

# ***Peace Works***

Lutheran World Service India  
Assam Riot Victims' Rehabilitation and Support Project



## ***Midterm Evaluation Report May 2006***

By Peter Jeyamaran, Scott Smith and Heather Payne  
for



**Christian  
Medical  
Association of  
India**



2, Local Shopping Centre, A - 3, Janakpuri, New Delhi 110 058 INDIA  
**Tel:** +91 [0]11 2559 9991, 2559 9992, 2559 9993, 2552 1502 **Fax:** +91 [0]11 2559 8150  
**E-mail:** cmai@cmai.org **Visit us at:** www.cmai.org

## **Table of Contents**

	Executive Summary	2
<b>1</b>	Background of the Project and Evaluation	3
<b>2</b>	Method of the Evaluation	5
<b>3</b>	Findings	7
	3.1 Project profile and relevance	7
	3.2 Target area selection process	8
	3.3 Livelihood support and infrastructure	9
	3.4 Capacity building for income generation	10
	3.5 Community building for long-term sustainability	11
	3.6 Building trust and solidarity	13
	3.7 Acceptance and competence of non-local staff	13
	3.8 Use and selection of local staff	13
	3.9 Cooperation and coordination with GOs and NGOs	13
	3.10 Central Committee	14
	3.11 Overall management of the project	14
<b>4</b>	Conclusions and Recommendations	15

## ***Appendices***

*Appendix 1 Terms of Reference*

*Appendix 2 Consultants' details*

*Appendix 3 Evaluation activity record*

*Appendix 4 Evaluation tools*

*Appendix 5 Sample interview report*

*Appendix 6 Scored results of stakeholders' interview and discussions*

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since May 1996 there have been 3 episodes of violent ethnic conflict between the majority Bodos and the minority migrant Santhal community in Kokrajhar district, lower Assam. Lutheran World Service India LWS[I] responded initially and persisted in relief work, collaborating closely with the government, so much so that they were requested in 2003 to assist in long-term rehabilitation and development. LWS[I], through Normisjon in 2003, obtained NORAD support for a 5 year project from Jan 2004 with an annual budget of approx. 150 000 USD.

The current project aims at building and ensuring long-term and secure lives and livelihoods, for communities who have only lived with fear, violence and instability for over seven years.

ARRP's profile is extremely good with government and other NGOs after long associations. The feeling of the community towards ARRP is also good with only a slight reservation expressed by a Santal leader. The interventions are largely found relevant but some follow-up research needs to be done e.g. on success rate of planted trees and use of vocational training.

The target area selection has been confined to riot-affected villages and is seen to be fair by the stakeholders. ARRP is keen to extend the programme to all remaining affected villages and this will need to be negotiated with the donor. The Evaluation Team recommends that the original period of 5 years is retained for the sake of spreading the benefits of development equitably; already the development in this small pocket of Assam is further on now than if the troubles had not occurred.

The infrastructure and livelihood programme of road construction has been very successful and should continue, perhaps with some constraints if the project is to expand in area and keep to the same time period.

Self-help groups are the backbone of the sustainable intervention efforts of the project. ARRP staff give skills training and government training opportunities are also tapped. However, several skills training courses did not show any income-generating results e.g. candle –making. Little follow-up has been done to date. SHG operating training with the Government manual has been effective in building organisational skills and has led to a degree of empowerment in the women. They are able to speak in public meetings and feel at ease as representatives in the Village Development Committees. Women in SHGs stood out from non-members in the open discussions; they were livelier and better dressed. The results of all training already given need to be assessed by the project. Gender balance in workloads and in spending power is poor. Men have more free time in the villages and alcoholism in men is regarded as a problem. It may be that the project is potentially giving more work to already over-worked women while men have some potentially productive time available. If empowerment is really important to this Project, then it is vital to address fundamental cultural and political, practical and strategic gender issues. Agricultural support has had some success e.g. the seed bank. It is important that ARRP continue their efforts to establish more farmers' groups of both men and women. This will help them to access a whole raft of government schemes. ARRP has done well to produce a brochure to help spread the information of these schemes.

The community building strategies have borne fruit with most VDCs performing well in bringing tangible results in terms of improved water supply, for instance. Children's education and adult literacy support appear worthwhile in terms of community building. Health needs more focus.

Peace building between the two main ethnic groups has had significant impact through seminars, sports events, sharing community centre buildings.

Overall management is sound and energetic with good use of the substantial budget. The project goal and objectives need to be clearer short and long term & communicated with the community.

# 1 BACKGROUND OF PROJECT EVALUATION

In May 1996 and September 1998 Kokrajhar district (lower Assam), consisting of two subdivisions – Kokrajhar and Gossaigaon - witnessed violent ethnic conflict between the majority Bodos and the minority migrant Santhal community. Although the conflict affected other districts such as Dhubri and Bongaigaon, Kokrajhar was the worst affected. Hundreds were reportedly killed, thousands of homes destroyed, and several lakh people of both communities displaced. The Assam State government brought in military force to quell the rioting, and over 250,000 people took refuge in 68 relief camps.

LWS[I] responded by providing temporary housing assistance, supplementary nutrition meals for women and children, economic skills training, clothing, education (school buildings and teachers) and so on. In this, it has been working together with other national and international NGOs. Right from the start, LWS[I] built up and sustained strong coordination with government agencies, at state, district and sub-division levels. As a result, in the long-term, LWS[I] was practically the only NGO with access to all relief camps in the state.

LWS[I] was also closely involved in the work of the local Inter Church Peace Mission, which worked to restore mutual trust between the two communities. NELC and Normisjon were also partners in these peace efforts.

In 1997, the majority of the refugees returned to their original villages and homesteads, with government provided rehabilitation grants. However, 23,000 families, designated “encroachers” (illegally occupying homestead lands), were unable to return. In addition, there were about 3,000 families who – despite having received rehabilitation grants – were unable to return to their original homes, living in small huts made of bamboo and plastic sheeting, close their to their original villages or on relief camp sites.

However violence erupted in 1998 on two occasions, causing people to flee again to the safety of the camps. LWS[I] continued to play a vital role in providing large-scale relief operations. During 2003 the conflict level gradually came down, and lot of people wanted to go back to their homestead where they had to begin rebuilding their village totally from scratch. Since 2002, both government and most of the non-government agencies discontinued most of the relief supplies from the area. Only LWS[I] India and Medecins Sans Frontiers [MSF] continued with minimum support to Relief Camp schools and health services respectively.

LWS[I] was approached by the District Commissioner to assist in rehabilitating those families who had returned to their own land, by providing a variety of support – infrastructure (roads), housing, drinking water, education and livelihood. There were also requests coming from the riot victims and the government officials for rehabilitation that LWS[I] should intervene substantially and without delay, to address the severe economic and social problem being faced by the affected communities in the current situation.

LWS[I] prepared a project proposal for rehabilitation and development to Normisjon in 2003. Normisjon further approached NORAD for support. From 2004 a 5 year project was approved by support from Normisjon and NORAD with an Annual budget of approximately 150 000 USD.

**Goal of the project:** The current project aims at building and ensuring long-term, stable, sustainable and secure lives and livelihoods, for communities who have only known and lived with fear, instability, violence and uncertainty for several years.

**Project short term and long term objectives as stated in current Project documents:**

- 1 To provide infrastructure, food security and livelihood support to communities who have returned to their own revenue / allotted lands from selected relief camps in Kokrajhar district.
- 2 This will include housing assistance, roads, and schools, as well as agricultural implements and seed support.
- 3 Access to safe drinking water (tube or ring wells) in all selected villages.
- 4 To provide capacity building training for new livelihood skills for both men and women.
- 5 To build community based systems and structures such as to ensure that support provided by LWS[1][1] through this project has longer-term sustainability.
- 6 To build bridges of trust and solidarity between Bodos and Santhals.
- 7 To establish stronger partnerships and linkages with Government systems and service providers, particular in areas of health care, education, agricultural extension and so on.

**Project evaluation:** The 5 year project has been running for 2.5 years and so the planned mid-term review is due to evaluate whether the project is on the right track. This means whether the approach is appropriate and effective in serving the target people in the best possible way and whether limited human and monetary resources are utilized efficiently. LWS[1] wanted to know how well their involvement is welcomed and accepted by the local people. Practical recommendations for improvement were required as an integrated part of the evaluation

**Specific objectives for the evaluation**

- 1 Assess the project profile and its relevance in the context. Is the project effective in addressing the challenges of the target group?
- 2 Assess the selection process of target area. Is it biased or directed by undue influence in some way?
- 3 Assess the input in livelihood support and infrastructure. Assess quality of work and whether resources invested are efficiently and well used.
- 4 Assess the capacity building program. To what degree has ARRP contributed to income generation.
- 5 Assess the community building efforts and its relevance for long term sustainability.
- 6 Assess ARRP's building of trust and solidarity between people groups of the area.
- 7 Assess acceptance and competence of the non local staff.
- 8 Assess use of and selection of local staff.
- 9 Assess cooperation and coordination with Government and other NGOs working in the same area.
- 10 Assess composition, cooperation and relationships between the Project Management and the local Advisory Committee.
- 11 Assess the overall management of the project and consider whether human and monetary resources are used according to approved plans and in line with internal rules and regulations of LWS[1].

**LWS[1] Project team expectations from the Evaluation:**

- 1 To learn how to assess community capacity, the process of implementation with people's participation, to be more accountable to donor, communities & organization (LWS1) & to strengthen weaknesses.
- 2 Extent of utilisation of resources: LWSI funds, human resources; Community resources.
- 3 Are we on right track to meet goal, objectives? Is the application of resources meeting project goals?

## 2 METHOD OF EVALUATION

### Approach and working methods

In the Terms of Reference, LWS[I] required the evaluation to be participatory in its approach and to be a combination of interviews, group discussions, field observations and study of plans and reports of the project. The senior Project management also requested that the evaluation be a capacity building exercise. Please see Appendices for copy of Terms of Reference.

### Methods used were:

- All centred on the planned project objectives and results and evaluation objectives
- Key informant interviews, participatory rapid appraisal [PRA] and focus group discussions with various stakeholders in field e.g. women's groups, farmers, Village Development Committees [VDC] 2 different interview/discussion question sets were prepared and used; please see Appendices.
- Visit key individuals in other organisations, government offices and neighbouring villages to see another perspective of the programme.
- Examination of project deliverables in the field and project documentation to verify reports.
- Workshop for staff at start to explain the participatory process, understand the Project team's expectations and their overall vision of the project's efforts in the community and to review with the team the capacity of community groups.
- Questionnaire completed by staff, interviews with Project Coordinator and Director of Disaster Management
- Concluding day with Project team; SWOT [Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats] and BEEM [Build, eliminate, exploit and minimise] tools, verbal feedback and an assessment of the evaluation process itself.

### Recommendations

Practical recommendations were requested and have been given for each of the evaluation objectives in order that the Project may serve the people better, reach its goals and use scarce resources in an optimal way.

### Evaluation team

The team required the following competence:

- Team Leader: Good understanding of Community Development in general.
- 1 Member: Good understanding of agriculture, fishery, food security
- 1 Member: Good understanding of construction of community houses, roads, wells etc. and be able to assess use of funds for such work.

