



Project Evaluation

**Livelihood development for vulnerable remote communities as
alternative to relocation project
Khoun and Kham districts, Xieng Khouang province**

(January 1 2004 – January 31, 2005)

Conducted February 15 -19 2005

for CRWRC

Mr. Steeve Daviau Team Leader

March 03 2005

Table of contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Project Evaluation | 1 |
| Table of contents | 2 |
| I. Introduction to project background | 3 |
| 1.1 Objective of the evaluation | 4 |
| 1.2 Background information | 4 |
| 1.3 Specific Objective: | 4 |
| 2. Scope of the evaluation | 4 |
| 2.1 Evaluation methodology | 5 |
| 2.2 Evaluation Team | 6 |
| 2.3 Study constraints and limitations | 6 |
| 3. Resettlement issue | 6 |
| 3.1 Impact of resettlement | 6 |
| 3.2 Resettlement issue in Xieng Khouang | 7 |
| 4. Analysis of project outputs, impacts and weakness | 7 |
| 4.1 Road and foot path construction | 7 |
| 4.2 Food security | 8 |
| 4.3 Hygiene and sanitation and clean water construction | 12 |
| 4.5 Project implementation and community participation | 13 |
| 4.5.1 Participation | 13 |
| 4.5.2 Implementation | 13 |
| 4.5.3 Additional observations | 14 |
| 5. Conclusion | 14 |
| 6. Recommendations | 16 |
| 6.1 Efficiency in addressing Resettlement issue | 16 |
| 6.1.1 Relevance of the targeting: | 16 |
| 6.1.2 CRWRC involvement and resettlement issue: 3 cases | 16 |
| 6.1.3 New approach | 17 |
| 6.2 Food security | 18 |
| 6.3 GFS | 18 |
| 6.4 Health | 19 |
| 6.5 Road | 19 |
| 6.6 Education | 19 |
| 6.7 Participation | 19 |
| 6.8 Implementation | 20 |
| 6.9 Gender issue | 20 |
| 6.10 Efficiency | 20 |
| 7. Bibliography | 22 |
| 8. Appendix | 22 |
| 8.1 Timeframe | 22 |
| 8.2 Participants to the presentation | 23 |
| 8.3 TOR | 24 |

Acronyms

| | |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| CRWRC | Christian Relief World Reformed Church |
| ECHO | European Community Humanitarian Organization |
| EUR | Euro |
| FUF | Friends of Upland Farmers |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| GFS | Gravity Fed System |
| GOL | Government of Laos |
| Ha | Hectare |
| ICCPR | International Covenant o Civil and Political Rights |
| IRAP | I Rural Access Profile |
| LFA | Land and Forest Allocation |
| MCTPC | Ministry of Construction Transport Post and Communication |
| NFE | Non Formal Education |
| PHC | Primary Health Care |
| PTA | Parents and Teacher Association |
| PRA | Participatory Rural Appraisal |
| RRA | Rapid Rural Appraisal |
| UNDP | United Nation Development Project |
| UNESCO | United Nation Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization |
| UXO | Unexploded Ordinance |
| VHV | Village Health Volunteer |
| XKH | Xieng Khouang |

I. Introduction to project background

1.1 Objective of the evaluation

The purpose of this End of Project Evaluation is to evaluate the project's effectiveness, and results measured against goals, objectives, results and outputs set forth in the project proposal. The evaluation will offer strategic and operational recommendations to ensure future direction, sustainability and effectiveness of this program.

1.2 Background information

This Evaluation is focusing on the 13 months (January 1 2004 – January 2005) of implementation of the ECHO project totalizing 503,000 EUR. ECHO is the humanitarian aid office of the European Union. This project fits in the first year of a 5-year program. The project targets 3,332 beneficiaries in Kham and Khoun districts.

1.3 Specific Objective:

According to the proposal submitted to ECHO, the project overall objective is to provide of alternatives to avoid forced resettlement of 12 ethnic minority villages in Khoun and Kham districts, Xieng Khouang province.

Overall objective:

The livelihood of vulnerable remote communities has been significantly improved so that relocation is prevented

Project objective 1:

The communities have better access to basic services and markets through improved foot path and road access

Project objective 2:

The communities have improved food security through increased agricultural production, better storage and marketing

Project objective 3:

The communities have access to sufficient safe drinking water

2. Scope of the evaluation

The *raison d'être* of this evaluation is because it was planned in the project proposal. The achievements may not have justified the holding of an evaluation at this stage since

many activities just have been initiated and the impacts difficult to measure. Nevertheless, the consultant could assess the relevance of the main objective of the project: the maintenance of villages in their traditional setting to avoid forced resettlement.

2.1 Evaluation methodology

As stated by the TOR,

“Generally, the evaluation will be appreciative, participatory and learning centered in its approach. It will involve stakeholders who represent the community, project, CRWRC and GOL. An evaluation team will be formed of appropriate expertise selected by stakeholders. Relevant information will be gathered from reading, data analysis, one on one conversations/interviews, focus group discussion and debriefing of group and individual site visits. Participatory Rural Appraisal will be used as primary tools in the evaluation.”

