

Fastenopfer Country Programme Laos

2011-2016

External Evaluation

Evaluation Report



devolutions Ltd.
Martin Sommer
Untere Zelg 9, Oberscherli
CH – 3145 Niederscherli
Tel : +41 31 8492632
Mobile : +41 79 5005761
devolutions@bluewin.ch
www.devolutions.ch

Vilayphone Chouramany
131/03 Watchan Street, Ban Watchan
Chanthabouly District
Vientiane, Lao PDR
+856 20 7790 3550
v.chouramany@gmail.com

Abbreviations

ACD	Association for Community Training and Development
ARMI	Association Rural Mobilisation and Improvement
CCL	Comité de Coopération avec le Laos
CDE	Centre for Development and Environment
CIDSE	International Alliance of Catholic Development Agencies
CORD	Peace through Partnership Laos
CP	Country Programme
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EE	external Evaluation
FO	Fastenopfer
GoL	Government of Laos
INGO	International NGO
JVC	INGO Japan International Volunteer Center
Helvetas	INGO Helvetas Swiss Intercooperation
LBFD	Lao Bhuddism for Development
LIWG	Land Issues Working Group
MoU	Memory of Understanding
NORMAI	Non-Profit Association for Rural Mobilisation and Improvement
NPA	Non-Profit Association
NSEDP	National Socio-Economic Development Plan
NTFP	Non-timber forest products
Oxfam Novib	INGO
PADETC	Participatory Development Training Centre
PAFO	Provincial Agriculture and Forestry Office
PCM	Project Cycle Management
PO	Partner Organisation
SAEDA	Sustainable Agriculture and Environment Development Association
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
ToR	Terms of Reference
VDC	Village Development Committee



Contents

Summary	4
1. Introduction and Background	6
2. Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation	6
3. Methodology, Data Analysis and Field Visit	7
4. The Lao Development Context	7
5. The Evaluation Results	9
<i>Effectivity: Tangible and recognised</i>	9
<i>Efficiency: Reasonable</i>	10
<i>Relevance: Very high</i>	11
<i>Impact: Reported but poorly documented</i>	11
<i>Sustainability: Traceable</i>	11
<i>Networking</i>	12
<i>Legal Status of Fastenopfer</i>	13
<i>Operational Issues</i>	14
<i>Risk Management</i>	16
6. Evaluation Conclusions	16
7. Recommendations	18
 Annexes	
Terms of Reference	20
Evaluation Matrix	26
List of Interviewed Persons	28



Summary

The Lao Country Programme is one of 14 priority country programmes of the Swiss Catholic NGO Fastenopfer Lucerne. The external evaluation of this programme is an integral part of the overall Fastenopfer strategy and programme revision, aiming at the definition of new country strategies for the period 2017-2022. It intends to account for the results achieved during the period 2011-2016, to serve for public information and to promote learning for the formulation of a new country programme Laos.

The evaluation objectives address all DAC evaluation dimensions plus operational issues, networking and risk management. They comprise to assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the programme implementation, the impact on target groups and sustainability of improvements in their living conditions and the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme as a management tool. Furthermore, the evaluation is looking at strengths and weaknesses of the implementation arrangements and at the potentials and obstacles for a possible reorientation of the programme.

The development context for international NGOs in Laos is currently restricted and tightly regulated. Development cooperation with Lao based organisations continues to be possible on a technical focus and within the Lao policy framework. The Government however does not tolerate rights related advocacy activities by external agencies and it maintains a regime of control over the local level organisations and self-help initiatives to ensure alignment with national priorities. Nevertheless, Lao non-profit associations and international NGOs such as Fastenopfer continue to deliver vital services to the community which are not covered by the State actors or private business.

Much of rural Laos reveals distressing indicators of poverty, malnutrition, child mortality and exclusion. The official policy to “turn land into capital” has in many instances led to the aggravation of rural poverty due to relocation to make way to major land-intensive investments in plantation agriculture, hydropower or mining and the consequent loss of access to productive land. FO’s strategy to address food security in such remote areas is thus very **relevant** as a life-line for many communities. In close cooperation with 6 partner organisations, Fastenopfer has achieved tangible, widely recognised and **effective** programme results. With their focus on *integrated farming systems with an organic approach*, they have supported small niche producers to generate speciality products for local and regional markets such as bee keeping (pollination, honey, soaps) and medical herbs. In other locations, significant progress in local food security, livestock keeping and mother and child care are directly related to Fastenopfers’ technical advice and contributions. Programme **efficiency** is rated as reasonable, given the modest overheads for programme management and lean way of administrative processes. The rather scattered regions of partner activities however do not facilitate horizontal exchange and peer learning at low cost. Programme **impact** on the target groups and on institutional strengthening of partner organisations has been reported, but it is poorly documented. This is not untypical for a young programme such as this, but it is critical for the medium term