The consultants who carried out the evaluation and wrote the report were:

- Ms Heather Payne Team Leader, Social Development Adviser
- Mr Peter Jeyamaran, Team member, Civil Engineer,
- Mr Scott Smith, Team member, Development Adviser/ Agriculturalist

Please see Appendices for consultants' CVs.

### Outline evaluation schedule

The LWS[I] Project team made all arrangements efficiently so that the short time available was used to the maximum.

<b>Evaluation Plan</b>	
<b>Day 1 Wed May 3rd</b>	
9.30-10.30	Mtg w Project Co-ordinator & Disaster Management Director to confirm plan, make appts for KII & request Six month reports/Annual budgets and finance reports/ MIS/JDs
10.30-12.30	Staff workshop 1: to introduce ourselves, inform them of plan & start eval activities led by Scott: SHG qualities, VDC qualities Prepare specific case snapshots of project impact [ change that would not have happened otherwise]
2.0-3.30	Project area villages -Gaonchulka FGDs 1&2 headmen & women FGD content: comparative inputs in all project villages; follow-up on training received, incl health e.g. AIDS knowledge, FP, maintenace of tube wells
3.30-5.0	PRA in village 1 Ranking of project inputs: m. important, most value for money, most sustainable
	Visit constructions
<b>Day 2 Thurs May 4th</b>	
am	FGD 3&4 youth & ethnic leaders Tension levels & critical factors of tension
pm	Key informant interviews[KII] 1-9 [3 by each of 3 consultants]
	Visit constructions
<b>Day 3 Fri May 5th</b>	
am	FGD 5&6 farmers & church
pm	KII 10-19
	PRA village 2
	Visit constructions
<b>Day 4 Sat May 6th</b>	
Staff workshop 2:	
am	SWOT, BEEM, individual questionnaires Present case snapshots of project impact –not completed
pm	Feedback from consultants on provisional findings

**For actual schedule of evaluation activities completed please see Appendices**

## Limitations of this evaluation

The length of time planned was clearly a limiting factor which showed in the ratings by the LWS[1][1] Project team in terms of quantity and quality of investigations made. Another 2 days would have made for a more thorough appreciation of the comprehensive work completed and in progress. Project documentation was sometimes difficult to see, especially upcoming plans and budgets. The selection of villages was made by the Project for advance plans to be made. This was a disadvantage in that the visits tended to be taken up to some extent with cultural conventions than functional investigations. Also, naturally, the most established and successful sites could be shown. Generally the Project team were open to outside opinions and resistance was minimal.

### Assessment of approach, process and methods used:

The 18 members of the LWS[I] team were asked to assess the evaluation process in 3 ways and with a 3 point scale, happy 😊 , middling 😐 , unhappy ☹:

- whether their expectations of the evaluation were met: 17 were happy, 1 was unhappy
  - whether the quantity of project work seen and addressed was sufficient: 10 happy, 8 were middling
  - whether the evaluation covered the work in enough depth: 13 happy, 4 middling and 1 unhappy.
- A senior manager later described the process as “interactive, participatory and creative”.

### 3 EVALUATION FINDINGS

The evaluation tools were focussed on the specific evaluation objectives and the findings are also set out to respond to the specific areas of inquiry listed in the evaluation objectives.

#### 1 Project profile and relevance.

The team found that the project profile is impressive within Kokrajhar District. LWS[I] enjoys an excellent reputation with nearly all the project stakeholders. The overall rating of all stakeholders was a top score of 5. The Government officials speak highly of LWS[I] and feel that the Project follows the guidance they give. It has addressed basic food security needs to some extent through the Food for Work scheme, built considerable community capacity in income generation and in organisation for development and achieved significant ethnic reconciliation. The community members themselves were all positive too about the relevance and effectiveness of project intervention although they were not familiar with the overall project goal and objectives. What LWS[I] tried to achieve through this project was to rebuild the riot victims' lost confidence, thereby give them new hope for a dignified life and renewed trust in humanity. The Project feels that the community members are now aware of this. They were certainly aware of all the interventions and the women in focus group discussions were very clear and articulate about what activities have taken place, including the peace building efforts. The focus group discussions and PRA exercises showed a wide divergence in what different communities felt were relevant.

Order of relevance of interventions rated by communities by PRA		
<i>Village1</i>		<i>Village 2</i>
Latrines	1	Roads
Sewing machine	2	Schools
Tubewells	3	Seeds
VDC	4	Peace
Peace	5	Latrines
Dugwells & seeds	6	Dug wells
Roads	7	

The team found that some of the trainings had not had any obvious benefit e.g. candle and soap-making. There was not much evidence of market research or community consultation in selecting subjects for training. The staff themselves do most of the training and the government training resources are used.

The visibility of the project is high with roadside signposts to project villages and also painted roadside boards with details of road construction under the Food for Work scheme. A budget line for project visibility is good to have.

#### 2 Target area selection process

The overriding perception in the District is that the selection is fair. Interviews and discussions gave an average rating of 4.59 out of 5. Villages selected were recently resettled, riot-affected communities with no basic services, no voice and within reach of roads for access - "the distance from Gosaigoan Project Office for operational purpose". LWSI within its capacity tried to initiate the project activities in remote needy areas; but for implementation of the project, they had to give heed to the government advice on the security considering the staff safety. But with the rapport building in the neighbouring villages, the situation has now been improved and LWSI is not leaving any villages affected by the riot within the scope of this project.

Villages had to send a letter of application to the Project and Government had to give permission. The original proposal states slightly different criteria among the riot-affected villages:

- greatest need (financially);
- Female Headed Households;
- physical disability (including blindness);
- those who have returned without cash relief;
- those having less than 2 bighas land, and so on.

One member of the Central Committee mentioned that he agreed that first the project should help the “riot effected” but then also go to other “vulnerable sections”. The Project is open to this possibility and is seeking the donors’ guidance about it.

It was not possible to find any bias or undue influence towards one community or another, although LWS[I] appears to genuinely acknowledge that the Santal community is the more marginalised.

The good work of LWS[I] is spreading in neighbouring non-project villages like Athaibari Thinali. The village headman has already sent an application to include his village in the next expansion plan.

The project is keen to cover all the affected villages in the District to complete the resettlement of the remaining needy population. So far a total population of 47,202 [8,783 families], has been reached. The 2003 proposal states 2476 families were affected in all. There seems to be no other mention of the intended size of the target population.

ARRP is now committed to intervention into 113 villages and senior management has expressed that they will be open to working with as many villages as are needed to resettle the camp residents. This may be another 35+ villages. This presents a problem both for the resources of the project but also for the process that the project is committed to using to resettle the people. The process is a five year progressive process, whereas the commitment to the area originally was for five years this means that if the project continues to take new areas they will have to extend their presence in the area for several years simply to complete the planned schedule. The team wants to highlight the probability given the practice to date.

Project management reports that the final decision regarding whether the project would commit to a potential village is made after this initial assessment and in discussion with the entire staff. Some initial assessments were made available but the decision process documenting reasons why or why not to take each village does not seem to be well documented.

### **3 Livelihood support and infrastructure**

The quality of livelihood support and infrastructure construction appears very good. The overall perception on the use of funds is that there is good value for money. The feeling of all stakeholders is that the funds are well divided between infrastructure and livelihood and they are well spent. The rating given is just over 4 out of 5 on both these points.

The simplicity of the Project Office furniture, fittings and equipment helps towards this reputation, it appears. Certainly, LWS[I] seems to have spent the high budget directly for the benefit of the community rather than on project administration. In fact, the office facilities were slightly less than adequate for such a high budget and for the duration of 5 years, such that efficiency was a little compromised e.g. the lack of adequate inverter / generator to cope with the frequent erratic power cuts.

Food security has been improved through the Food for Work, FFW, programme. This is used in the early resettlement months when there is no other income or means of generating income. It seems to be well appreciated by all, the beneficiaries as well as government officials. Roads that are built

were ones that the government was not going to initiate because they are too small. They are only the dirt sub-grade but the community had thought of them as one of the most valuable contributions.

The Evaluation Team did not ask but it is assumed that clear land measurements and title are given to families at time of resettlement and that some time limit is set so that those settling are not allowed to sell or put land up on mortgage for some years.

#### **4 Capacity building for income generation**

Community women's group discussions revealed that family income has risen; the rating out of 5 points was 3.5. The number of self-help groups, largely women's groups, that are operating and the level of organisation is impressive. However, the number of men's/farmers' groups is very low. Women also identified themselves very readily as farmers. Obviously farmers have been encouraged to form more group and more efforts will be taken in future after regenerating their willingness for cultivation and minimizing the fear psychosis (to some extent still prevailing) in cultivating nearby the another ethnic group's land. This feeling of insecurity was found during the interface among farmers. However the project since its beginning was proactive in developing / reviving significant numbers of Field Management Committees - FMC (Assam Govt. term for farmers groups) and linked them with District agriculture office or Regional Agriculture Research Station for training, seeds support and on-farm demonstration. From the rehabilitated families a considerable number of male members are engaged in part-time jobs outside their villages as they do not have much agricultural land.

While planning for training, the Project applies gap analysis and comparative analysis under participatory strategy planning. However, on a close look at this participatory strategic planning format does not include specific product market research and business planning.

It was noted that most of the trainings were targeting women members of the SHGs. While the team appreciates that their own income will increase the status of women in the communities it seemed from some FGD questions that men have more free time than do women.

There is no doubt that SHGs have resulted in more empowered women able to articulate their views in public meetings, sit on the VDC without being uncomfortable and ask an evaluation team member if women can plough. Ploughing is the last male reserved occupation when it comes to farming. But what should stop women from ploughing?

Trees were given by the project through government nurseries. The survival rate varied depending on the varieties. Seed Banks developed from the first years seed distribution were a surprising success. The banks are run by the VDC, giving a service to the community and a purpose for the VDC.

The project has arranged many technical trainings in order to help inspire and build the capacity of the SHG and VDC members toward income generation. This programme has some marked success areas such as the grain bank, mushroom growing and tailoring. The Project team recognises that follow-up of some of the trainings has not been sufficient and that it is the need of the hour to ensure the village people receive a worthwhile income. The Project is also initiating an assessment of the vocational trainings given in earlier years based on certain qualitative indicators already developed for the purpose.

From the two PRA exercises during the evaluation process it appears that some of the trainings are not thought of as very useful or important by the communities. Candle making, soap making, even bicycle repair were not identified as important in these exercises. Admittedly, these were not an exhaustive method of assessing the effectiveness of the trainings but they did raise the question of applicability of some of the trainings. It is recognized that a gestation period is needed for the

successful translation of any vocational training into income generating ventures, besides positive cooperation from banks, other extension agencies and the trainee's own initiatives. Candle making training was completed on Dec 05 only, so it is too early to say about its result.

When asked about the effectiveness of the trainings the staff would relate one of two case studies of success. Case studies should not be seen as any more than "frosting on the assessment cake". They give some interest and are important in telling the story but are not a substitute for full follow-up of all trainees.

The exercise by staff in the first Evaluation workshop to assess the level of capacity of the SHGs and VDCs showed some indeterminate grading of capacity. The community groups themselves, with Project guidance, can discuss and decide what the criteria for assessment should be. The criteria should reflect that groups need to be more than sources of money for individuals and, in effect, they have already proved themselves in this way. The project should, therefore, not settle for only finance-based criteria that is now used and was shown to the Evaluation team.