2.1.1. Prior going to the field:

- Meeting with country director to discuss about the project
- Secondary data including research on resettlement issue in Xieng Khouang
- Project documents: Proposal to ECHO, Interim Narrative Reports, RRA and Appraisal Inquiries 03 2003, PRA 05 2003.

2.1.2. Xieng Khouang:

- Briefly discuss with project staff; done during village visit
- District level: vice governor
- Sub-district level: head or vice head in Sadnoy and Nam Tehr sub-district.

2.1.3. Community level:

- 7 target villages have been visited in three days
- History establishment, number of families, provenance
- Clan system
- Migration patterns, since the establishment of the village
- Plan of migration (whole village, segments, clans, households, individuals) to address the dynamic of migrations
- Government policy; meetings, letters, villager’s opinion concerning the resettlement of their community, resettlement site; status of the village
- Activities implemented
- Beneficiaries for each activity (wealth ranking for 5/7 villages)
- Process of distribution/setting/planning and results.
- Vision of the project, weakness and strengths and suggestions for improvement

2.2 Evaluation Team

| No. | Name and Surname | Responsibilities |
|-----|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Mr. Steeve Daviau | Anthropologist, Team Leader |
| 2 | Mr. Sida Sayaphet | Program Manager |
| 3 | Mr. Leexong Leetakoon | Assistant Project Manager |
| 4 | Mrs. May Saydala | Team Leader for Education |
| 5 | Mr. Bouaphan Phosana | Head Social Relief Department |

Mr. Leexong and Mrs. May Saydala are both Hmong people and provide the team leader with valuable assistance in translating Hmong language.

2.3 Study constraints and limitations

- Planned evaluation (usually the external evaluator plans the evaluation and select the villages to be visited and the stakeholders to be met).
- Time limitation (1 hr/village; in reality the discussions extended longer in all villages).
- Lack of documents prior to go to the field (the team leader received the village profile and the results of the RRA and the PRA conducted in 2003 between the field visit in Kham and Khoun district, so I didn't know about each village activities prior to go to Kham district).
- It wasn't planned to meet any authorities at district and province level, but the team managed to meet authorities at sub-district and district level.
- The time limitation did not allow using methodologies such as gender disaggregated focus group discussions, household interviews, etc. and the team had to limit the scope of the investigations to the village authorities: head, vice-head, party secretary, and key informants.
- Some activities have just started and are not bearing fruits yet

3. Resettlement issue

3.1 Impact of resettlement

Resettlement in the context of development has many devastating impact on resettled communities: brutal degradation of the living condition of the population involved, increased mortality, increased vulnerability, increased prevalence of water-born diseases, loss of food security, social conflicts, etc. There is growing awareness among donors, NGOs and government, but resettlement is still ongoing and the project aims to address this issue in the two target districts. Source: Laurent Romagny and Steeve Daviau, 2003; Synthesis on Resettlement in Long district, Luang Namtha province, Action Contre la Faim, Vientiane, Lao PDR

3.2 Resettlement issue in Xieng Khouang

In the Nineties, about 2000 Hmong refugees from Thailand were repatriated. These repatriations were realized under the responsibility of the United Nations and many projects were implemented to facilitate their return and their integration.

At the same time, the authorities of the province and districts initiated many resettlements of villages. According to the UNDP report from 1997, we observe that (between 1990-97) more than 70 Hmong villages (14% of total of villages) were moved within the province and between the districts. The resettlements are directed from East to West with the districts of Kham and Pek as principal zones of settlement; some villages from north of Kham were also relocated to the south of this district. Villages visited in Kham after the Liberation, answering the call of the state to settle in the plain and cultivate paddy cultivation (Sanjohtai); but after the return of the Tai Dam that had left during the war, they had to give back the land to their owner according to the decree 194 on inheritance. Meuang Kham was established in 1784 (IRAP: 1998) and Hmong people arrived in Xieng Khouang after, starting from 1830 onward.

The area has been the theater of important fighting during the war. In Houay Loun village, in Khoun was General Vang Phao Airfield while the hill over Sanchotai village in Kham district was an American base. People were trapped between two factions and many villages fled for more quiet areas only to come back at the end of the conflict.

In both districts, all communities have faced migration from segments, households, clan out of their village toward the lowland, the US, Vientiane, the district or provincial center, etc. Many are almost half of the number of household they have been once.

Local development strategy includes establishing village clusters (2 in each of the 3 sub-district in Kham). The villages closer to the road become the center; government will lecture the others to resettle near road or river. People will move. In Kham, the idea isn't to bring all upland villages to the lowland, but to fill the space available where land is available according to the Land and Forest Allocation (LFA). Ideally people will move not separated but all together, but split if no carrying capacity. **8 villages** are concerned by resettlement in Kham and **1 village** in Khoun district but this information is incomplete.

4. Analysis of project outputs, impacts and weakness

4.1 Road and foot path construction

Outputs:

- 12 villages were surveyed for foot path construction
- Tools have been distributed

- 9/12 villages have been digging their foot paths
- 40 km of footpaths were upgraded (35+5)
- 88.8 tones of rice distributed
- 7,756 m3 of rocks destroyed using dynamite
- 52,190 m2 of foot path cleared of UXO

Impacts:

- Transportation is eased from and to the villages, people are investing in transportation means like in Houay Hok, 5 household bought a motorbike.
- In Phakok village, the price for hiring a truck to carry goods decreased from 800,000 – 1 million kip to 100,000. Rice price increased from 1,000 kip/kg to 1,300 kip/kg. Also, since the road is built, merchants come directly to the villages and villagers can negotiate more easily; before they would bring their harvest in the district centre and were more vulnerable and would accept lower price.