accountability. This constraint applies equally to the **sustainability**. The resilience and capability of local communities to cope with livelihood challenges has been reportedly strengthened by direct technical advice on farming techniques, land, water and natural resources management or nutritional diversification and an inclusive local level development planning approach. Measured evidence of the sustainability of these contributions is however incomplete.

Within the community of international organisations, Fastenopfers' networking activities are rather limited and the organisation is not widely known as a specialised agency in the area of rural livelihoods and food security. The tight capacities of the Fastenopfer coordination do not allow for a regular participation in the respective network platforms and the national level policy dialogue on agriculture and food security. Their legal status is currently informal, without official registration nor office. Indirectly however, the programme experience is made available to the wider community through national non-profit associations such as CIDSE.

Programme related networking is done between the partner organisations via joint workshops and study tours. More of this is expected by the partners as they see scope for broadening their approaches and learn directly from practitioners. The mission believes that Fastenopfer could benefit from being better linked with other relevant programmes in the sector, capture their specific expertise and contribute to scale up successful approaches developed within the Fastenopfer partnerships.

In conclusion, the future Fastenopfer Laos programme should a.o.:

- continue its needs-based, relevant and widely acknowledged operations in the remote rural districts;
- define a clear thematic focus on food security and nutrition and a geographical approach with activities clustered in two to three of the most food insecure regions to facilitate easy farmer-to-farmer exchange, efficient deployment of capacity building among the partner organisations and appropriate coordination to optimise programme delivery;
- identify not more than 6 implementing partners to avoid a marginal role for Fastenopfer among the funding agencies and in their advisory endeavour;
- consider the relative advantages and constraints in formalising as an international NGO in the Lao PDR;
- strengthen the capacity for effective programme coordination with a local co-coordinator to consolidate Fastenopfers' institutional profile in Laos, strengthen results documentation and reporting and to alleviate the international coordinator from administrative tasks.
- Attempt a slightly increased overall budgetary envelope to improve the resource availability, in particular to strengthen horizontal peer learning and ensure solid programme coordination.



1. Introduction and Background

The Lao Country Programme (CP) is one of 14 priority country programmes of the Swiss Catholic NGO Fastenopfer Lucerne (FO) in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is enshrined in the overarching FO-strategy under the title “people strengthen people” for the period 2011-2016. Initiated in 2005 with an average annual budget of around 500'000 CHF and 7 national cooperation partnerships, the Lao CP is a comparatively small and recent programme. Nevertheless, it aligns conceptually with the other CP's and works on one core thematic area: food security/sovereignty.

FO has embarked on a process of strategy and programme revision with a view to define a new strategy and country programme period for 2017-2022. For the purpose, four of the 14 CP's (Laos, Burkina Faso, Haiti and South Africa) will be externally evaluated with international expertise. The other programmes shall be assessed with different approaches. The results of all these evaluations will underpin the FO discussion on strategic options to shape the future CP's and adapt the structural set-up.

Fastenopfer has mandated Martin Sommer, devolutions Ltd., Oberscherli together with Ms Vilayphone Chouramany, Vientiane to conduct an independent external evaluation (EE) of its Lao Country Programme with agreement dated February 18, 2015 (see annex 1: ToR).

2. Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation is intended to meet a range of expectations. It shall serve for public information, accountability, learning for future strategies as well as the formulation of the new CP Laos. The evaluation objectives address all DAC evaluation dimensions plus operational issues, networking and risk management.

The scope of the evaluation includes the CP Laos and related organisational arrangements, the implementation period 2011-2016 and future perspectives, governance, strategy and project documentation of the partner organisations (PO) and relevant policy documents of the Lao Government.

The objectives for the evaluation comprise to:

- Assess the relevance of the CP, the effectiveness and efficiency of its implementation
- Assess the impact on target groups and sustainability of improvements in their living conditions
- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the CP as a management tool for steering the cooperation between FO and the partner organisations
- Assess strengths and weaknesses of the implementation arrangements, namely the collaboration with partner organisations and the coordination units
- Identify potentials and obstacles for a possible reorientation of the CP



The recommendations will feed into the process of the formulation of FO's future country strategy for Laos.