More needs to be done with analyzing and supporting agricultural activities that are sustainable. Of course a major component of these systems is cattle for ploughing. Originally this was in the plan but was not completed for logistic problems rather than a lack of need.

## **5 Community building for long-term sustainability**

### ➤ CBO creation and monitoring

- The project creates Self-help Groups (basically women's savings and income generation groups), and VDC's which are basically groups of local influential people, mostly men but some women, who express some interest in being the contact group between the village and ARRP.
- These groups are the key to the sustainability of the intervention of ARRP and therefore the health of these groups is critical. The capacities of the groups can be measured and monitored through identifying diagnostic skills, knowledge, behaviors (within the group environment), and activities of the group and group members (in the outside environment). The project has identified some criteria and it was reported that they are monitored but the project did not see a history of that happening. This needs to be done and, even further, they need to be used as indicators for helping the project know what capacities the CBO's need to develop. In particular the amount of social capital, or linkages, both interior and exterior to the group, needs to be monitored as an indicator of potential effectiveness and potential action toward development.
  - The project has started to help groups register with the local government authority as part of their intervention plan. This is a critical step that demands primary attention. The temptation is often to push this process too fast. The result is that the groups are registered but do not know what is in their registration a document. ARRP's experience showed that Registration of informal groups like SHGs, CBOs at an early stage may lose the informal character resulting in an exodus and becoming quite fragile. ARRP are aware of this and on the basis of this view, after completion of two years the SHGs in Singimari VI and Khagrabari areas, have been advised for registration and they have been successful. The capacity of the newly formed Village Community Development Committees (VCDC), that are the lowest units of the government should be developed as well as the project created SHGs and VDCs. Because the project is highly respected in the area it has the chance to help develop organizational skills and abilities the VCDCs.
  - The project has done a good job of creating and beginning to build the capacity of women SHGs. For the coming years it is suggested that men groups should also be helped to come into existence. Men's groups are more difficult to initiate but if common concerns and goals can be found they can be created and can be useful.

ARRP plans to develop a tool to enhance the capacity of the community. This is the Community Capacity Indicator (CCI) based on five managerial function; Planning, Organising, Managing, Alliance Building and Accounting. The team did not have sight of this tool.

The creation and training of the Village Development Committees has led to positive improvements in the quality of village life. The public opinion is that VDCs have brought about better infrastructure from the Government as well as LWS[I]. VDCs have established a good pattern of women's participation to the extent of benefiting both the women and the community. However, women still do not consider themselves as potential village leaders.

Generally, the people feel that the VDC governance will live beyond the project life. Some women's groups felt that LWS[I] should now let the community stand on their own feet. This indicates that the community is ready for the accompaniment phase of the project.

The schedule below shows the stages of resettlement that ARRP has planned:

<b>0 to 6 months:</b>	Mobilization phase
<b>6.1 Month to 1 year:</b>	Capacity building phase.
<b>1.1 year to 3years:</b>	physical input for social and physical reconstruction.
<b>3.1 year to 4 years:</b>	Diminishing physical inputs with encouraging community participation based on people's own capacity. Strengthen alliance building effort among different like minded organizations for evolving an apex body on behalf of the village which in turn would play the role of nodal agency through empowerment. This will be registered under society registration act-(1860) to draw financial support from Government and other financial agencies.
<b>4.1year to 5years:</b>	Accompaniment phase - With bare minimum inputs and increased mental support / input, continuation of escort services / referral services as guide/advisor/facilitator.
<b>5.1year &amp; onward:</b>	Final phase out & handing over to VDC to carry forward the Programme under the guidance of consultative committee consisting of Church body, Northern Evangelical Lutheran Church (NELC), Beneficiaries' representatives (with proportionate equal representation from different ethnic groups), and Government line Departments including financial Institutions etc.

The Project has already started assessing the impact in 27 old communities adopted during 2004 based on qualitative indicators. A low key approach is proposed for these areas in order to encourage them to move towards the take off stage on their own.

Health is an aspect of community development that does feature much in the project activities although malaria is a major threat to life. HIV/AIDS is also menacing at hand because of the highway and the truckers' the gateway to W Bengal.

Out of a set of 35 Community Health Volunteers (CHVs) that are trained, 4 are working with the Medecin Sans Frontiers (MSF) as Community Health Workers. During the Doctors' strike the State Deputy Commissioner of Kokrajhar district requested us to depute some trained Health Volunteers. Accordingly ARRP deputed 6 trained Community Health Volunteers to Gossaigaon and Kokrajhar subdivision (Letter Ref: No. ARRP/LWSI/06/663 dated 08/02/06) The same number assist the Health Department with polio and HIV/AIDS campaigns. Apart from these some of the trained CHVs are practicing in their own villages / communities by giving good advice to the patients and referring them on to the right places for treatment. ARRP has already experimented with revolving medicine funds for the trained CHVs.in operational areas like Persuabari, Ramdeo, etc. and they are still practicing it in lieu of minimum service charges from the community. Refresher training was conducted in 2005 for the CHVs trained during 2004 in technical collaboration with Govt. Health Departments. The CHV who was interviewed gave a very different

picture of the present role and work of his fellow trainees. He has been sick himself for some months but his information must still be valid.

Though LWSI is not directly working amongst the truckers, basic knowledge on HIV/AIDS has been enhanced a lot in the village through the health education given by the CHVS. Government doctors and resource persons from other NGOs also take the responsibilities to make the community people know and understand about causes of ill-health.

ARRP gives prime importance to gender issues while conducting any type of programme as a result of which at least a few women have come into the decision making processes of the community.

## **6 Building trust and solidarity**

The project has contributed significantly to the improved trust and solidarity between the people groups of the area. The construction of simple community centres located between villages of different people groups has been an enormous asset. Also, the joint meetings and platforms for peace building have been significant such that several people selected these project activities as the most important. Voices from the community only talked about friendly relations now and the total loss of the fear that they experienced earlier. The main purpose behind community sports or sports for school children organised by ARRP is peace which is clearly stated in public. Street plays should be started to have effective result in peace and other critical issues like HIV/AIDS.

Culturally, ethnic division can erupt when there is an unforeseen incident and this could still happen here such as a road accident when the perpetrator and victim are from different groups. The church wants to take a more active role in ongoing peace building, both the Santal and Bodo dioceses.

## **7 Acceptance and competence of the non local staff**

Most of the staff members are not local and their relationship with the community appears to be very good. They are committed in their work as community organisers and live close to the villages where they are posted. There was just one report from one of section of the community, which reflected a negative attitude by some staff. There is a problem of language where there are 2 distinct local languages and a third official state language, Assamese, that some people in both groups do not understand. Staff members are from many different places and some do not know even Assamese, Hindi or Bengali, also commonly spoken. The number of Santali speakers among the staff is negligible.

## **8 Use and selection of local staff.**

This has met with the approval of the local community, although not many local people are paid by the project. LWSI has made sincere efforts to get qualified staff from among Santhals. But there was hardly anyone with even the minimum qualification of a working knowledge of at least two languages including Hindi to take Community Organizers responsibility. They are continuing to look for Santali staff.

## **9 Cooperation and coordination with Government and other NGOs**

The Project has felt the government has been helpful and not interfered although they feel a little neglected by the officials. One official more or less said the same thing and made earnest promises to tour the area within 2 weeks of our visit. On the other hand, the Project feels they have been as transparent as possible with the government. The District authorities are in a state of transition following the introduction of the new level of government, the Bodo Territorial Committee [BTC]. Most of the state powers and functions will be transferred except for the police and other security services. There is a tricky problem regarding resettling the forest "encroachers" who are largely Santals. The most senior official suggested that the people should be allowed to remain and that LWSI introduced new non-forest trades e.g. silk farming using 'eri' leaves and not mulberry. Silk would fit with the local weaving production. However, the land is under the control of the BTC who may not grant residential rights in the reserved forests. The government is clearly dependent on NGOs to work on the ground with communities to increase uptake of District resources. The people need to know the new BTC; to know about the institutions and services, develop faith in them and

use them. They suggested that LWS[I][I] should produce a brochure of district services for the community in the full range of local languages. LWS[I][I] has done this already for agricultural schemes for farmers' groups. One sector that officials especially mentioned for support was health. This appears good and can be exploited further. VDCs have started to make links with Government and obtained water schemes and roads. This ability is a definite benchmark in the capacity of VDCs. The accompaniment phase of the project means that staff members must also be proficient and knowledgeable in Government schemes. The District Commissioner's office suggested the project make a brochure of schemes available and the project is keen to do this although, in fact, it is the government's own responsibility to deliver its services. There is a good NGO working with truckers at the Bengal border crossing post with good knowledge and skills in HIV/AIDS education. The project coordinator along with Prof. Basumatari, the founder of the local NGO visited jointly to some high risk areas of Srirampur. Prof. Basumatari has been helping the LWSI initiated AIDS program during 2004-2005 regularly as resource person. In future too, this sort of collaboration would be continued to yield synergy in addressing AIDS issues in this locality. Also Medecin Sans Frontiers operates a couple of clinics in the area where 6-8 CHVs assist.

## **10 Advisory [Central] Committee's composition and relationship with the Project Management**

Three members of the Advisory Committee were interviewed. They all said that they were better informed by the project than they had been at first but one member felt he still needs to be better updated on the project's activities. There is no regular meeting or written accountability by the project management to the Advisory Committee; the pattern is to meet as needed or as called by the Project Management. The Advisory Committee is certainly one of the strengths and resources of the project. One or two members thought that the role of the board should be revisited and better defined. Membership also was raised; women members are lacking and technical resource people. The churches have a prominent part on the Committee and this should remain as LWS[I] and Normisjon plan an ongoing responsibility for the church in the development and welfare of the community.

The Central Board, or Advisory Board, is certainly one of the strengths and resources of the project. The Bishop was aware that the role of the board should be revisited and better defined. Certainly this should be done but not directly by the staff of the project. The Program Director could possibly be the convener and possibly with an outside facilitator.

The question of broadening the board membership was raised by the bishop as well. This would be part of a re-thinking of the board's role in the present and any future project activities. An important question for this process will be: Will the members of the board be "representatives of certain constituents" and so will be looking for the best deal for their constituents, or will they be members be selected for their ability to contribute to the project.

The roles and responsibility of Central Committee members however were not clearly defined.

## **11 Overall management of the project**

The overall project management is very energetic and sincere with good monitoring from Kolkata in the form of quarterly personal visits. The planning and reporting cycle of the LWS[I] was difficult to grasp because it did not seem sequential with one cycle leading directly into the planning of the next year. Budgets and plans were not easily matched. However, funds seem carefully managed. Strategic planning and reporting are lacking in the documentation that was available. Project management is energetic with an eye for detailed record-keeping, both numbers and narrative of case stories. Personnel management enquiries raised a thorny issue in job descriptions and appraisals. Staff say a job description for community organisers was circulated which implies it is not provided to each new member of staff to guide their work from the start. To date a copy of a job description has not been seen by the evaluation team, not even in the most recent batch of couriered documents.

Senior management stated that they did not want to have excessive documentation and this is supported. The most important thing to document for this project is impact. The tendency for project

staff is to record activities in detail rather than give the time, effort and imagination it takes to measure and record actual impact or results of the activities. Again, case studies are colour for the follow-up, not the full evaluation of activities.