Weaknesses:

- Post distribution monitoring: in Keo Leuk, hoes were not enough for the labour, same for Houay Loun that is short 10 hoes. Generally, in many villages, shovels aren't used because people don't need them.
- In Huayloun village, villagers complained about the poor supervision, since they dig in the wrong direction for the GFS pipeline system and lost their labour investments.
- There was not enough technical supervision in Phakok that has a lot of un-used labour mentioned the village head resulting in delay in the realisation of the construction work needing technical expertise.
- If villagers generally satisfied with the rice they received for their labour (rice for work), there has been delay in distributing rice in the rainy season.

4.2 Food security

4.2.1 Corn

Outputs:

- 116 kg of seeds provided to 33 households
- 7.75 ha planted
- 14,373 kg of maize were harvested

Impacts:

- Corn had had the best results in terms of production. Two maize per plant were harvested and up to 450 kg per kg of seedlings planted.

- Better yields than the indigenous species that have been used many years

Weaknesses:

- The participation in planting cash crops is directly linked to the availability of the road to bring the production to the market.
- Seeds were brought late in the season and the villagers had started to plant their own indigenous seeds in case CRWRC would never show up with the promised seeds. Then the surfaces were not available anymore when the seedlings finally arrived.
- Distribution in sub-district centre. Villagers are told how to do by the head of the sub-district of Sadnoy.
- No demonstration in field is implemented in many villages. Only in Keo Leuk village, villagers in Keo Leuk couldn't make it to the sub-district capital and missed the training. They picked up the seedlings and were told by the head of the sub-district how to plant.
- In Houay loun, villagers say technical support advise them wrongly and there was a confusion between maize and soybean, and the farmers planted according to the technician's advices, so it went wrong.
- Planted too tight; then, they waited for the stalks to dry on feet, like for their indigenous species, but it moist and they lost sometimes half of one maize.
- The new crop introduced will have a high yield only the first year because it is a hybrid seed that needs to be purchased each year.

4.2.2 Soybean

Outputs:

- 628 kg of seeds distributed to 68 households
- 9.11 ha were planted
- 379 kg of beans were harvested

Weaknesses:

- Soybean have been a total failure this year in all villages visited
- The indigenous species produced also lower yields than usual, but nothing comparable to the seeds sponsored by FUF. 3 kg harvested for 2 kg planted in Houay Loun compared to 1/10 kg ratio for indigenous species.
- 15 farmers planted soybean in Pa-Ham, 239 kg planted and 93 kg harvested. Planted too tight, diseases,
- Slow distribution of seeds occurred here also and villagers planted their own seeds, fearing never to see the promised seeds.
- In Pa-Ham, they are still interested in experimenting soybean; one year isn't conclusive, we need three years to have a good experiment say village head.

4.2.3 Cardamom

Outputs:

- 27,000 seedlings were distributed

Impacts:

- Villagers in Houay Loun are confident, and they got 10,000 kip/kg for indigenous species to merchants from Nong Het and Phonesavang; the domesticated species from the FUF should pay even more.
- Contribute to long term development since the first harvest would occur about 3-4 years after the plantation.

Weaknesses:

- 70% of survival rate in Houay Loun.
- 60% of the plants died in Nyodpied due to lack of training and demonstration; also because gasoline was accidentally spread over during transportation.
- 50% of the plants died in Sanchotai village in early stage. The low participation is explained by the fact that villagers didn't want to carry the seedlings from Phonekham village.
- In Pa-ham, villagers mentioned that the FUF advise them not to cut off the head of the plant. The distribution occurred during the rainy season and only the plant they cut survived; the other died.

4.2.4 Existing cash crops:

CRWRC has introduced three crops, soybean, corn and cardamom. If the two first were already planted by the Hmong farmers, it's their first experience in planting cardamom usually harvested in the forest. The provider of seeds and seedlings is the Friends of Upland Farmers selected for its capacity to handle big amount of crops, furthermore both soybean and maize have been traditionally planted by Hmong farmers. But the evaluation team also acknowledged existing cash crops and marketing system in some target villages:

- In Phakok, all household produce peanuts (70-80 bags in average) and got from 3,500 to 7,000 kip/kg; 100 tones were sold in 2004. There are three episodes of sales with the last giving better price. They cleared a space especially for the crop
- Sunflower is the second cash crop produced. Merchants from Phonesavan and Vientiane buy the local production.
- In both cases, merchant come and buy directly in the village but for the new crops introduced, the sales occur outside the village

4.2.5 Other outputs:

Farmer Producer Associations

In Pa-Ham, the association is active and regulations implemented. For instance, in the case where farmer receive seedlings but don't plant, he is penalized with a fine: 2kg for each kg of seedlings. Also, if a farmer does not cultivate an area that he has cleared, he is also fined for mis-use of the forest. The fine is calculated in amount of rice he would have harvested.