3. Methodology, Data Analysis and Field Visit

Considering the limited time frame for the field visit of the evaluation (8 days) and the relatively poor data base of the CP, it will be essential to focus on the (i) documentation, (ii) the perceptions emerging from the interviews and (iii) the observations during the programme visit. This implies that the evaluation builds on the recognition of patterns of change and the identification of potentials and opportunities for future strategy development rather than to strive for capturing the comprehensive programme results and effectiveness by employing statistical rigour and scientific methodology.

The field visit scheduled from March 10-20, 2015 was well prepared by the Fastenopfer Coordinator and realised as planned for the part of the international consultant. This included consultations with main partners, other donors and selected international NGOs in Vientiane, the field visits to CCL in Udomxay and office consultations with ARMI/NORMAI and ACD respectively in the ARMI-office in Savannakhet. No clearance has been obtained for including a community visit to the project sites of southern partners for the international evaluator. Due to illness, the national consultant Ms Vilayphone Chouramany has missed the major part of the field visits but was participating in the discussions in Vientiane and with CCL-management team in Udomxay.

The main implications are that the understanding of project results is based mainly on secondary sources, for lack of verification on-site. Nevertheless, the evaluation team is confident that relevant overall conclusions can be drawn from this mission for considering the future strategic orientation of the Fastenopfer Laos Programme.

4. The Lao Development Context

The working environment for national and sub-national Not-for-Profit Associations (NPAs) and for international NGOs engaging in land law and land rights related activities continues to be tightly restricted by the authorities since the disappearance of the leader of PADETC and the expulsion of the country representative of Helvetas for Laos in late 2012. NPAs focussing on technical development issues at Provincial or District levels have re-gained some room for manoeuvre as long as they operate within the Lao policy framework with a non-confrontational approach to Government. This applies to most current partner organisations of Fastenopfer. The registration process of new NPAs however has come to a near stand-still in 2014 and self-censorship among civil society organisations is said to be widespread.

The long-term vision in the new national 5-year Socio-Economic Development Plan 2016-2020 of the Government (8th NSEDP) places continued emphasis on poverty reduction through broad-



based economic growth under the single Party leadership, with no explicit role assigned to civil society organisations. The key directions of GoL include to “ensure that integrated rural development has a strong link to poverty reduction” and that “household poverty rate drops at less than 7% of total households by 2020”. Further, the plan stipulates to reach the indicator “mortality rate of children under 1 year reduced to less than 30/1,000 live births and mortality rate of children under 5 reduced to 45/1,000 live births by 2020”. However, the Plan also talks of: “To solve the poverty of the population and ethnic minorities across the country by enhancing robust and firm political roots and to carry out comprehensive rural development linked to the building of developed villages according to 4 statements and 4 targets: the economic development is regarded as the central task along with socio-cultural development and environment protection, to safeguard the national defence and security and to maintain political stability; to agglomerate big villages into small towns in rural areas linked to productions in the local regions and territories; to resettle the people by allocating new places to stay and permanent professions in priority manner; to pursue the people’s poverty reduction by promoting commercial production and services according to their respective local potential” or “To launch staff missions down to grass-roots’ areas to concentrate on transforming villages into developed units (...) by accelerating to counteract social drawbacks appearing in various villages and districts to secure the grassroots areas, to return the good social order and making the people enthusiastic to contribute to the development. Solve the people’s poverty and improve the people’s living and bringing it step by step to better conditions”.

In this concept, poor rural citizens are perceived as the victims of circumstances, the target groups for public sector training on Government policies, law and order and national solidarity and the recipients of public service delivery. It appears that Gol intends to carry forward its vision of State delivered poverty reduction to remote poor villages through linking these to regional and international markets without providing space for local self-initiative and organisation of the civil society. A silver lining in this could be the goal to “Issue 400,000 land titles for all parts of the country within the next 5 years” if it applies primarily to local farmers and traditional land and forest users.

The fact that the Gol is likely to fall short of providing the necessary resources for these ambitious development goals from domestic revenue means that they continue to depend on foreign collaboration partners such as FO to make ends meet. Within the guardrails of the NSEDP, FO is well placed with its decentralised, grassroots related and direct cooperation approach and the technical focus on rural food security. Strong relations with local and provincial authorities may help to mitigate when it comes to centrally driven, land-relevant resettlement and village development master plans.