The staff is, in general, very impressive; they exhibit commitment and talent in their jobs. It is reported that for many of the staff, this is their first real job. Therefore, development of the staff is important. The management has made some effort to develop an in-house training program recognizing the staff's experience and skills. The system, as described to the team, however, seems too casual. Scheduling staff training inputs could be very useful. In-house training is often valuable but also undervalued, as its impacts are not assessed. A more formal scheduling would make the commitment of the management more explicit. When, at the beginning of the Evaluation, the staff were asked to draw an animal that represented the character of the project, many came up with animals that symbolised a protector or provider e.g. a cow, a dog and puppies. This shows some room for developing the facilitating role of the Project in the community. One that is willing to share the power of knowledge and status rather than use it to pressurise in any way. A comment was made by a Santal community leader that an overbearing attitude was sometimes shown from the Project side.

The demonstrated habit of LWS-I to use their various projects for staff training and orientation should be commended. Again however this should be done with documented intent and assessment lest it miss its purpose.

The one job description that the team was shown was little more than a joining letter. Proper job descriptions need to be developed so that the staff will be clear about their duties and responsibilities. Developing job descriptions with the staff can be very positive especially when the staff have been actually doing their jobs for some time and can be specific about their duties. Job title, general description, general and specific duties, to whom they are responsible to for what, and expected behavior related attitudes should be included. These should be signed with one copy to the employee and one copy in the employee's personnel file.

A systematic staff appraisal system can be linked to staff development and should be seen as development-linked rather than checking up on their activities. Annual appraisals are not as effective in this regard as semi-annual appraisals. A quarterly review of goals and planned activities, not a full appraisal, is often just the reminder staff need.

The way the budget is reported it is difficult to see just how much the project is dedicating to staff development. Making this expenditure explicit can only be beneficial and should be done.

Staff development is going on with good experience gained with other LWS[I] projects. In-house training also takes place, shaping staff that have not always had any previous experience.



### ***ARRP Evaluation – the activities***

- 1** Explaining a PRA exercise
- 2** Observation visit to project sub office
- 3** Interview with District Commissioner's Officials
- 4** PRA selection of priority intervention
- 5** Focus group discussion with women
- 6** PRA village mapping already completed by ARRP



***ARRP Evaluation – the people***

- 1 Santal and Bodo women & children**
- 2 Bodo women & children**
- 3 Santal men**
- 4 Bodo dancing girls**



## 4 CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations are together to avoid unnecessary repetition. The recommendations are set out against the specific objectives of the evaluation. They are practical as specified in the Terms of Reference, in order that the programme may serve the intended target population better, reach its goals and use scarce resources in an optimal way.

Overall, the impact of the project is significant. In fact, there is now more development in the district than was likely without the troubles. The development efforts in the communities have themselves brought about peace and the specific reconciliation approaches have borne fruit. ARRP works have brought peace, hence the report title *Peace Works*.

**1 The project was found to be largely relevant to local needs** and effective in addressing the challenges of the target community. It has addressed basic food security needs to some extent through the Food for Work scheme, built considerable community capacity in income generation and in organisation for development and achieved significant ethnic reconciliation. The community members themselves were all positive too about the relevance and effectiveness of project intervention. The priorities of different villages varied considerably, unsurprisingly. Some income generation trainings were given that were not relevant to market needs. While the community is well-versed with the Project activities, including the peace-building efforts, they were not familiar with the overall project goal and objectives. There is a stated practice of bottom-up planning with the community and this needs to be strengthened on the ground to make the project as relevant as possible.

The District government officials were unequivocal about the relevance of the project. It is relevant to local needs and effective in addressing the challenges of the target community. This, therefore, could be exploited further in the way of more proactive advocacy on the thornier issues remaining in the area, e.g. the rehabilitation and development of the Santal forest dwellers.

### ***It is therefore suggested that:***

- The project goal and objectives should be re-worded to be simpler and clearer so that the community themselves can discuss, understand and own them. They also need to more strategic rather than activity-based in order to maximise the sustainable impact.
- The community, through the various groups, should all be involved in preparing the Community Action Plan. The VDC especially should have a part in the actual decision-making with enough time to fit in with the well-oiled and protracted LWS[I] planning cycle. This should happen earlier in the phased schedule, say at the end of the capacity building phase after 1 year when the physical input for social and physical reconstruction starts.
- If this planning cycle could be foreshortened and simplified that would be even better.
- While the range of intervention needs to be maintained in order to be able to respond to VDC-directed priorities, the Project should only complement the services and benefits already provided by the District Offices. Some less relevant activities can then be omitted to save over-stretching resources, especially staff.
- The wording of the roadside village signposts needs to be modified from "LWS[I] adopted village" to something sounding less like a superior-inferior relationship to something that describes a more equal relationship such as "LWS[I] partner village". Since the evaluation visit LWS[I] has acted very promptly and changed the signs to read, "*LWS INDIA Partnered Project for Resettlement of Riot affected communities in ..... village*".

**2 The target villages have been selected fairly** according to the perceived criteria. The process of selection as described by the Project seems good with inputs from project, government, and the communities. The final decision as to which villages to accept for project intervention is not well documented and therefore is not as transparent as it could be. However, now that security is

much improved, there is no justification for the distance from the Project Office to be a criteria. The more remote villages should not be rejected, rather their remoteness should make them more suitable to be served by the project.

The Project stages of operation set out in the Annual Plan 2005 are ideal for each community over five years but they do not suit the progressive start of implementation in villages from year to year. It is not clear how these strategies fit together.

Similarly, when it comes to increasing the target population to cover all the riot-affected villages in the District, the phased strategy of intervention will need to be adjusted. The time span or the range of services will have to be contracted to match the planned project period. Alternatively, the project period needs to be extended. As it is, this District has become more developed after two and a half years as a result of the conflict than it would have done in the normal course of events in Assam. After five years the difference between this pocket of Assam and others untouched by conflict will be very marked indeed. It would seem more just, considering the bigger picture, for the benefits of development to be spread more widely and benefit more people in need in other places.

**Therefore, the recommendations are:**

- that some of the other initial criteria could be used again to ensure those most in need are addressed earlier than others in the remaining 2 years of the project.
- villages that are evaluated and not taken as target villages should be notified of the decision along with the reason for not choosing the village. This means the criteria for and the process of gathering and assessing the criteria should be transparent.
- to cover all affected villages within the present project period of 5 years, the project time in each village is reduced somewhat with the phases of resettlement contracted by 12-18 months in the presently served villages so that new villages can be started. The budget implications of this will need to be studied, along with staff capacity.

**3 The input into livelihood support and infrastructure,** the quality and efficient use of funds. The Food for Work scheme of road construction is well-established with very good documentation, quality of work, quality of food grain distributed and community satisfaction.

***The only recommendation therefore is:***

- that it continues, although with an extension of the project area and the time constraint of the project period of 5 years, the length of time for each village's schemes may have to be curtailed.

**4 Capacity building for income generation**

Self-help groups are the backbone of the sustainable project interventions. However, several skills training courses did not show any income-generating results e.g. candle –making. Little follow-up has been done to date. SHG operating training with the Government manual has been effective in building organisational skills and has led to a degree of empowerment in the women. They are able to speak in public meetings and feel at ease as representatives in the Village Development Committees. Women in SHGs stood out from non-members in the open discussions; they were livelier and better dressed. The results of all training already given need to be assessed by the project. Gender balance in workloads and in spending power is poor. Men have more free time in the villages and alcoholism in men is regarded as a problem. It may be that the project is potentially giving more work to already over-worked women while men have some potentially productive time available. LWS[[]] staff give skills training and government training opportunities are also tapped.

Deep-rooted gender issues are involved e.g. the gender imbalance in family responsibility. If empowerment is really important to this Project, then it is vital to address fundamental cultural and political gender issues. This can be from a basis of faith and social justice and also from a basis of human rights. The power relationship within marriage and in other sexual relations is increasingly recognised as the underlying root cause of ill health in women, especially STD, HIV/AIDS.

Often classroom or institution-based trainings do not provide enough time to practice the skill being trained for. Additionally, trainings often do not deal with the business (money management) and people (public relations and customer care and development) side of the business. These are learned by experience in formal or informal apprenticeship arrangements. Care should be taken for the training and skills development expectations for the placement with a list of skills to be taught. It is also very important that the safety of the trainee and the trainer be assured during the placement. Assessing the growing capacity of groups in income generation and in community building efforts is an important to devise and use well. Progressive support without an end goal and means of measurement is not possible. The scoring should be backed up with standardized descriptive observations so that when one staff ranks a group as “2” others will be sure what that means. It is important to know how old the group is in order to know what to expect capacity-wise. Obviously a group that has only been together for 6 months is not going to be as capable as a group that has been active for 2 years. Linking the scores to the “next step” for the development of the group obviously, needs to happen to keep the group moving forward and also to keep the staff focused on what each group needs to be working on and so what the staff needs to be working on.

**Therefore, it is suggested that:**

- More varied means of training and raising earning capacity should be considered e.g. apprenticeship schemes and the range of Government youth employment schemes.
- Communities need to be consulted first before skills trainings are offered in order to gain ownership, relevance and improve earning capacity.
- Consider using more technical experts to give training and Government trainings available locally.
- Simple market research is also recommended before further training is given.
- Employ more local men and women as community motivators, especially young Santal men, in order to inculcate a sense of purpose and social responsibility.
- Start a scheme either within existing SHGs or separately for CHVs to buy medicines and then charge for treatment and medicines to earn from their skills and knowledge. Refresher training on a regular basis is needed.
- More needs to be done with analyzing and supporting agricultural activities that are sustainable.
- It is suggested that follow-up of all training participants is a top priority to see if the trainings have resulted in useful income generating enterprise. If the trainings have been acceptably productive then they should continue. If they have not, then analysis should be done to improve the results.
- This follow-up exercise should be scheduled and budgeted for.
- The project could investigate apprenticeship-style training arrangements.
- Making financial resources available at the local level will encourage income generation activities, both agricultural based and service based efforts.
- a follow-up impact assessment measuring tree survival rate would assess the program’s true lasting impact.
- LWS[I] should increase the number of farmers’ groups as a priority so that they can access Government agriculture schemes, which are considerable.
- If the need is still there, the team suggests a recommitment to studying how to make cattle for ploughing available. The alternative is either going into debt buying them or seeking mechanical means which is not as beneficial overall.
- Both SHGs and farmers groups should have both men’s and women’s members.
- Gender-sensitive indicators to determine the empowerment and leadership capacity of women need to be sharpened, used and documented.
- The project cannot do too much to prevent new land grants being sold for profit or mortgaged other than lobby for it and document activities related to this while the project is in the area.

## **5 Community building for long-term sustainability**

VDCs have responded well to training and to taking responsibility for managing some community development schemes such as new drinking water systems. women have taken their part and can

be encouraged to think beyond their known horizons in terms of decision-making beyond the family, within the community. Gender is a deep and fundamental issue that affects many social development outcomes and needs to be addressed with a more concerted effort. Of course, as one staff member said, 'Development is not a magic wand to change the so-called patriarchal society within two years' time.

Health improvements will lead to community building and needs more focus. Out of 35 trained CHVs 4 are regularly and gainfully employed by MSF. Others give good service on a voluntary basis and are called by the government for specific campaigns and emergencies. A follow-up training has been given. The stock of medicines they had after the training is long gone. However, the will to advise the community still exists and should be built upon. From these points we can say that the trained CHVs are functioning regularly as a health care service in the community.