Thresher: 3 have been delivered

Weaknesses:

- One has been installed in Phakok village, since there is no possibility to bring it to other community still inaccessible by road.
- The village head manage the thresher himself and claims it as his own. This is an area of concern.
- According to the village head, it won't leave the village to rotate between target villages as planned by CRWRC. People must pay fees for labour and also gasoline to use the thresher.
- One thresher is in the middle of a field on the road to Keo Leuk but couldn't be sent to the village since the road isn't finished yet, while the third one is in Nyodpied, but the evaluation team could not assess its use.

Storage:

- In Phakok, fees have to be paid, only for crops to be sold while crops to be self-consumed are kept home or in rice loft. A percentage of the money will go to the fund. Regulations are not clear and some individuals – the Village Head in this case, is likely to take the benefits at the expense of the community is the situation isn't address rapidly.

The activities did not allow increasing villagers' income since there is no marketing component linked to the production of cash crops. This lack of guarantees is directly responsible for the low participation and the amount of crops planted. Villagers still rely on subsistence farming and are cautious in their moves.

Nevertheless, CRWRC is targeting a crucial issue here; many of the target villages were growing opium up to October – November 2004 when government went to cut down all standing poppy fields. 50 ha were destroyed in Kham district. Household income reached up to 6 millions kip for healthier households. The activity will contribute to replace the loss of opium and contribute to communities' wealth provided market agreements and once the roads are finished.

4.3 Hygiene and sanitation and clean water construction

The project provides technical expertise altogether with government partners and material including pipes, cement, steel rods, etc. Villagers contribute with their labour and local material for fence building; establish regulations, payment of fees, etc. A community committee is established to manage the implementation of the activity.

Outputs:

- Design for 9 target villages have been realized
- GFS have been finished in 4 villages and been 90% completed in 4 villages
- Maintenance and management committees have been established in 8 villages totalizing 40 members
- One training on Primary Health Care set up
- 130 mothers and children immunized in collaboration with the health department
- Family planning set up for 58 couples in 11 villages
- 100 model families set up

Impacts:

Clean water will obviously reduce women and child burden in bringing water into the village and decrease the risks of malnutrition and insure healthy growth of children.

- There are many water taps in each village, more than the standard of 80 people/tap, as in Sanjohtai where there are three taps for 125 people
- Water tap are generally well located, like in Sanchotai with one tap near the school
- Water quality seems fine in villages visited

Weaknesses:

- VHV have been set, but 100% are men. Illiteracy is the main constrains for women, but in Houa Hok village, a woman just married has a secondary 3 and could be trained as VHV.
- Extension poor with training during village meeting, only males, head of household attends
- Concerning GFS systems: the quality of the taps used is questionable; there was no evacuation drain for water in Pa-ham and in Huayhok village, water doesn't reach the village since the mason did not follow the design done by the supervisor.
- No clear criterions for model families establishment
- The committee for GFS management don't have clear regulations and system
- No hygiene kit and water use kit have been distributed. This should be considered to insure that water remain clean at household level.

4.5 Project implementation and community participation

4.5.1 Participation

- Project plans to take into account local authorities and structures, the clan system for instance. Gender concerns are also mentioned in the project proposal; men and women equally encourage participating in village-based organization, and also the project aims targeting the most vulnerable as disabled.
- In Khoun, almost no international agencies involved, government do not reach many upland communities, no vaccination or disease prevention campaign, few merchants go, poor road access. There are problems in almost every village in terms of authority, motivation of people that are opium growers, suspicious because they have been vulnerabilized with the destruction of the opium in October – November 2004.
- In 5 villages visited out of 7, the team leader could register each beneficiary involved in the food security activities according to their status in the wealth ranking activity implemented by the project in the assessment phase. 25.6% of the wealthier households participate in seeds planting activities, compared to 30.9% of the middle-class and only 11.9% of the poorest households that can less afford to take risks planting new seeds since they lack labor and are food insecure. This result displays the socio-economic profile of the project beneficiaries for a sample of 193 households in Keoleuk, Houay Loun, Nyodpied, Phakok, and Sanjohtai village).

| District | Village name | Households | Wealthier | Beneficiaries | % | Middle-class | Beneficiaries | % | Poor | Beneficiaries | % |
|---------------|--------------|------------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------|-----------|---------------|--------------|
| Khoun | Keoleuak | 34 | 12 | 5 | 41.7% | 11 | 2 | 18.2% | 12 | 2 | 16.7% |
| Khoun | Huayloun | 44 | 3 | 1 | 33.3% | 15 | 7 | 46.7% | 26 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Kham | Nyodpied | 28 | 3 | 0 | 0.0% | 13 | 5 | 38.5% | 12 | 4 | 33.3% |
| Kham | Phakok | 63 | 15 | 2 | 13.3% | 22 | 1 | 4.5% | 26 | 1 | 3.8% |
| Kham | Sanjohtai | 24 | 6 | 2 | 33.3% | 10 | 7 | 70.0% | 8 | 3 | 37.5% |
| Total: | | 193 | 39 | 10 | 25.6% | 71 | 22 | 31% | 84 | 10 | 11.9% |

4.5.2 Implementation

- There are no data available at village level. A copy of village profile, activities implemented, group members, regulations, planning, etc. should be in villager's hands.
- Rely too much on political rep and mass organization. No training has organized and no Village Development Committee has been set up yet.

