-livestock production and plan and manage local resources by developing an ecologically sound package of techniques, conducting research, training promoters and strengthening local committees; improve nutritional status of families through educational campaigns and research of food preparation and diet.

**Status**

Farmers are struggling to overcome impact of 1988-1990 drought and negative effects of government's economic policy on agricultural inputs, credits, etc. High levels of agricultural production were achieved on communal and women's committees' land in seven communities, 56 percent higher than the average for the area. Improved planning guaranteed sufficient seeds and fertilizer through a revolving fund. Training in production and organization was carried out through workshops and a weekly radio program.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country	Peru	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Paca
PVO Representative's Name	Tom Edwards	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	IRINEA

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	33,750	22,500	56,250
PVO \$	0	11,250	7,500	18,750
TOTAL	0	45,000	30,000	75,000

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

Activity Description

Promote the participation of women in production and health activities by strengthening 16 women's organizations and forming 75 new ones through leadership training, 60 evaluation workshops and cultural exchanges; promote the formation of 30 health subcommittees, provide primary health care to 5,600 people with coordination of the Ministry of Health; establish revolving funds to increase agricultural production and finance shops to process agricultural products; and install a communal grain mill and bakery.

Status Project terminated in the second grant year of Matching Grant. Status at end of second year: 30 effective women's committees were formed in 20 communities with membership of more than 700 women. Most successful aspect of the program has been the increased capacity and participation of women in community and regional organizations. This is reflected in the participation of some groups in the first assembly of the Confederation of Campesina Women. Health: Established 14 infant feeding centers providing nutritional care and vaccinations for more than 500 children annually; although women manage the centers, they have not reached the level of self-sufficiency desired. Productive projects: Individually and in groups women have received training and technical support from promoters for planting traditional crops and home gardens; credit program has provided loans to women, for most, the first credit they have received.

COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)

Country	Peru	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Anta Province. Cuzco
PVO Representative's Name	Tom Edwards	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	CADEP, Cuzco

COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	30,000	0	0	30,000
PVO \$	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	30,000	0	0	30,000

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>	Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>
AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>	

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-F: (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Strengthen the capacity of autonomous rural peasant organizations to defend their interests, elaborate their own development alternatives and actively participate in regional decision-making processes; provide housing for peasant representatives while in Cuzco on business or attending courses; provide assistance in legal, economic, administrative, technical and social areas of peasant organizations; disseminate information and training materials via the regional radio program, "Mosoq Allpa."

**Status**

Matching Grant funding terminated in second year of grant, but project activities continue with other funding. Status as of end of second year: Since 1985, 150,000 people have used the facilities and services of Casa Campesina, which has become a focal point for meetings between local authorities and campesinos. Casa Campesina also supports a team of 20 community health promoters; 38 community libraries, supplied through loans by main library, complement a literacy program; a training program for local leaders, includes courses in communal accounting and administration. Legal program provides assistance in preparation of community statutes and land disputes. Mosoq Allpa radio transmits two programs in Quechua and Spanish on topics related to farmers and local culture, with direct inputs from farmers collected by local correspondents.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Peru</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Cuzco</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Tom Edwards</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Bartolome de las Casas</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	15,734	11,066	0	26,800
<b>PVO \$</b>	0	8,934	0	8,934
<b>TOTAL</b>	15,734	20,000	0	35,734

67

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>	Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>	
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>	AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Assist 2,000 farmers in Alto Piura Basin to improve agriculture production through training promoters, providing technical assistance for crop and livestock production and research on integral production systems; strengthen organizational capacity of farmers' association through courses; improve health by training promoters, planting school and family gardens and coordinating health-related agencies; improve capability of IDEAS team through training and systematizing experiences.

**Status**

Project completed during this period, but project activities continue using other funding; Organization: Continued management training among farmers associations, supported projects to improve canals, three wells, build community center, rotating fund. Agri-livestock: Rotating fund for fertilizers recuperated only 20 percent due to severe drought and impact of inflation; promoted family and school organic vegetable gardens through training, seeds, 12 composts; gardens produced 15,000 kgs. tomatoes; produced 2,600 fruit trees; cows, pigs and chickens of 340 families dewormed; continued training 13 promoters and distributed 700 animal health manuals. Health: Workshops for health promoters and leaders resulted in "Integral Health Program" for micro-region.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Peru</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Alto Piura</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Tom Edwards</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>IDEAS</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	33,750	30,000	26,250	90,000
<b>PVO \$</b>	11,250	15,000	3,750	30,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	45,000	45,000	30,000	120,000

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization, Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number, OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date, September 1, 1988	End Date, August 31, 1993
AID Project Officer's Name, Loreta Williams	