5. The Evaluation Results¹

Effectivity: tangible and recognised

Based on the field visit and interviews with one PO (CCL) at project office, government office and community level and another four POs (ARMI; ACD; CIDSE and LBFD) in their respective offices, and considering the feedbacks from multiple additional interviews and meetings with associate donor partners, other INGOs and development actors, the overall impression of effectivity at implementation level is largely positive.

The PAFO in Udomxay gave a rather enthusiastic account of its partnership with CCL of “integrated farming with organic approach”, of the scope to support small niche producers to generate speciality products (e.g. bee honey based products; medical herbs) for export while validating local biodiversity. The joint activity report for the EU as the main funding agency of CCL confirms the scale of results achieved at beneficiary levels. However, due to the administrative complexity of arrangements with 5 donors, reporting does not allow attribution to specific external inputs. FO in this context is perceived as a mere co-funding agency. The FO training services provided to the programme have not been substantially validated. No exchange takes place between donors on the projects’ progress, staff problems within CCL are obvious and along with it a regular erosion of experience and know-how. The FO decision to withdraw from this partnership appears obvious and reasonable.

ARMI disclosed an intelligent approach to move forward as an NPA with inclusion of provincial and district level officials and a politically backed composition of the Board. This provides the space to implement village level structures (village interest groups; village development committees) and to facilitate village development plans which have been elaborated bottom up. As no field visit could be effected (see Ch. 3), the impression is based on a meeting with a village delegation at the ARMI office in Savannakhet and on the most recent progress report. The reported changes in poverty incidence and food insecurity, in health and other fields are significant and perceived as having improved the living conditions for the families. Challenges remain in vaccination of livestock or in better coverage of the poorest households. A strong sense of self-confidence was experienced among the community leaders to be better prepared to cope with future challenges.

FO is perceived by both ARMI and ACD as a valuable partner to provide not only funding, but very specific and appropriate advice and training on natural resources management, marketing and most of all the proper management, monitoring and reporting of project implementation. Both underline the importance that FO is focusing its support on one challenge, the food security. The family of PO’s with FO provided an opportunity for peer-learning, “togetherness” is felt to be important to cope with outside influence and emerging new challenges. In comparison, JVC, a Japanese Volunteer INGO which is not a PO of FO, is said to face great problems due to “not

¹ See Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix



being embedded” in a community of organisations and due to their confrontational approach on land rights issues.

The CIDSE-partnership allows FO to indirectly contribute to land related policy advocacy not only as a funding agency but increasingly with technical support, e.g. on organisational development and policy analysis. The PO operates in a sensitive policy environment and has to face regular set-backs. But through the many years of operation and the fact that all implementing activities take place through official channels including the Ministries, the Lao Womens Union, the local police etc., CIDSE has managed to be tolerated as a “broker of interests” and mediator in village level land conflicts. Asked about a plan B in case of further deterioration of the political environment, the PO pointed out the possibility to focus more on technical aspects of food security, with the land issues taken along at back-stage or to spread the risk with another 2nd project. Effectiveness in the field of advocacy is more difficult to capture. According to CIDSE tangible results such as the elaboration of policy statements for the Land Issues Working Group are achievable as part of the Mic-Mac-Network.

An interesting path is taken by LBFD in its Grassroots Leadership Training and Action initiative. Although they have prepared a rich activity report (Annual Report 2014) this has little focus on outcome but is descriptive and little structured. The project has also developed a kind of theory of change based on ethical awareness, in combination with capacity building and sustainable development action. It is promising to note that the respected Buddhist clergy can make a difference in mediating local conflicts of interest over land concessions. This is an asset to bring about more social justice to remote areas which are increasingly exposed to indiscriminate external investments on land with relocation or poorly compensated expropriation under silent approval of local or provincial officials.

Efficiency: reasonable

It has been difficult to obtain evidence on per-unit costs for specific project activities and to get the full picture of administrative costs in the partnerships. However, apart from the CCL-case which is said to run expensive international overheads with the donors’ contributions, the respective PO-structures are largely modest and appropriate in terms of staffing, equipment and facilities. Beyond, the fact that the FO-coordinator is performing his assignment without adequate office facility and minimal transportation and communication infrastructure is a reflection of the good ratio of overhead for 6 decentralised partnerships.