- Danger to implement political agenda through technical assistance (GFS in Keo Leuk)
- CRWRC project staffs seem to rely too much on government staff for technical input
- The timing of activities has not been planned according to the seasonal calendar and this has major impact of project efficiency.
- The use of Lao language for training undermined the good understanding of villagers.
- Despite the fact that staff received proper training and that external trainers with years of experience were contracted, there has been shortcomings in timing and the coordination of activities.

4.5.3 Additional observations

The Education component was initially not included in the evaluation. Nevertheless, the evaluation team was favourably surprised by the non formal education activities implemented in Huayhok village and decided to mention the education outputs and achievements.

Outputs:

- 4 teachers provided for three villages
- 7 schools in 7 villages and 3 groups of school have access to learning and teaching material
- Parents and Teacher Association (PTA) set in each villages
- Health curriculum improvement implemented in every school covering 354 pupils from primary 1 to 3
- There are 128 adults learning (123 females) and 6 teachers.

Impacts:

- NFE provide good opportunity for girls to study Lao language and writing. The class are held early morning from 5-7 o'clock.
- High attendance for NFE class observed in Huayhok: 18/22 present on daily basis.
- Good monitoring system with weekly visit from education team

5. Conclusion

5.1 The project objective to avoid resettlement of 12 upland communities by providing alternatives has been successful. Not only CRWRC achieved in fixing the villages in the upland, but insuring long term development since access is a crucial criterion insuring permanency of upland villages. On one hand, roads allow civil servants improved access to communities; one another hand, villagers have improved access to services and market. All the community members will benefit from the road.

5.2 The third objective related to access to sufficient safe drinking water has also been achieved. Here also all community members have improved access to water.

5.3 The objective that has been only partially achieved is linked to food security. Generally speaking, participation remained low due to the lack of guaranty for villagers about marketing avenues for the new crops introduced. Seeds have been distributed too late in the season; villagers fearing not to receive any seeds planted their indigenous seeds, leaving less space for CRWRC sponsored seeds. While maize has been very successful, soybean has been a failure; the harvest didn't cover the seeds planted.

Storage activity is also problematic since it may serve only for commercial crops, not to protect food crops at community level; this means that only beneficiaries from agriculture component will share the benefits of the activity.

The lack of marketing agreements and guaranty is the prerequisite for the success of the introduction of new cash crops in the target villages. The lack of authorisations in setting up FUF branch in the target area is a main constraint that limits people's production because since the road allow (or will allow very soon for some villages) the transportation of goods, the main constraint is the inexistence of markets.

5.4 Planning of activities need to be improved to insure increase efficiency. Seasonal calendar should be taking into consideration when planning activities such as seed delivery for instance.

5.5 The restitution of the evaluation in the CRWRC office allowed program manager to learn that VDC have not been implemented yet in the target villages. This suggests that reporting of achievements and the capitalization on activities implemented by reporting remain weak. The monitoring of the activities implemented could also be improved.

5.6 Training activities should also be improved. Women should be present for agricultural training since they are the one who in reality are in charge of this sector in the Hmong society. Training should focus on example and demonstrations instead of theory and lectures.

The overall impact of the project is linked to the challenge to offer development alternative in mountainous area. If most of the international assistance is targeted toward easy accessible areas, CRWRC successfully offer development alternative in the mountain and the facto contribute to secure Hmong livelihoods by supporting development *in situ*, avoiding the bad consequences of resettlement in the lowlands. CRWRC had realized an impressive amount of outputs in the 12 months timeframe. Even if the overall objective of the project: to avoid forced-resettlement of Hmong upland communities have been successfully achieved, a second ECHO phase would be more beneficial since more than 12 months are needed for reaching sustainability and insuring everlasting of the action.

6. Recommendations

6.1 Efficiency in addressing Resettlement issue

6.1.1 Relevance of the targeting:

- According to the project proposal, 12 villagers were selected out of 30 villages visited for their immediate needs and risks to be resettled if no appropriate measure were taken. Then, during discussions prior going to the field, there were supposedly only 5 villages out of 12 were to be resettled. 4/6 in Khoun and 1/6 in Kham.
- The field visit revealed that no target villages were threatened by resettlement. Apparently, both Nyodpied and Namwaan villages wanted to move. The visit couldn't not address the motivation of villages: impact of opium crops destruction, pressure, etc. But according to the district authorities, villagers ask for moving.

6.1.2 CRWRC involvement and resettlement issue: 3 cases

1. Nyodpied: initially, government wanted the village to move out of a conservation forest area and settle in the IFAD supported project where villagers were promised paddy land. Since the project provided road access, clean water and cash crops, only 19 households are authorized to move and 12 forced to remain. The development activities forced 12 household to stay; if there is paddy 18 households may stay but if not, they may all finally leave.
2. Houay Loun: the visit revealed the existence of three segments, one of which is located 1 hour away and constituted from a segment left from another village resettled in the lowland and later incorporated in Houay Loun. The directive is to resettle 8 household into Houay Loun; 2 had already come and 6 don't want to move. This is a case of forced-internal resettlement.
3. Keoleuak: three segments also. GFS survey done with government staff according to which only possible to implement GFS in the segment downhill and two upland segments have to consolidate, and they refused. This explains why villagers didn't agree upon receiving clean water since it would push them to resettle. Despite the fact that this kind of migration implicate low risks in terms of food security and sanitation, the approach should be based upon villagers will.