### **Recommendations:**

- The project needs to assess the capacity of SHGs and VDCs using criteria that the groups have identified themselves so that they buy in to the capacity assessment process.
- SHGs and VDCs could be registered as community-based organisations [CBOs] in their own right in order to gain maximum advantages from Government development schemes.
- Training for these groups should include more on human rights and equity to increase social inclusion in communities of the most marginalised such as disabled people.
- The project needs to introduce the accompaniment phase without delay in the original villages and should not delay so long where the project has started working more recently.
- Both practical and strategic gender issues need to be addressed as a fundamental issue, probably in staff first and then in the community. This is probably the best route to address alcoholism, by aiming to increase family responsibility in men
- The perceptions of men regarding women's social and economic empowerment need exploring by debate in order to address inequities.
- Street plays should be started to have effective result in peace and other critical issues like HIV/AIDS.
- The project should put more stress on conducting seminars, quiz competitions at community level on HIV/AIDS.
- The experiment with a revolving fund for medicines for CHVs should be pursued vigorously and funds obtained by any means to start private practice in a very small way.

## **6 Building trust and solidarity**

The peace building efforts have borne much fruit and the community appears remarkably transformed from earlier accounts. Women say they feel safe; the ethnic groups work together in the fields, go to each other's weddings, and walk out at night without fear. Indian society can be quite volatile so any sudden incident needs to be prepared for. The churches are keen to play a more active part especially with youth activities.

### **Recommendations:**

- Continue with peace building measures, including the church in events like sports competitions in order to raise the church profile in these efforts.
- Include role plays and worst case scenarios in peace building events for all ages, building up conflict resistance and resolution practices.
- Joint advocacy campaigns such as pushing for permanent land grants for Santalis can serve to fuse the communities further and the project can facilitate and support the Santal church leaders who want to lead in this. This needs to be tackled with a judicious mixture of religious leaders of both groups and experts from Government including Bodo Territorial officials in order to avoid future complications, if any.

## **7 Acceptance and competence of the non local staff**

The staff are very dedicated, living in the village area and travelling frequently. They are willing to learn and grow in competence. They are accepted well, although there is a small language issue with few community workers knowing Santal. One small voice in the Santal community mentioned a slightly overbearing attitude in some staff and the Project value of working with a service attitude is to be commended.

**Recommendations:**

- More staff need to improve Santali language skills and efforts to recruit more Santali staff members need to be continued, both men and women.
- The title of community organisers could be reviewed for the same reasons that the “adopted village” needed to change. “Facilitator” may be a more suitable word because the purpose of the project is to enable the village to organise itself.

## **8 Use and selection of local staff.**

Despite efforts, ARRP has only been able to recruit a few community animators from the locality.

**Recommendations:**

- As mentioned before, it is recommended that more local people, men and women, especially Santalis, are given roles of community animators or even as community facilitators if they have sufficient skills and commitment.

## **9 Cooperation and coordination with Government and other NGOs**

This is already very good. Further ways to use local resources efficiently can be sought. The good relations can be exploited in the best sense of the word by being more proactive in advocacy on a new level alongside the community.

**Recommendations:**

- The project and the community should push the government to make all information available to the people on development schemes and benefits and in all the local languages. Links with BDO village level workers need strengthening.
- CHVs should assist at the MSF clinics and develop systematic referral systems to them. Assisting at the clinics will enhance the CHVs knowledge and skills.
- The truckers’ NGO can train the community in HIV/AIDS awareness and local people can be encouraged to volunteer with the NGO to learn awareness raising skills with high risk behaviour groups.

## **10 Central Committee’s composition and relationship with the Project Management**

The role of the Committee and pattern of meetings needs to be defined more clearly. Information flows have improved from the start of the Project.

**Recommendations:**

- As members suggested, the role and composition of the Central Committee should be reviewed. Women members should form at least 33% of the Committee.

## **11 Overall management of the project**

There has been a lot of debate about job descriptions/profiles. Although staff say that a job description was circulated it would be good, they say, if it is once again distributed. Annual staff appraisals at project level have also been done so far our knowledge is concerned, but these should be recorded for the betterment of the project and the staff as well. It is necessary for all staff to know all the government schemes upto date. Some staff feel the need to enhance their understanding and reporting skills which may be we are bit lacking.

**Recommendations:**

- Review at project level of the goal and objectives to make them more strategic and logical and to enhance staff understanding and reporting skills.
- Enhanced staff management practices are needed with clear job descriptions and annual staff appraisals
- Better use of the Advisory Committee building up their role to increase the sustainability of community development.
- More women need to be recruited as community workers in order to demonstrate and enhance gender balance in society.
- Create a budget for staff development if at all possible

**APPENDIX 1****Terms of Reference (TOR)****Mid-term Evaluation****Assam Riot Victims' Rehabilitation/Development support (ARRP)****1. Background**

In May 1996 and September 1998 Kokrajhar district (lower Assam), consisting of two subdivisions – Kokrajhar and Gossaigaon - witnessed violent ethnic conflict between the majority Bodos and the minority migrant Santhal community. (Although the conflict affected other districts such as Dhubri and Bongaigaon, Kokrajhar was the worst affected.) Hundreds were reportedly killed, thousands of homes destroyed, and several lakh people of both communities displaced. The Assam State government brought in military force to quell the rioting, and over 250,000 people took refuge in 68 relief camps.

***LWS[I] Interventions between 1996-2003***

LWS[I] responded by providing temporary housing assistance, supplementary nutrition meals for women and children, economic skills training, clothing, education (school buildings and teachers) and so on. In this, it has been working together with other national and international NGOs. Right from the start, LWS[I] built up and sustained strong coordination with government agencies, at state, district and sub-division levels. As a result, in the long-term, LWS[I] was practically the only NGO with access to all relief camps in the state.

LWS[I] was also closely involved in the work of the local Inter Church Peace Mission, which worked to restore mutual trust between the two communities. NELC and Normisjon were also partners in these peace efforts.

In 1997, the majority of the refugees returned to their original villages and homesteads, with government provided rehabilitation grants. However, 23,000 families, designated “encroachers” (illegally occupying homestead lands), were unable to return. In addition, there were about 3,000 families who – despite having received rehabilitation grants – were unable to return to their original homes, living in small huts made of bamboo and plastic sheeting, close their to their original villages or on relief camp sites.

LWS[I] continued work with both groups, distributing blankets and plastic sheets to protect them from the severe winter. Under the supplementary nutrition program, more than 7.4 million meals were served. About 200 drinking water sources were developed in resettled villages. Since standing crops and stored seeds were destroyed in the riots, LWS[I] provided seed, fertilizers and agricultural implements to ease their struggle during this time.

LWS[I] worked closely with the Northern Evangelical Lutheran Church and Normisjon to assist the children of riot-affected families to continue going to school. In addition to paying honorariums to teachers, LWS[I] also provided supplementary nutrition to an average of 1,600 students daily.

However violence erupted in 1998 on two occasions, causing people to once again flee to the safety of the camps. LWS[I] continued to play a vital role in providing large-scale relief operations: supplementary nutrition benefited an average of 9,000 persons per day. Clothing and blanket distribution reached 24,000 persons. Temporary shelter material was given to 3,834 families, tube wells and ring wells installed. Agricultural assistance in terms of seeds, fertilizer and agricultural implements were provided to many families. Camp inmates were supported to operate temporary schools for children, while a large number of youth trained as health volunteers to meet the basic health care needs of the people.

During 2003 the conflict level gradually came down, and lot of people wanted to go back to their homestead where they had to begin rebuilding their village totally from scratch.

LWS[I] was approached by the District Commissioner to assist in rehabilitating those families who have returned to their own lands, by providing a variety of support – infrastructure (roads), housing, drinking water, education and livelihood. There were also requests coming from the riot victims and the government officials for rehabilitation that LWS[I] should intervene substantially and without delay, to address the severe economic and social problem being faced by the affected communities in the current situation.

LWS[I] prepared a project proposal for rehabilitation and development to Normisjon in 2003. Normisjon further approached NORAD for support. From 2004 a 5 year project was approved by support from Normisjon and NORAD with an Annual budget of approximately 150 000 USD.

## **2. Goal of the project**

The current project aims at building and ensuring long-term, stable, sustainable and secure lives and livelihoods, for communities who have only known and lived with fear, instability, violence and uncertainty for several years.

**Therefore, the specific short term and long term objectives are:**

1. To provide infrastructure, food security and livelihood support to communities who have returned to their own revenue / allotted lands from selected relief camps in Kokrajhar district.
2. This will include housing assistance, roads, and schools, as well as agricultural implements and seed support.
3. Access to safe drinking water (tube or ring wells) in all selected villages.
4. To provide capacity building training for new livelihood skills for both men and women.
5. To build community based systems and structures such as to ensure that support provided by LWS[I][I] through this project has longer-term sustainability.
6. To build bridges of trust and solidarity between Bodos and Santhals.
7. To establish stronger partnerships and linkages with Government systems and service providers, particular in areas of health care, education, agricultural extension and so on.

## **3. Aim and object for the evaluation**

2006 is the third year of the project and it is time for a project review to evaluate whether the project is on the right track. That means whether the approach is appropriate and effective in serving the target people in the best possible way and whether limited human and monetary resources are utilized efficiently. We also like to know how well the involvement of LWS[I][I] is welcomed and accepted by the local people. Practical recommendations for improvement will be an integrated part of the evaluation.

## **4. Approach and working methods**

The evaluation should be participatory in its approach and will be done by combination of the following methods:

- Study plans and reports of the project
- Interviews
- Group discussions
- Field observations

## **5. Specific objectives for the evaluation**

- 5.1 Assess the project profile and its relevance in the context. Is the project effective in addressing the challenges of the target group?
- 5.2 Assess the selection process of target area. Is it biased or directed by undue influence in some way?
- 5.3 Assess the input in livelihood support and infrastructure. Assess quality of work and whether resources invested are efficiently and well used.
- 5.4 Assess the capacity building program. To what degree has this program contributed to income generation.
- 5.5 Assess the community building efforts and its relevance for long term sustainability of the local community.
- 5.6 Assess the projects importance in building trust and solidarity between people groups of the area.
- 5.7 Assess acceptance and competence of the non local staff.
- 5.8 Assess use of and selection of local staff.
- 5.9 Assess cooperation and coordination with Government and other NGOs working in the same area.
- 5.10 Assess composition, cooperation and relationships between the Project Management and the local Advisory Committee.
- 5.11 Assess the overall management of the project and consider whether human and monetary resources are used according to approved plans and in line with internal rules and regulations of LWS[I].

## **6. Recommendations**

Give practical recommendations for each of the points under paragraph 5 above in order that the program may serve the people better, reach its goals and use scarce resources in an optimal way.

## **7. Evaluation team**

The team should have the following competence:

- Team Leader: Good understanding of Community Development in general.
- 1 Member: Good understanding of agriculture, fishery, food security
- 1 Member: Good understanding of construction of community houses, roads, wells etc. and be able to assess use of funds for such work.