The FO-programme as such has not yet made much progress in facilitating peer learning and developing targeted synergies and regional leverage between the PO’s, apart from exposure visits which seem to have mostly focused on the bee keeping option. There is certainly scope to encourage farmer-to-farmer exchange also on issues such as “how to deal with land concessions”, “how to get organised among village common interests”, “how to better access farm inputs, technology, credits and know-how for agriculture and livestock”, “how to deal with contract farming, with marketing of export crops” etc. Individual activity areas however are wide



apart, and opportunity costs to organise exchange visits are high both in terms of costs and of time for the farmers.

From the field visit, it appears that there is a reasonable balance of benefits between the individual farming families, their local organisations and the institutional strengthening of the PO's. The programme does not get lost in elaborate processes and formalisation of procedures but rather invests the precious resources in activities that benefit the primary target groups.

Relevance: very high

Much of rural Laos is at a development level comparable to Sub-Saharan Africa, with distressing indicators of poverty, malnutrition, child mortality and exclusion. The official policy to “turn land into capital” to drive rural development forward has in many instances led to the aggravation of rural poverty due to loss of access to land, relocation to make way to major land-intensive investments in plantation agriculture, hydropower or mining. Rural development in Laos is thus not synonymous with rural people's development in the broad sense, but has benefited a selected number of people who had access to property and assets and to regional political power. FO's strategy to address food security in such remote areas is thus very pertinent and constitutes a life-line for many communities.

The strategic focus of the FO country programme may be sharpened further, e.g. by building more regional clusters of areas of operation to benefit from the proximity for peer-exchange visits, to decisively focus on food security related activities only, to professionalise its village organisation approach and to allocate more resources to the upland communities with highest incidence of poverty and malnutrition.

Impact: reported but poorly documented

The approach of FO Laos to concentrate on the grassroots level and pursue a consistent, gradual and essentially bottom-up empowerment of the main target groups and their organisations is plausible. This leads to solidly grounded structures over time and allows for self-control and –management of the innovations brought about by the FO-programme. Concerned communities from different partnerships have reported the added value of enjoying exposure to other parts of the country and learn from relevant experience elsewhere which is much more than inspiration on farming technology. This has the added impact of opening people's perspectives to other parts of their own country, other cultures and concepts of livelihoods and mostly, other approaches to deal with challenges. However, the mission finds that the documentation provided does not adequately reflect and underpin the impact of FO's action in Laos.

Sustainability: traceable

In terms of sustainability of economic, social and environmental project outcomes, a broader and more representative documentation would be required to allow for overall programmatic conclusions. Considering the individual target group level, the resilience and capability to



develop specific coping strategies has been reportedly enhanced through the FO programme with direct professional technical advice (e.g. on inclusive local level development planning; crop diversification; land, water and natural resources management or nutritional diversification), the provision of innovative knowledge and sharing of expertise across the partner network (e.g. on bee keeping) and the linkages to other specialised service providers (e.g. positive change through CIDSE on policy inputs to the Land Issues Working Group and soft approaches to empowerment). The programme sustainability is mainly manifested in the lasting effects of professional qualification through capacity building of local people and Government staff. The wide range of capacity strengthening offers provided to the FO partners and through them to farmers, Government staff and local leaders by various INGOs is said to be substantial, although undocumented. FO's own contributions are pragmatically determined by way of identifying actual technical or managerial needs in the process of implementation. This has received a strongly positive echo by some PO's as it contributes to a felt gap and reveals the quality of the FO coordination to be responsive and solution oriented. In order to fit more strategically into the landscape of capacity development activities, it might be useful to map the relevant training initiatives and have a dialogue with the POs over their own strategy to sustainably add value to individual knowledge and to institutionalise external development inputs.

It was however possible to capture the relative institutional effects of FO-contributions among the POs and trace how they are sustaining their quality services and support activities to the respective target communities. The status of each organisation in this respect is variable, with ARMI/NORMAI being more advanced in their process management, PCM, technical and financial capacities compared to other partners. This impression was substantiated by the recent partner assessment by the FO-team (March 2015) and it confirms the need for both conceptual-technical as well as managerial capacity strengthening tailored to specific needs and over a longer period of cooperation with most partner organisations.