6.1.3 New approach

If CRWRC is really willing to address resettlement issue in the target area, there is a need to consider retargeting villages based upon the findings on priority area concerned by planned resettlement in Kham district and in Khoun district as handled out by district authorities on the demand of the team leader. Authorities are willing to discuss about their development strategy and about resettlement issue and there is no need to be over-cautious and self-censured. The two table below display data concerning the 2001-2005 Five Years Plan; this mean that more resettlements are likely to occur from 2006-2010.

According to the discussions with Kham Vice-Governor, there were 79 permanent villages out of 120 districts and 41 were at risks and concentrated in three sub-districts. But the data sent by the district display a different rate: 8 villages will be resettled including 6 villages in Pheungsam sub-district.

| Sub district | Data | stable | To be resettled | Grand Total |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Bountin | Number of Villages | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| | Population | 2,896 | 0 | 2,896 |
| Heuangtai | Number of Villages | 11 | 1 | 12 |
| | Population | 4,410 | 505 | 4,915 |
| Khamneua | Number of Villages | 17 | 0 | 17 |
| | Population | 8,297 | 0 | 8,297 |
| Longmadtai | Number of Villages | 30 | 0 | 30 |
| | Population | 13,122 | 0 | 13,122 |
| Louangkhava | Number of Villages | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| | Population | 2,108 | 0 | 2,108 |
| Niotkeua | Number of Villages | 19 | 1 | 20 |
| | Population | 7,722 | 325 | 8,047 |
| Pheungsam | Number of Villages | 8 | 6 | 14 |
| | Population | 2,568 | 1,942 | 4,510 |
| Thei | Number of Villages | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| | Population | 3,267 | 0 | 3,267 |
| Total number of Village | | 112 | 8 | 120 |
| Population | | 44,390 | 2,772 | 47,162 |

In Khoun district, the team heard about 6 villages targeted by resettlement. But according to the data sent by the district, there is only one single village in the resettlement list.

| Sub district | Data | Stable | To be resettled | Grand Total |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Keoset | Number of Villages | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| | Population | 2,421 | 0 | 2,421 |
| Longsan | Number of Villages | 8 | 1 | 9 |
| | Population | 3,726 | 105 | 3,831 |
| Ngan | Number of Villages | 16 | 0 | 16 |
| | Population | 3,396 | 0 | 3,396 |
| Samphanxay | Number of Villages | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| | Population | 3,299 | 0 | 3,299 |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------|---------------|
| Sanlouang | Number of Villages | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| | Population | 1,329 | 0 | 1,329 |
| Sieng | Number of Villages | 27 | 0 | 27 |
| | Population | 11,926 | 0 | 11,926 |
| Youn | Number of Villages | 16 | 0 | 16 |
| | Population | 5,608 | 0 | 5,608 |
| Total number of Villages | | 89 | 1 | 90 |
| Population | | 31,705 | 105 | 31,810 |

The survey of the potential for land suitable for paddy cultivation remain a crucial issue in the target villages since the availability of paddy is the main conditions for villages to be stable.

6.2 Food security

CRWRC needs to understand the local situation and local mechanisms to insure food security within the community. Internal mechanisms of solidarity in each clan usually provide food for the poorest segments of the clans.

- Distribution of seeds according to seasonal calendar
- Training and demonstration in the fields with farmers
- Involve women in training
- Monitor the use of the thresher in Pakhok village
- Support existing production (peanuts and Sunflowers) and marketing
- Set up buying units at local level to insure higher price and better power to negotiate
- Secure marketing opportunities with clear agreements, contract, and guarantees
- Storage for cash crops, not for food security
- Include women as beneficiaries because they are the one who plan the seedlings so empower them by inscribing their names in.
- Improve the use and regulations of the storage built and its use not only for cash crops but for food items as well to avoid post harvest loss due to rats.
- Develop or increase paddy land surfaces in target villages
- Evaluate the indigenous peanut storage system and the potentialities for improving the marketing of the peanut to increase villager's profit.

6.3 GFS

- Improve the technical support to villagers by insuring the presence of technical support during labor involvement from the community
- Improve collaboration between technical supervisor and the mason in charge of building the water system
- Set up clear regulations concerning the protection of the spring
- Consider the distribution of basic hygiene and water use kit
- Evaluate the possibility to improve the tap used to insure sustainability
- Monitor the implementation of the construction in Houay Hok village

6.4 Health

- Training of VHV should be done in Hmong language
- Improve extension, now done during village meeting and only head of household participate. Women receive low, distorted, biased information. Set up proper community activities.
- Require one female VHV per village

6.5 Road

- Improve the planning of tool distribution from the beginning according to the number of labor.
- Insure presence of technical support during labor involvement from the community
- Plan to transport rice to the target area prior to the rainy season in order to avoid delays in delivery.

6.6 Education

- Insure that government will support the teacher after the project's life.