## **8. Budget**

To be negotiated with the team

## **9. Tentative schedule**

Four days May 2-6<sup>th</sup> 2006

## **10. Reporting**

Written, electronic report to be submitted to Normisjon and LWS[I] at the latest by 10th June 2006

## APPENDIX 2

### Consultants' Curriculum Vitae Scott Allen Smith

Sister's Bazaar  
Mussoorie, Uttaranchal 248179  
India  
Phone: 91-135-2631878

[melscofam@sbcglobal.net](mailto:melscofam@sbcglobal.net)

#### **Academic Qualifications:**

1997 M. Sc. (Training), Leicester Univ. U.K.  
1986 Post-graduate Diploma (Social and Community Development), Coady International Institute, St. Xavier Univ., Canada.  
1982 M. S. (Soil Physics) Texas A&M University, U.S.A.  
1975 B. S. (Soil and Plant Sciences), Texas A&M University, U.S.A.

#### **Professional Experience:**

**1999 – present** Associate for Community Organising and Management Skills  
Training (see EHA pg. 2)  
**1998 – 99** Human Resources Development Consultant to the Rural Dept.  
of the United Mission to Nepal. (see U.M.N. pg. 2)  
**1991 - 98** Project Director for the Surkhet Project, a community organising-based  
rural development project of the U.M.N., Nepal (see SP on pg. 2)  
**1988 - 91** Trainer for cross-cultural preparation of international volunteers  
program for Habitat for Humanity International, GA USA.  
(See H.f.H. pg. 2)  
**1980 - 86** Project Director of the Christian Health and Agricultural Project, an  
integrated rural development project, Bangladesh (see CHAPA pg. 2)

#### **Other Experience:**

- Created and compiled a practical workshop guide for orienting and training field and mid-level personnel in empowerment based community organizing and development.
- Led a cross-cultural team in an organizational evaluation for the Leprosy Mission, Bangladesh, 2003.
- Wrote several development-related articles for magazines in Nepal and one for the Community Development Society (USA).
- 8 months interviewing candidates for the Recruitment and Orientation office of the Presbyterian Church (USA) in 1999-2000.

#### **Languages:**

Bengali: Nepali: Hindi: Spanish

#### **Personal Information:**

Born: 1952 Married with 4 Children:

Dated: Aug. 2005

**Key Accomplishments**

- EHA** I assisted several (8) community health projects associated with Emmanuel Hospital Association (EHA) hospitals to redefine their concept of Community Health and their role in that process. Through a series of workshops (16) over a two year period and numerous follow-up visits, I am training project staff (90+) to increase the capacity of communities to take a lead in their own development activities. I also began to regularise the association's human resources procedures for staff selections and development.
- UMN** I developed workshops dealing with the role of community empowerment within community development processes for the United Mission to Nepal (UMN). I designed and initiated an empowerment-based rural development project in far western Nepal. In this connection I collaborated in staff training/selection processes for the wider organization as well as codified management procedures of the project.
- SP** I designed, managed, and completed a village-based community development project which resulted in continuing community groups working in several sectors for their own development. My duties included budget and personnel management and development, project publicity and interpretation, cross-cultural management including developing the project's culture and direction. I developed and implemented various processes related to the project, from the staff selection process to a participatory evaluation process. I developed rational/explanation/justification for explaining the empowerment model to donors, government, and superiors. I used participatory methods to deal with personnel and program decisions of the project. Finally, I drafted and monitored the strategic plan for the project. The project had, at it's height, 35 staff with a budget of over \$100,000/yr.
- HfH** I was primary trainer for persons preparing for cross-cultural project management experience with Habitat for Humanity around the world. Training included technical, management, and interpersonal techniques for project management. The training course was 12 weeks long and over the two-year period I trained approximately 150 people.
- CHAPA** I developed staff empowerment models to maximise their skills and commitment. I managed various professionals in an attempt at an integrated rural development effort. Management of the project included budgeting, personnel management, planning, working closely with a multicultural board, and developing publicity for the project funders.

Aug' 05

**J. PETER JEYAMARAN**  
B.E., D.C.T & D.C.S, D.C.E

having a vast experience of about 20 years in the field of civil Engineering and related activities - Implementation/ monitoring / evaluation of projects all over India

**Nehemiah Consultancy Services** Construction management

No.8 Surya Prakasam street, Krishnapuram Ambattur, Chennai - 53

Phone: 91 - 44 - 26581783 Mobile: 94441 48694

**SPECIALIZATION / KEY COMPETENCIES :**

- Visit the areas under consideration and identify the kind of building / infrastructure to be planned in conjunction with the objectives of the Organization
- Render technical outlook and suggest appropriate designs to the organization and enable them in finalizing the same.
- Evaluate the construction projects under execution/completed already - in line with the objectives of the Organization and in conjunction with the original plans, timeline, designs, drawings and specifications - as well in terms of financial aspects
- Offering services in Technical (Design, BOQ..), Administration (Tender, Work Allocation) etc. and further supplying appropriate monitoring mechanism to the Organization for effectively monitoring the project.
- Conducting damage assessment survey and prepare assessment report
- Executing reconstruction programme for those affected by natural calamities through participatory involvement and rebuilding the lives , Earthquake resistant constructions ,Design of Low cost Buildings etc.Planning, Executing End to End Management of multiple reconstruction programmes , Coordinating with multiple agencies / groups,
- Managed /monitored / evaluated different types of Building Programmes executed in different Indian states: Maharashtra , Madhya Pradesh , Orissa , Bihar , West Bengal , Assam , Meghalaya , Nagaland , Gujarat , Punjab , Himachal Pradesh , Delhi, Uttar Pradesh , Karnataka ,TamilNadu and Andhra Pradesh.

**RELIEF / REHABILITATION**

- Visited Super cyclone affected areas in the state of Orissa , conducted relief activities for a village ,also 25 houses to those who lost the houses
- Visited earthquake affected areas in Gujarat , involved in relief Programme ,constructed four villages - 360 houses
- Involved in the rehabilitation project for the children of commercial sex workers in the city of Mumbai , a new village with homes , staff quarters , admin Building , etc.
- Visited Tsunami affected areas in Tamilnadu and engaged in temporary , semi permanent and permanent houses construction in various villages and thro various agencies

**CURRENT PROJECTS**

- Technical Consultancy and Project Management services to EFICOR for constructing about 320 houses to people affected by TSUNAMI at Cuddalore District of Tamil Nadu
- Technical consultancy to KNH in implementing construction activities - houses to people affected by Tsunami - at various Districts in Tamil Nadu

- Technical as well construction management consultancy for a residential project at Mysore
- Construction management of four residential Projects at Chennai
- Technical Consultancy to UESI for constructing a Students Centre at Tambaram , Chennai

2004 Onwards	2 years plus	Self employed	<b>NEHEMIAH CONSULTANCY SERVICES</b> CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT AN ENTERPRISE INVOLVED IN CONSULTANCY AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES
1992 to 2003	11 years	Civil Engineer	Holistic Child development India - KNH , Pune
1990 to 1992	2 years	Civil Engineer	YCLT , Yavatmal , Maharashtra
1987 to 1990	3 years	Civil Engineer	A.C.Rajan & Associates , Architects , Chennai
1986 to 1987	1 year	Tech.Asst	Public Works Dept ( P.W.D ) , TamilNadu

## MEMBERSHIP

A registered member of RedR India - and attended a few of the training programmes

## INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANCY OFFERED

visited Bangladesh to give Consultancy to another partner organization of KNH called as COB-CCC in planning the building works at their supported projects

## EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS :

<b>B. E (civil)</b> Bachelor of Engineering
<b>D.C.E</b> Diploma in Civil Engineering
<b>D.C.T &amp; D.C.S</b> Diploma in Concrete Technology and Design of concrete structures

**Knowledge in Computer** : MS-Word, MS-Excel  
**Languages Known** : English , Hindi , Tamil

## PERSONAL DETAILS

Date of Birth : May 26<sup>th</sup> , 1968  
Nationality : Indian  
Religion : Christian

CMAI, 2 Local Shopping Centre,  
A3 Janakpuri, New Delhi 110 058, INDIA

Permanent address: 41 Teddington Park,  
Teddington, Middx, TW11 8DB UK

## Curriculum Vitae

**Heather Payne**

Work: 0091 (0)11 2559 9991/2/3  
Home: Tel 011 2561 4199  
Mobile: Tel 98688 51991  
Email: [heather.payne@cmai.org](mailto:heather.payne@cmai.org)  
[heathermayapayne@gmail.com](mailto:heathermayapayne@gmail.com)

### Summary

I am a social development worker with experience in gender and disability issues and a background in the paramedical area of occupational therapy. My work in developing countries (Africa and Asia) has included training, management and project evaluation. Development communications is an area of expertise, with a particular emphasis on participatory approaches.

### Skills

- Management - personnel, financial and technical in community health service provision and disability information in UK and developing countries. Evaluation and change management to increase voice of poor marginalised rural communities.
- Training - in communication skills, advocacy, management etc using participatory methods. Trainers training.
- Disability - community-based rehabilitation in developing countries. Intergrated approach to empowerment of poor disabled people through meeting medical and social needs. Evaluation of CBR and information needs and services. Inclusive rights-based policy promotion.
- Communications – writing skills, newsletter production skills, participatory communication approaches e.g. photography and video and photographic skills.
- Computer programs including: Word, Exel, Power Point, Photo editor
- Languages – Nepali [fluent], Tamil [basic]; French [basic]
- English language teaching as a native speaker [CELTA qualification]

### Experience

#### **Christian Medical Association of India**

**Social Development Adviser** Jan 05 to date

- Introducing Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning organisational framework
- Project design & proposal writing
- Donor liaison & report writing
- Social development input to Policy and Advocacy Group, Community Health Dept
- Consultancy management

#### **British Executive Volunteers Overseas**

**Social Development Adviser** to Tibetan Government in Exile in India Sept-Nov 2004

- Introduced Community-based Rehabilitation services into Tibetan Settlements; researched training in India, presented paper to Ministry of Health, advised on 3 Year Plan, led community workshops.

#### **Shakespeare College, Old Street, London, UK**

**Teacher** Aug-Sept 2004

St Giles Language School, Highgate, London, UK

Teaching practice June-July 2004

#### **Healthlink Worldwide, London, UK**

**South Asia Regional Link Co-ordinator** 2000 - 2004

- Developed strategic projects with funding in health and disability information and communication focussing on people-centred communications to strengthen the voice of vulnerable people to influence policy and practice.
- Built capacity of partners and networks in strategy development, which was valued and sought after.

- Project design, fundraising and donor liaison in the framework of mutual partnerships.

#### **Disability consultancy and advisory role 2000 - 2004**

- Disability Adviser to SOURCE International Information Centre, University of London. Supported the compilation of a Directory of Essential Disability and Development Information Resources 2003.
- Co-chair of British Overseas NGOs in Development Disability and Development Group that is consulted by DfID on policy and supports members by sharing lessons learned, particularly in good practice and fundraising.
- Disability Adviser to DfID Disability Knowledge and Research communications sector.
- Adviser to WATSAN DfID Engineering Knowledge and research project, WEDC, Loughborough University, UK. Edited the literature review, rated the best that DfID Infrastructure Division had seen.
- Member of the International Disability and Development Consortium and the EU policy subgroup.

#### **Disability Programme Co-ordinator 1998 - 2000**

#### **Interserve / International Nepal Fellowship**

##### **Community Health Programme Manager 1994 - 1997**

- Streamlined participatory/consultative management; personnel, financial & technical
- Strengthened field-based intervention & empowerment of marginalised groups of poor farmers, women & girls and artisans.
- Increased support & collaboration with statutory multi-sector services
- Accelerated capacity-building in staff and community leaders, with gender bias.