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

**BURKINA FASO SUMMARY:** Three projects supported. **UNAIS** concentrated on primary health. **AMURT** focused on food self-sufficiency and agroforestry. **CNN** worked in soil conservation and water control techniques. (Pages 1-3)

**Status**

**CNN** Rock bunds and micro-catchment work continue, with millet planted in the bunds. **UNAIS** The health center operates and trained village workers implement their lessons on primary health care. **AMURT** Eight wells were constructed and 50 kg. of potatoes planted. Cart and donkey bought. A nine-person forestry committee was started.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country Burkina Faso	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) Varies
PVO Representative's Name John Soloninka	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency Varies

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	79,033	4,500	(1,405)	82,128
<b>PVO \$</b>	42,888	1,500	7,059	51,447
<b>TOTAL</b>	121,921	6,000	5,654	133,575

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>	Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>
AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>	

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

**KENYA SUMMARY** Three projects supported. **KMC** and **FSK** concentrated on agriculture. **Tototo** assisted low-income women to participate in cooperatives. (pages 4-6.)

**Status**

All three projects have terminated. In **KMC**, ten wells were dug and seven were fitted with handpumps; pilot fishponds were established; health facilities expanded and a community-based health-care program under way. In **FSK**, within small-scale farmer support program, 82 farmers purchased heifers and 200 received agricultural training in gardegning techniques. In **Tototo**, total of 101 groups have been involved with business and leadership training. In the past year 15 new groups of women established savings clubs. Most groups have been running income-generating savings clubs and have received credit. All participants received training in leadership, project planning, group organization and business management skills

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Kenya</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Varies</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Sigurd Hanson</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Varies</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	75,088	64,761	(5,345)	134,503
<b>PVO \$</b>	11,549	20,286	14,522	46,357
<b>TOTAL</b>	86,637	85,047	9,177	180,860

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

Activity Description

**NIGER SUMMARY** Eight projects supported, concentrating on animal fattening, women's cooperatives, pesticides, gardening and fertilizing, soil conservation, tree nursery and forest management, well digging, marketing of crops, food drying, tree grafting and purchase of oxcarts; classes in health, veterinary techniques, language and record-keeping.

Status

In **Dagga**, an extension agent was assigned to the cooperative. Co-op members made contributions to their rolling fund which was used in 1990 to buy peanut seeds; they were 100 percent reimbursed. An extension agent in **Dadin Kowa** oversaw its final months. A co-op store and cereal bank were started in **Boni** selling millet, manioc flour, soap, batteries, oil and tea. A Hausa language literacy program was set up and a village press activated. A cereal bank and store were established. Colorful mats were woven and sold by local women in the cooperative. At **Nadara**, 13 additional concrete wells were sunk. A village library and press operate efficiently. Forest Management Project: 85,000 saplings were transplanted and wild grasses were experimented with. Six villages held literacy classes. Of the 128 who attended classes, 42 reached literacy. Monthly co-op meetings were held. 1,047 cubic meters of dead wood were cut to be sold. 17 co-op members attended a 15-day accounting class.

COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)

Country	Niger	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Varies
PVO Representative's Name	John Soloninka	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	Government of Niger

COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	85,939	109,539	28,694	224,172
PVO \$	152,642	93,084	109,790	355,516
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>238,581</b>	<b>202,623</b>	<b>138,484</b>	<b>579,688</b>

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

**SENEGAL SUMMARY** One project supported. **Association of Agro-Pastoralists** concentrated on purchase of cattle and seed. (Page 15.)

**Status**

**AAP of Ndianda Peulh** purchased 13 bulls, three plows and one horse; bought special seed for cattle food supply.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country	Senegal	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Ndianda Peulh
PVO Representative's Name	John Soloninka	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	Groupement des Eleveurs de Ndianda Peulh

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	0	0	0
PVO \$	17,639	0	0	17,639
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17,639</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17,639</b>

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>	Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>
AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>	

AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

Activity Description **INDIA SUMMARY** In India, four projects were supported. **CAST** concentrated on helping families increase income and improve health; **CCOORR** concentrated on development of organizational skills and helping poor families in skilled training; **CMAI** concentrated on improving health status; **IRRM** concentrated on assisting families to organize at the grass-roots level.

Status **CAST:** introduced income-generating schemes and modified the program of primary health care; **CCOORR:** project focused on youth employment and women's needs; **CMAI:** implemented community-based primary health care plans; **IRRM:** local banks provided loans and health programs began.

COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)

Country <b>India</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Varies</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>N/A</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Varies</b>

COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>PVO \$</b>	85,204	176,283	88,301	349,788
<b>TOTAL</b>	85,204	176,283	88,301	349,788

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization: Lutheran World Relief		Grant/Contract Number: OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date: September 1, 1988	End Date: August 31, 1993	AID Project Officer's Name: Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description** PHILIPPINES SUMMARY Two projects were supported. One concentrated on work for land security and improvement of agricultural productivity. The other concentrated on primary health-care training.

**Status** In the first project, SCFI, 38 Certificates of Stewardship Contract awarded and anti-erosion appropriate technology implemented; in the second, IPHC, successful training in primary health care went to 4 new NGOs, 48 new staff of NGOs and 129 new community health workers.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country: Philippines	Location in Country (Region, District, Village): Varies
PVO Representative's Name: N/A	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency: Varies

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	0	40,181	52,979	93,160
PVO \$	0	12,142	18,914	31,056
<b>TOTAL</b>	0	52,323	71,893	124,216

74

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization	Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number	OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date	September 1, 1988	End Date	August 31, 1993
		AID Project Officer's Name	Loreta Williams

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

**BOLIVIA SUMMARY** In Bolivia, three projects were supported. **FEPADE** concentrated on increasing agricultural production and improving health conditions; **CASDEC** concentrated on increasing agricultural and animal production; **SEMTA** concentrated on technical and organizational training, improving health conditions, and establishing women's centers. (Pages 22-24.)

**Status**

One project remains active in Bolivia currently: **CASDEC** Agricultural Development, Phase III. CASDEC has been successful in promoting greater awareness and actions to protect natural resources, reflected in reforestation efforts within the target communities.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country	Bolivia	Location in Country (Region, District, Village)	Varies
PVO Representative's Name	Tom Edwards	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency	Varies

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	45,916	31,751	22,202	99,833
PVO \$	31,804	25,905	13,068	70,777
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>77,720</b>	<b>57,620</b>	<b>35,810</b>	<b>170,610</b>

15

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization <b>Lutheran World Relief</b>		Grant/Contract Number <b>OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00</b>
Start Date <b>September 1, 1988</b>	End Date <b>August 31, 1993</b>	AID Project Officer's Name <b>Loreta Williams</b>

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

**ECUADOR SUMMARY** In Ecuador, three projects were supported. **SENDA JUVENIL** concentrated on developing youth employment opportunities and establishing small businesses; **FEPP** concentrated on increasing food production, improving crop marketing, and promoting local organizations; **PRE** concentrated on assisting families to diversify and increase food production, and on carrying out leadership training. (Pages 25-27.)

**Status**

In Ecuador, each of the three projects is in its final year. The **FEPP** Lago Agrio project has successfully implemented an ambitious program designed to promote the conservation of natural resources among indigenous persons and colonists who have migrated to the area. The **PRE** Campesino Development, Phase III project has also focused on training in soil conservation and organic agriculture. Both projects have promoted improved primary health care through education, especially among women. The **SENDA Juvenil** Artisan Workshops project has been less successful in establishing small cooperative businesses among youths. Its goals were apparently overly ambitious given its lack of experience in income-generating activities and the fluidity and divergent interests of its target population of marginal youth. Through increased training in management, accounting and marketing, satisfactory results can be expected in a reduced number of businesses.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country <b>Ecuador</b>	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) <b>Varies</b>
PVO Representative's Name <b>Tom Edwards</b>	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency <b>Varies</b>

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
<b>AID \$</b>	68,500	68,874	46,005	183,379
<b>PVO \$</b>	34,500	37,376	29,751	101,627
<b>TOTAL</b>	103,000	106,250	75,756	285,006

16

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Exp. Date 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type	Project Number	
Appropriation	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Office	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization, Lutheran World Relief	Grant/Contract Number, OTR-0158-A-00-8158-00
Start Date, September 1, 1988	End Date, August 31, 1993
AID Project Officer's Name, Loreta Williams	

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

PERU SUMMARY Ten projects were supported, concentrating on: women's production and health activities, training health promoters, increasing agricultural production, strengthening capacity of autonomous rural peasant organizations, and increasing income. (Pages 28-37.)