6.7 Participation

- Participation is linked to people's thrust and confidence in the project, if they see the benefits they can get is the best incentive for participation.
- Set up Village Development Committee (VDC) in each village to support the emergence of a civil society; i.e. of decision making outside the mass organization that monopolize the political power.
- Civil servant will lecture villagers that don't understand yet to improve their participation in the project. We have to be very careful not to support the domestication of Hmong communities under the name of development.
- Villagers in Houay Hok mention the lack of rewards for the one that distinguish themselves for their implication in the project.
- Villagers are involved in subsistence economy and undergoing a transition to market economy and CRWRC is introducing cash crops; we should keep in mind that those experimentations mean increased labor input and less time to produce their own food. Experimentation should be done in plots one year before delivering the seedlings to the farmers, to avoid that experimentations on yields or suitability been done at the expense of the communities.

6.8 Implementation

- Make available a copy of village profile, activities implemented, group members, regulations, planning, etc. in each village.
- Reinforce civil society and build local capacity to plan and manage village development by assisting villagers in setting up groups and regulations.
- Improve community management capacity to insure project sustainability,
- Upgrade staff capability to plan, monitor project activities
- Closely monitor private company hired for sub-contracting: TEST for GFS design, construction workers for GFS construction, etc.
- In field training, demonstrations with model/pilot farmers in each village.
- Right timing for agricultural activities; based upon seasonal calendar. This should start with the making of seasonal calendar for each village.
- Use Hmong language for training, to insure translation to reach wider audience
- Project staff should spend more time in the field, not only for monitoring activities, but to implement activities at key episodes (planting, harvesting, construction, etc.)
- Improve commitment of government staff to hasten the process of implementation

6.9 Gender issue

- Gender issue has seriously to be addressed. Women's participation is low from grassroots to the top of the organization. It would be too easy blame on Hmong cultural traditions and clans system to explain women's lack of power in the decision making process. Other project working with Hmong communities in other provinces have been successful in targeting women and insuring their participation and benefits to project. One of the solutions is made possible by using female staff. In this case, CRWRC should imperatively increase the ratio of women ethnic Hmong to ease discussions and transfer of information.

6.10 Efficiency

1. Concerning the first objective (Communities have better access to local services and markets through improved village and area access), the project meet its objectives since most of the household use the new roads. The access of services will be eased in Kham district where a dispensary has been rehabilitated in the sub-district centre. In Kham district, the 18 km road improves access to the 9 villages located in the area.
2. The efficiency of the food security (Communities have improved food security through increased agricultural production and better storage of farm produce) is less tangible. In terms of yields, maize has proven to be very successful, but soybean disastrous. Both crops are ultimately designed to be sold. But the prerequisite for the success of this activity rely on the existence of road access,

and of secure market agreements for villagers. The refusal from the provincial governor to authorize the setting up of a FUF branch to buy the crops and the state of achievement of the road system are the main constraint that undermined the efficiency of the activity and should be resolved over time.

3. The access to clean water will obviously improve the overall health situation as stated in the objective three. But the main constraint to reach efficiency is the extension of the basic PHC methods. VHV are 100% male and they have not organised community activities reaching women. Discussions are held during village meeting gathering only male-head of household. Women and children are not likely to receive many benefits of the PHC. Regulations concerning village sanitation are not clear, at least at this stage of the project life.

7. Bibliography

CRWRC

- 2003 XKH New Project Implementation Mission 18-28 March 2003
- Laos FY 2004-2005 Joint Planning Form & Program Plans
 - Narrative Interim Reports, Framework partnership Agreements
 - Villages profiles

GOUDINEAU, Yves (Eds).

- 1996 Resettlement and Social Characteristics of New Villages, Basic needs for resettled communities in the Lao PDR, An ORSTOM Survey. Vol. 1 and 2. Supported by UNESCO and UNDP.

IRAP

- 1998 District Accessibility Profile. Kham district, August 1998, Prepared by IRAP Xieng Khouang with Rural Development Committee, MCTPC/UNDP Project Lao/95/001.

8. Appendix

8.1 Timeframe

| Date/Day | Time | Objectives | Who |
|------------|-------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 15/02/2005 | 06:00 | Departure | Steeve & Syda |
| | | Travel to Thae area and overnight. | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| | 15:00 | Short debriefing with Veehan | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| | 16:00 | Meeting with Kham district Vice-Governor | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| | | Meet with Mr Khongmi. Head of Khet | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| 16/02/2005 | 06:00 | Sanjohtai | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| | 11:00 | Pa-Ham | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| | 15:00 | Phakok | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| | 17:50 | Nyodpied | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| 17/02/2005 | 06:00 | Travel in Sadnoy area | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| | 09:30 | Houay Loun | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| | 12:00 | Keo Leuk | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |

| | | | |
|------------|---------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | 15:30 | Meet with Vice -Governor | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| 18/02/2005 | 08:45 | Houay Hok | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| | 15:00 | Representative of Khoun district Mr. Khamphay | Steeve, Syda, Lee, May and Bouaphan |
| 19/02/2005 | AM | Preparation | Steeve |
| | 14:00 | Presentation | Steeve |
| 20/02/2005 | 08:30 | Departure to Vientiane | Steeve, Syda, Viengxay and Bruce |
| 21/02/2005 | All day | Reporting | Steeve |
| 22/02/2005 | All day | Reporting | Steeve |