##### **Community Health Training Officer 1993 - 1994**

- Expanded staff training options with internal & external resources.
- Developed and implemented new staff scholarship policy.
- Promoted participatory training approach with trainers' training
- Introduced participatory learning appraisal
- Led participatory impact evaluation of past community health intervention

#### **Interserve / United Mission to Nepal**

Women's Development & Health Adviser 1988 - 1991

#### **Birmingham Social Services**

Occupational Therapist 1985 – 1988, 1973-1980

#### **Interserve / Christian Medical College & Hospital, Vellore, India**

Occupational Therapist 1981-1984

#### **S. Birmingham Health Authority**

Occupational Therapist 1971-1973

2004 Cambridge CELTA [Certificate of English Language Teaching to Adults, formerly RSA CTEFLA] St Giles, Highgate, London, UK

1991-1992 University of Reading, Berks, UK [M.A.. Rural Social Development]

1985 Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, UK [Cross-cultural communication]

1984-1985 All Nations Christian College, Ware, Herts, UK

1971-1981 Several short courses in rehabilitation & adaptations of disabled people's homes

1968-1971 St Lyses School of Occupational Therapy, Exeter, UK [Diploma of Occupational Therapy]

1960-1967 Walthamstow Hall, Sevenoaks, Kent, UK [GCE: 8 O level, 2 A level]

## **Education & Training**

## **Conferences & papers**

XII International Leprosy Association Congress, Delhi, India 1984 Poster presentation on rigid rocker footwear.  
 Association of Women in Development, Washington DC, USA 1991 Participatory use of video in women's development.  
 "Whose voice is being heard?" Abilympics International Conference, Delhi, Nov 2003

## **Publications**

2 short articles in GO magazine, Interserve 1999  
 Mid-term review Chipata CBR Programme, Zambia 1998  
 Impact Evaluation of Burtibang Community Health Programme, Nepal 1993  
 "Video as a participatory tool for women" MA dissertation University of Reading 1992

**APPENDIX 3****Evaluation activity schedule completed**

<b>Date and Day</b>	<b>Activity/ Place of visit</b>	<b>People with whom the activity took place</b>	<b>Persons accompanied/ Remarks if any</b>
02/05/06 Tuesday	On travel Ms.Heather and Mr. Scoot from Delhi to Guwahati Peter from Chennai to Guwahati  Afternoon travel towards Gossaigaon  <u>Introductory meeting with LWS[I](I) officials</u>	Introductory meeting with Programme Director – LWS[I](I) – Mr.Mathai Kutti And Project co ordinator Mr.S.Sarkar And other staff of the Project	-
03/05/06 Wednesday	a.m  <u>Planning / discussion on expectations of evaluation</u>  Gossaigaon – LWS[I] (I) office  p.m  Visit to Kukrajhar <u>KII -</u> with Addl.Deputy Commissioner and Asst Commissioner of Kukrajhar Dist  visit to Ratgaon village informal visit to One of the zones of project	Programme Director – LWS[I](I) – Mr.Mathai Kutti And Project co ordinator Mr.S.Sarkar And other staff of the Project  Mr.Azad , ADC Mr.Sudarsan , Asst Commissioner  Ms.Rani Mr.Bhandari Mr.Sahoo Community organizers	Along with Programme Director – LWS[I](I) – Mr.Mathai Kutti And Project co ordinator Mr.S.Sarkar
04/05/06 Thursday	a.m Visit to Gaonchulka village People group – rawas,santhals - <u>KII with VDC</u>  at newly built community centre	Separate interviews with  Men, women and youth of the VDC  Separate interviews with	Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.s.Sarkar Mr. Topan Roy Mr.Bhimram Das

	<p>Visit to Burachara village People group - santhals</p> <p>- <u>KII with VDC</u> at newly built community centre</p> <p>p.m</p> <p>Visit to Pakri Kuri village People group - Bodos</p> <p><u>PRA</u></p> <p>at newly built community centre</p> <p><u>KII with Sub - Divisional Officer</u></p> <p><u>KII with Medical doctor</u></p> <p>At Hotel Review of the day activities</p>	<p>Men, women and youth of the VDC and farmers</p> <p>With the community</p> <p>Mr. A.K.Soharia SDO</p> <p>Dr.M.R.Dev . M.B.B.S</p>	<p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.s.Sarkar Mr. Topan Roy Mr.Bhimram Das Mr.J.B.Limboo</p> <p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.s.Sarkar Mr. Topan Roy Mr.Bhimram Das Mr. K.Sahoo Ms. Kanchan Kalwar Mr. P.Narzary</p> <p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.S.Sarkar</p> <p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.S.Sarkar</p>
05/05/06 FRIDAY	<p>a.m</p> <p>Visit ot Athiabari village People Group - Santhals</p> <p><u>KII with various people</u></p> <p>Visit to Bamnijhora village People from two more villages came here - Borobadha and singemari villages</p> <p>People Group - Bodos and santhals</p> <p><u>KII with various people</u> Also gender questions</p>	<p>Interviews with VDC president Pastor Farmers SHGs Gram Sevak</p> <p>Interviews with VDC president Pastor Farmers SHGs Youth</p>	<p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.s.Sarkar Mr. Imam Mr.Bhimram Das Mr. K.Sahoo Mr.N.Sahoo Ms. Kanchan Kalwar Ms.K.Rani</p> <p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.s.Sarkar Mr.Bhimram Das Mr.G.Panda Mr.P.Sutradhan Mr.Prakal Narzary</p>

	<p>p.m</p> <p>Visit to Jiaguri village People group – Bodos</p> <p><u>PRA</u></p> <p>At LWS[I] Office</p> <p><u>KII with Executive Member , BTDA</u></p> <p><u>KII with Principal of Gossaigaon College</u></p> <p><u>KII with the Chairman – Project Central committee</u></p> <p><u>KII with Bishop of NELC Bongaigaon Diocese</u></p> <p><u>KII with Secretary – Central Committee - NELC – Grahampur Diocese</u></p>	<p>PRA With the village community</p> <p>Mr.Sobaram Basumatary Executive Member ,BTDA</p> <p>Prof.Issa Basumatary ( he is also the Director of NEL)</p> <p>Mr.Majem Narzary</p> <p>Bishop N.N.Borguary</p> <p>Mr.Philion Baskey</p>	<p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.s.Sarkar Mr.Bhimram Das Mr.P.S.Thakur MrK.Sema Mr.Prakash</p> <p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.s.Sarkar</p> <p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.s.Sarkar</p> <p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.s.Sarkar</p> <p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.s.Sarkar</p> <p>Mr.Mathai Kutti Mr.s.Sarkar</p>
<b>06/05/06 SATURDAY</b>	<p>SWOT , Glad , Sad assessment</p> <p><u>KII with Programme Director</u></p> <p><u>KII with Project coordinator</u></p> <p>Feed back from the project staff</p> <p>Feed back to the Project on the evaluation results</p>	<p>With LWS[I](I) project team</p> <p>Mr.Mathai Kutti</p> <p>Mr.S.Sarkar</p>	<p>All the Project staff</p>
<b>07.05.06 SUNDAY</b>	<b>Bye Bye to Gossaigaon – return to different places</b>		

## APPENDIX 4

### Evaluation tools – questionnaires

#### 1 Interview questions for Government and/or Project informants

1. So far to what extent has the project given the right kind of help to the people in need? [Both human development & physical construction]
2. What are the results to date of the project intervention?
3. Is the project meeting its 5 yr goal and objectives?
4. How fair was the selection process?
5. What criteria were used?
6. Who decided on the criteria and judged the criteria?
7. How well was the budget divided between costs for livelihood and infrastructure?
8. Were the results worth the money spent?
9. What builds trust between people?
10. How well has the project done this?
11. how well will the results of the project last
12. How much have they helped?
13. How much have they blocked/obstructed?
14. How much have they ignored?
15. How open has the project been regarding their work?
16. In what other ways can the project cooperate and coordinate in the future?
17. How appropriate is the composition of the Advisory committee?
18. How well does the project management work with the Advisory committee?
19. How important is the advice of the Advisory committee to the project management?
20. How effective has the project been in the use of its money?
21. How efficiently has it used its staff?
22. How well has it followed the approved plans?
23. How well has it followed LWS[I]'s internal guidelines?

## **2 FGD & KII Interview questions Community Informants**

1. So far to what extent has the project given the right kind of help to the people in need? [Both human development & physical construction]
2. What are the result to date of the project intervention?
3. Is the project meeting its 5 yr goal and objectives?
4. How well has the project helped people to earn more money?
5. How did they do this?
6. How much more money?
7. Who controls the new money in the family?
8. How well do the VDC fullfill their responsibilities?
9. How well do the VDC fullfill their responsibilities?
10. What are the VDCs responsibilities?
11. How much has the project influenced the VDC functioning?
12. what other organizations/CBOs lead the development of the area?
13. What are their responsibilities?
14. How well do they fullfill their responsibilities?
15. How much has the project influenced this? Rate the likelihood of these organizations continuing after the project leaves?
16. What builds trust between people?
17. How well has the project done this?
18. how well will the results of the project last
19. How well have they been accepted by the local community?
20. How well have they done their jobs?
21. How much responsibility have local staff been given?
22. How transparent was the staff selection process for local people?
23. How effective has the project been in the use of its money?
24. How efficiently has it used its staff?
25. how well has it followed the approved plans?
26. How well has it followed LWS[II]'s internal guidelines?

### 3 LWS[I] Evaluation Questionnaire for LWS[I] Project Staff

Q. No.	Question	Rating 1-5	Comments/examples
C1	Has the project given the right kind of help to the people in need? [Both human development & physical construction]?		
C4	How fair was the selection process for the target area?		
C5	What criteria were used?	No rating needed XXXXX	
C6	<b>Who decided on the criteria and judged the criteria?</b>	XXXXX	
C7	How well has the project helped people to earn more money?		
C11	How well do the VDC fulfill their responsibilities?		
C13	What are the VDCs responsibilities?	XXXX	
C15	What other organizations/CBOs lead the development of the area?	XXXX	
C19	Which non-project organizations do the CBO's work with? What activity?	XXXX	
C20	Rate the likelihood of these relationships continuing after the project leaves?		
C23	How well will the results of the project last?		
C23	How transparent was the staff selection process for local people?		
C29	How effective has the project been in the use of its money?		
C30	How efficiently has it used its staff?		
C31	How well has it followed the approved plans? [5year goal and objectives]		
C32	How well has it followed LWS[I]'s internal guidelines?		
G7	How well was the budget divided between costs for livelihood and infrastructure?		
G8	Rate to what extent the results were worth the money spent?		
G16	In what other ways can the project cooperate and coordinate with the government in the future?		