**Status**

Peru continues to be LWR's largest Latin America program in terms of both amount of resources and number of active projects. Five projects received MG finds during this period. All except LABOR are concentrated in rural mountain areas. The CESS Solidaridad, IDEAS, CIED-Cajamarca and IRINEA projects all contribute to a greater awareness and action to protect the natural environment, while at the same time training farm families in more appropriate agricultural and animal production techniques. Production levels have not consistently met goals, due to two basic causes: first, chronic drought conditions in the Peruvian highlands over the past three years; second, the impact of Peru's structural adjustment program initiated in August 1990, which resulted in higher costs for agricultural inputs and lower prices for agricultural products. However, each of the projects continued to strengthen the organizational and technical capacity of community promoters and leaders.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country Peru	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) Varies
PVO Representative's Name Tom Edwards	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency Varies

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Grant Year 1	Grant Year 2	Grant Year 3	Total
AID \$	146,098	151,071	127,110	424,279
PVO \$	103,084	104,819	42,855	250,758
TOTAL	249,182	255,890	169,965	675,037

## LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF--Sources of Funds

Source	AID No.	Country	FY 91 Grant Year
AID/W MG 3	8158	mixed	301,283
Private			
Cash			9,254,515
In-Kind--Pvt			8,395,983
AID Emergency Agreements			
AID/W--FFP	9702	Ethiopia em	3,861
AID/W--FFP	0708	Ethiopia em	1,001,770
AID/W--FFP	0700	Ethiopia em	25,173,112
AID/W--OFDA	0048	Ethiopia em	750,252
AID/W--OFDA	9008	S. Sudan wells 1	19,284
AID/W--OFDA	0043	S. Sudan wells 2	189,243
AID/W--OFDA	1092	S. Sudan wells 3	56,200
Sub total of AID EM grants			27,193,722
AID/W	938-2109	O/F Gen'1	251,379
Total			45,396,883

18

**SPENDING BY PROGRAM SECTORS**

	<b>EXPENDITURE</b>			<b>BUDGET</b>		
	<b>AID</b>	<b>LWR Match</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>AID</b>	<b>LWR Match</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>'88-'91</b>	<b>'88-'91</b>	<b>'88-'91</b>	<b>'88-'91</b>	<b>'88-'91</b>	<b>'88-'91</b>
<b>Agric'l Dev't</b>	746,656	650,170	1,396,836			1,901,000
<b>Inst'n Bldg</b>	49,017	16,193	65,210			92,000
<b>Comm Dev't</b>	230,216	217,625	447,841			383,000
<b>Health</b>	90,706	368,653	459,359			224,000
<b>Human Res Dev't</b>	124,850	22,323	147,173			
<b>Sub Total</b>	1,241,455	1,274,964	2,516,418			2,600,000
<b>Evaluation</b>	15,913	15,736	31,649			40,000
<b>Total Direct Costs</b>	1,257,367	1,290,700	2,548,067			2,640,000
<b>Indirect Costs</b>	181,389	162,723	344,112			360,000
<b>Total</b>	1,438,756	1,453,423	2,892,179	1,500,000	1,500,000	3,000,000

16

INDIA: CCOORR.

Sample baseline data

	Baseline Data (1989)	Present State	
		1990	1991(Proj)
●Mother deaths - per 1,000 live births	3	2.5	2.5
●Infant deaths - per 1,000 live births	72	46	40
●Birth rate - per 1,000 population	28	25	20
●Death rate - per 1,000 population	9	7	6
●Family planning acceptors	10%	13%	15%
<u>Unemployment:</u>			
●Women - per day	\$0.31	\$0.58	\$0.58
●Youth - unemployed/under- employed out of 5,853	47.6%	45.6%	42.7%
●Youth - self employed	0	\$16/mo.	\$16/mo.
●Handicapped development	0	\$ 3/mo.	\$ 5/mo.
●Alternate to classical agriculture	0	\$12 per mo./acre	\$12 per mo./acre
●Child development centers	0	8 ctrs with 280	
●Community banking benefi- ciaries	0	29	49
<u>Youth Development:</u>			
●Library	0	11	1
●Physical development participants	0	573	164
●Youth self-employment	0	13	15

### 6.1. Criteria for selecting partners

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

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

### 6.2. LWR structure in West Africa

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

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

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

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

### 6.3. LWR partners in India

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

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

### 6.4. Promoting evaluation methodologies

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

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

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

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

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

#### 6.5. Promoting sustainable development

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

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

#### 6.6. Financial reporting form

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

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

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

6.7 Objective #3 re. host governments

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

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

6.8 Number of projects included in MG-III

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

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

6.9. Reporting to A.I.D.

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

7. ASSESSMENT OF GRANT ACTIVITIES

7.1. Four principal issues addressed by this evaluation:

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

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

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

83

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*SW*

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

## 7.2. Answers to five basic questions:

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

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

For reference, those three objectives are repeated here:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.2.3.1.4. LWR feels that the "indicator" of 30 projects was useful only at the stage where A.I.D. was considering the grant proposal, rather than being a useful indicator of success or failure, and therefore prefers that this "indicator" be removed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

48

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

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

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

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

ea