8.2 Participants to the presentation

| No. | name | Position | Organization |
|-----|---------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Thanongsay | Road Engineer and Foot path | CRWRC |
| 2 | Jessica | Project Advisor English | CRWRC |
| 3 | Viengxay | | Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare |
| 4 | Wihaan | Project Manager | CRWRC |
| 5 | Yangleng | Project Advisor GFS | CRWRC |
| 6 | Leexong | Assistant Project Manger | CRWRC |
| 7 | Chansmone | Project Advisor Education | CRWRC |
| 8 | Sengthao | Project Advisor Agriculture | CRWRC |
| 9 | Bounmee | Deputy | Social Welfare Khoun district |
| 10 | Sivachith | Deputy | Social Welfare Kham district |
| 11 | Seuvath | Deputy | Education Kham district |
| 12 | Tavone | Deputy | Education Khoun district |
| 13 | Seefoung | P.A. Road and foot path | CRWRC |
| 14 | Thayang | P.A. Agriculture | CRWRC |
| 15 | Oumma | Team Leader Health | CRWRC |
| 16 | Noy | Irrigation and Foot path engineer | CRWRC |
| 17 | Donesee | P.A. Road and foot path | CRWRC |
| 18 | Syda | Program Manager | CRWRC |
| 19 | Mai | Team Leader Education | CRWRC |
| 20 | Somphan | Deputy | Education Khoun district |
| 21 | Nooyang | Deputy | Agriculture Khoun district |
| 22 | Muavang | Road and foot path engineer | CRWRC |
| 23 | Chonsee | Road and foot path engineer & irrigation | CRWRC |
| 24 | Douangdee | Team Leader Agriculture | CRWRC |
| 25 | Mr. Bruce Shoemaker | Advisor | Mcknigt Foundation |
| 26 | Mr. Steeve Daviau | Team Leader Evaluation | Anthropologist |

* The name of female staff is written in bold 3/17 present for the presentation.

8.3 TOR

Livelihood development for vulnerable remote communities as alternative to relocation project Khoun and Kham districts, Xieng Khouang province End of Project Evaluation (ECHO no. 1)

Terms of Reference

January 2005

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this End of Project Evaluation is to evaluate the project's effectiveness, and results measured against goals, objectives, results and outputs set forth in the project proposal. The evaluation will offer strategic and operational recommendations to ensure future direction, sustainability and effectiveness of this program

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This Evaluation is focusing on the 13 months (January 1 2004 –January 31 2005) of implementation of the ECHO project. ECHO is the humanitarian aid office of the European Union. This project fits in the first year of a 5-year program. For more information see project proposal and progress reports for details.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The program evaluation should produce the following results:

1. Assessment of project results.
2. Consolidation of a report on this assessment, the critical findings and recommendations for the future direction of community programs after the project life.

Specific Objective:

Provision of alternatives to avoid forced resettlement of 12 ethnic minority villages in Khoun and Kham districts, Xieng Khouang province.

Indicator: Communities have remained at their present location and have an increased sense of security in their current circumstances

Sources of verification: Observations in the field, beneficiaries interviews and reports

Results:

Result 1. Communities have better access to local services and markets through improved

village and area access

Indicator : Majority of families use new roads to access outside services.

Sources of verification: Observations in the field, beneficiaries interviews and reports

Result 2. Communities have improved food security through increased agricultural production and better storage of farm produce

Indicator: Promoted crops are successful with good harvests.

Sources of verification: Observations in the field, beneficiaries interviews and reports

Result 3. Communities have improved overall health and hygiene situation through improved access to sufficient and clean water and basic primary health care method

Indicator: All families use water system and implement village sanitation regulations.

Sources of verification: Observations in the field, beneficiaries interviews and reports

4. METHODOLOGY

Generally, the evaluation will be appreciative, participatory and learning centered in its approach. It will involve stakeholders who represent the community, project, CRWRC and GO. An evaluation team will be formed of appropriate expertise selected by stakeholders. Relevant information will be gathered from reading, data analysis, one on one conversations/interviews, focus group discussion and debriefing of group and individual site visits. Participatory Rural Appraisal will be used as primary tools in the evaluation.

5. TIME FRAME

The evaluation will take place during the period of February 15-19, 2005

Day 1: Travel from VTE to the field 15/02/2005

Day 2: Field work

Day 3: Field work

Day 4: Field work

Day 5: Analysis and Presentation (2 hours)

Day 6: Traveling to VTE

One day will be added for traveling and two days for preparation and reporting. Total days for this evaluation is 8 days.

6. REPORTING

A draft report will be produced by March 04, 2005 and will highlight important summary of effectiveness of project, outputs and results, recommendations and conclusions. The report will be shared with the key stakeholders in the project including CRWRC and ECHO as Donor and communities. The final report will be submitted by March 18, 2005.

7. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The evaluation will be carried out by a Team of Evaluators as selected and agreed to by the key stakeholders and project/CRWRC. The members of the evaluation team will be experts in the areas such as health, income generation, literacy, education, agriculture, NGO organization and community development.

The Service Provider will be the evaluation team leader and will lead and facilitate the team in the evaluation process. He will carefully plan, implement and evaluate the process. He will write up all outcomes and analyses and recommendations in a short but clear report in English.

Provision of transportation, food and accommodation is responsibility of the Agency.