## 4 STAFF PROJECT SWOT & BEEM ANALYSES

### STRENGTHS

- Unity / Interpersonal Relation
- Positive Attitude
- Networking & Coordination with different Stakeholder
- Bottom up and Top down Approach within LWS1
- Staff Resource
- Documentation
- Learning Organisation

### WEAKNESSES

- Local Language
- Lack of space for Training / Workshop /Accommodation for guests
- Less Women Staff
- Planning
- More Training / Lack

### OPPORTUNITIES

- Govt Support
- Community Support
- Acceptance (of all our activities)
- Scope for IG activity (Land, Human resources)
- Learning Environment

### THREATS

- Insurgency problem
- Disaster
- Frequent misunderstanding between the community
- Communication
- 3B – Bomb, Blast, Bandh

### BUILD - STRENGTH

- Better Orientation
- Discussion & Make Communication
- Introductions of Self Appraisal Tools
- Capacity Building

### ELIMINATE - WEAKNESSES

- Learning Attitude
- Involvement of more women staff
- Networking & Coordination
- Developing sense of ownership include community in planning @ net level

### EXPLOIT - OPPORTUNITIES

- Govt Support - Relation, Participation, awareness of Govt scheme
- Community Support - Community Empowerment
- Acceptance - Transparency, Vision & Mission
- Scope for IG Activity - More training, Workshop, Exposure Analysis
- Learning Environment - Documentation, sharing, base for developing peace reconciliation approach

### MINIMISE - THREATS

- Insurgency - Peace related activity, more IG activity for unemployed
- Disaster - Manmade – peace reconciliation, disaster preparedness
- Communication - Linkage with Govt scheme, Community participation

**APPENDIX 5**

**LWS[I] Kokrajhar ARRP Evaluation interview report 26.5.06**  
**Yuhanna Pradhan CMAI CHD\_NEI Project Officer**

**Introduction:**

I interviewed two groups in two project villages (Athiabari-Santhal village and Bamunijhora village). The groups were comprised of village headman; schoolteachers, evangelists, CHVs and youth group members. I also interviewed Shri Bongay Shor Mushary and Egit Basumatary (Head Man) of adjacent non-project village called Athaibari Thinali. The group narrated the heart-rending story of riots, how their near and dear ones were killed, and houses burnt down, livestock, food and trees destroyed. Those who could run took refuge in the government relief camps. [number of years ago?] After the riot, nothing was there when they returned to their villages from the relief camp. [number of years ago?] The devastating effects of the riot will never be erased from their memories.

**Support received from LWS[I][I] and the results:**

When they started re-building their villages on their own with no outside resources and help, the LWS[I][I] responded promptly to the various needs of the villagers. This sentence is not really adding anything-better cut.

To help villagers construct their houses LWS[I][I] provided 8 pieces of tin for roofing with bamboo, also 30 kg of rice, mustard oil and 3 kg of pulses to each needy family.

LWS[I][I] facilitated dug tube well for safe drinking water, constructed latrines, distributed seeds such as paddy, mustard, radish, and potato, initiated kitchen garden, distributed trees seedling.

To enhance families' income LWS[I][I] provided training on tailoring, embroidery, cycle and tube well repair, vermi-compost, candle and soap making and provided sewing machine and loom to SHGs members., .

To link the villages with the main road LWS[I][I] constructed new village approach roads, culverts repair and broaden the existing roads. The whole community was involved in this food for work programme. Primary schools [number?] were started & teachers [number?] employed to check the dropouts as well as to ensure all the village children received at least primary education.

In order to build trust between the two ethnic groups and to enhance unity the community centres, were erected, games like football, volleyball and badminton were introduced and peace rally were held.

To strengthen the program village development committee and self-help groups were formed community health volunteers were selected by the VDC at each village levels. Now CHVs are referring the patient mainly with maternity problem to the nearby PHC. SHGs were linked with the bankers for loan. Farmers were linked with the Kishan Vikash Kendra for agricultural training. Spades were provided. VDC members are fully aware of their role and responsibilities in the villages.

Information was disseminated and training were organised on HIV / AIDS, environmental sanitations, Immunization and MCH, Malaria, safe drinking water etc.

Out of 28 KII questionnaire majority of the respondent gave 4 score to the LWS[I] intervention in these riot hit villages. The good work of the LWS[I] is spreading in neighbouring non-project villages like Athaibari Thinali. The village headman has already forwarded the application to the LWS[I] to include his village in next expansion plan.

\*\*\*\*\*

## APPENDIX 6

LWS[I] Assam Riot Victims' Rehabilitation and Support Project MID-TERM EVALUATION												
Scored results of stakeholders' interviews & discussions - part 1 of 3												
On a scale 1- 5 where 5 is highest value KII key informant interview FGD focus group discussion ASO Assistant Subdivision Officer SHO Senior Health Officer BDO VW Block Development Office village worker VDC Village Development Committee	Government			Community						Total score	Number of respondents	Average
	KII ASO	KII SHO	KII BDO VW	KII evan	KII teach	FGD 1	FGD 2	FGD 3	FGD VDC			
<b>Project relevance &amp; effectiveness</b>												
How well has the right help reached needy people ?	5	5	3	3	4	5	4	5	5	39	9	4.3
Rate the results to date of the Project intervention?	4	5		4	4					17	4	4.3
Is the Project meeting its 5yr goal and objectives?			4		4				4	12	3	4.0
<b>Selection of target areas</b>												
How fair was the selection process?	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	3	41	9	4.6
<b>Cost effectiveness</b>												
How well was budget divided?												
Were the results worth the money spent?			4							4	1	4.0
<b>Capacity Building</b>												
How well has ARRP helped people earn more money?			3	3	3		5	5	1	20	7	2.9
<b>Community and network building</b>												
How well do the VDC fulfill their responsibilities?				3	3	3	5		3	17	5	3.4
How well do they fulfill their responsibilities?				3					2	5	2	2.5
Rate likelihood of CBOs continuing after the project												
Rate likelihood of infrastructure lasting ?			4			5	5	4	3	21	6	3.5
<b>Building trust and solidarity</b>												
How well has the project done this?		3	5	2	5	5	5	5		30	8	3.8
How well will the results of the project last ?		4	4		4	5				17	4	4.3
How well have outside staff been accepted?			3	4	4				4	15	4	3.8
How well have outside staff done their jobs?				4	4					8	2	4.0
How much responsibility have local staff been given?				4	4					8	2	4.0
How transparent was the staff selection process ?												
<b>Cooperation with GOs and NGOs</b>												
How much have they helped ARRP?	5	5	5							15	3	5.0
How open has ARRP been regarding their work?												
<b>Central committee status and use</b>												
How appropriate is the composition of the committee?												
How well does ARRP work with the Committee?												
How important is the Committee to the Management?												
<b>Overall management of the project</b>												
How well has the project used its money?	5		5				5		4	19	5	3.8
How efficiently has it used its staff?	5	5	5				5			20	4	5.0
how well has it followed the approved plans?												
How well has it followed LWS internal guidelines?												

*LWS[I] Assam Riot Victims' Rehabilitation and Support Project* **MID-TERM EVALUATION**  
**Scored results of stakeholders' interviews & discussions – part 2 of 3**

<p><b>On a scale 1- 5 where 5 is highest value</b></p> <p>* Project management scores are included in total score on next table, not in total staff score in this table. This is to show staff opinion separate to management opinion.</p>	* Project Manag'ent		Project Staff																Total staff only	Responden ts	Average
<b>Project relevance &amp; effectiveness</b>																					
How well has the right help reached needy people ?	4	3	3	3	5	4	5	5	5	3	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	67	16	4.19
Rate the results to date of the Project intervention?	3	4																			
Is the Project meeting its 5yr goal and objectives	5	5																			
<b>Selection of target areas</b>																					
How fair was the selection process?	5	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	74	16	4.63
<b>Cost effectiveness</b>																					
How well was budget divided ?	4	3	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	71	16	4.44
Were the results worth the money spent?	5	4	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	67	16	4.19
<b>Capacity Building</b>																					
How well has ARRP helped people to earn more money?	-	-	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	5	0	5	57	16	3.56
<b>Community and network building</b>																					
How well do the VDC fulfill their responsibilities?			3	3	5	3	3	4	5	3	3	3	3	5	4	5	5	3	60	16	3.75
How well do they fulfill their responsibilities?			-																		
Rate likelihood of CBOs continuing after the project			3	3	3	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	1	5	4	0	5	4	56	16	3.50
Rate likelihood of infrastructure lasting			4	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	3	3	4	5	4	5	0	4	64	16	4.00
<b>Building trust and solidarity</b>																					
How well has the project done this?	3	5	-																		
how well will the results of the project last ?	2	3	-																		
How well have outside staff been accepted?	5	5	-																		
How well have outside staff done their jobs?			-																		
How much responsibility have local staff been given?			-																		
How transparent was the staff selection process ?			4	3	5	5	4	5	4	3	4	4	2	5	4	5	5	4	66	16	4.13
<b>Cooperation with GOs and NGOs</b>																					
How much have they helped ARRP?	5	5																			
How open has ARRP been regarding their work?	5	4																			
<b>Central committee status and use</b>																					
How appropriate is the composition of the committee?	4	3																			
How well does ARRP work with the Committee?	4	3																			
How important is the Committee to the Management?	3	4																			
<b>Overall management of the project</b>																					
How well has the project used its money?	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	72	16	4.50
How efficiently has it used its staff?	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	-	4	5	5	5	5	0	4	61	16	3.81
How well has it followed the approved plans?	5	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	0	4	4	67	16	4.19
How well has it followed LWS's internal guidelines?	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	76	16	4.75

LWS[1] Assam Riot Victims' Rehabilitation and Support Project MID-TERM EVALUATION			
Scored results of stakeholders' interviews & discussions - part 3 of 3			
<i>On a scale 1-5 where 5 is highest value</i>	Total score	Total no of responses	Overall average
<b>Project relevance &amp; effectiveness</b>			
What extent has the right kind of help reached needy people ?	113	27	4.19
Rate the results to date of the Project intervention?	24	6	4.00
Is the Project meeting its 5yr goal and objectives	22	5	4.40
<b>Selection of target areas</b>			
How fair was the selection process?	124	27	4.59
<b>Cost effectiveness</b>			
How well was budget divided between livelihood and infrastructure?	78	18	4.33
Were the results worth the money spent?	80	19	4.21
<b>Capacity Building</b>			
How well has the project helped people to earn more money?	77	25	3.08
<b>Community and network building</b>			
How well do the VDC fulfill their responsibilities?	77	23	3.35
How well do they fulfill their responsibilities?	5	4	1.25
Rate likelihood of CBOs continuing after the project leaves?	56	18	3.11
Rate likelihood of infrastructure lasting ?	85	24	3.54
<b>Building trust and solidarity</b>			
How well has the project done this?	38	10	3.80
how well will the results of the project last	22	6	3.67
How well have outside staff been accepted?	25	6	4.17
How well have outside staff done their jobs?	8	2	4.00
How much responsibility have local staff been given?	8	2	4.00
How transparent was the staff selection process ?	66	18	3.67
<b>Cooperation and coordinations with G.O.s and NGOs</b>			
How much have they helped?	25	5	5.00
How open has the project been regarding their work?	9	2	4.50
<b>Central committee status and use</b>			
How appropriate is the composition of the committee?	7	2	3.50
How well does the Management work with the Committee?	7	2	3.50
How important is the Committee to the Management?	7	2	3.50
<b>Overall management of the project</b>			
How effective has the project been in the use of its money?	101	23	4.39
How efficiently has it used its staff?	88	22	4.00
how well has it followed the approved plans?	77	18	4.28
How well has it followed LWS's internal guidelines?	85	18	4.72
<b>Overall average score</b>			<b>3.72</b>