An important sustainability-linked aspect brought up by Oxfam Novib is the fundamental importance of secured access to land to ensure that innovations and investments in smallholder agriculture systems have the perspective to be lasting and effective over time. They regret that due to the current political context, many PO's had softened their positions on land rights and diluted this behind a natural resource management focus. Political realism however confirms that the low key approach on land issues taken by FO and its PO's is delivering better results as it seeks to address the issue in the local, case-specific context.

Networking

The tight capacity available for the FO coordination does not allow a regular participation in informal networks among the INGOs in Laos. FO is also not widely known as an INGO outside the direct PO-relations. Both Helvetas and Oxfam Novib as well as CORD have commended FO's quality development contributions but deplored their absence in important policy relevant dialogue fora due to their informal status of operation.



Through CIDSE, the FO expertise has an indirect linkage to NRM-relevant policy platforms such as the Lao development worker oriented mic-mac network which drafts technical and policy inputs towards the more INGO- and bilateral donors' dominated Land Issues Working Group (LIWG). One example of a significant and recent policy contribution is the NGO statement prepared for the last Roundtable Meeting of the international community with the Government in which the Government was urged to find answers to the yet unresolved and land issue related disappearance of a prominent NPA-leader in 2012. It is however impossible to attribute the value addition of this networking effort to any individual contributor, given the wide array of actors involved in such a policy position.

Programme related networking is predominantly done between the partner organisations via joint workshops and study tours. More of this is expected by the partners as they see scope for broadening their approaches and learn directly from practitioners. The approach is however cost-intensive and must be carefully crafted around well identified potentials for mutual benefits. In addition, many partners are themselves engaged in regional networking (e.g. ARMI with institutional study tours in Myanmar; SAEDA in Mekong-wide networks). A new networking opportunity consists in the Swiss (SDC)-led initiative of "enabling environment" with a quarterly meeting between Swiss organisations active in Laos to share on the changes in development context, their approaches, good and less good practice and opportunities for synergies and collaboration. The mission believes that FO could benefit from being better abreast with the programs of SDC, the Centre for Development and Environment (CDE) of the University of Berne, Helvetas, the ICRC, the Swiss Red Cross and some small private foundations which in one way or other often address similar challenges of food security and health in rural livelihood systems.

13

Legal Status of Fastenopfer

The informal status of FO in Laos has definite advantages. It allows for flexibility, for a lean administration and it does not unnecessarily evoke the attention of Government over disputable policy positions. FO's objectives are in line with official development plans and the implementation arrangements generally include the provincial and district authorities.

The flip-side of this is that without an officially registered status as an INGO, FO cannot visibly engage in the sector policy dialogue on food security and rural livelihoods although its conceptual approach would fit well as a learning ground among the respective agencies and the partners are believed to have significant experience that could be shared in the policy process. Currently FO contributes indirectly to the policy dialogue through advocacy-partners such as CIDSE but as mentioned above, it is not perceived as a relevant and specialised policy partner with a profile in the Land Issues Working Group or in food security related platforms by CORD, Helvetas, SDC or others. A further disadvantage consists in the lack of an own MoU which would formalise the presence of an international coordinator under registered foreigner quota with simplified visa arrangement.



Some interview partners, among them Helvetas, have discretely addressed the fact that FO's name could also be in the way of assuming a more prominent role in the policy dialogue arena as under the Government of Laos policy, foreign funded assistance programmes of organisations with a "missionary flavour" would not be accepted. In the past, the Government prohibited foreigners from proselytizing, although it permitted foreign NGOs with religious affiliations to work in the country. But religious practice was "free" only if practitioners stayed within tacitly understood guidelines of activity acceptable to the Government.

In view of the future country programme, FO head office may have to decide on its profile and legal status linked to the policy dialogue ambitions and the formalisation of status.

Operational Issues

Implementation Structure: FO Laos is coordinated under a part-time (65%) mandate to an international consultant based both abroad as well as in Vientiane in time blocks. As a non-registered entity FO enjoys recognition by the Government based on the long-term presence in the country through its CIDSE-partnership. The fact that FO has no formal office in Laos is both an advantage (in terms of avoiding the official radar of surveillance, lean organisation, avoidance of bureaucracy and overheads and flexibility) and a constraint (in terms of visibility, profiling the institution and accessibility). The capacity for effective programme coordination could gain substantially by finding a co-hosting arrangement with an established institutional entity and the scope to share administrative services. Beyond, and in order to share the workload, to help ensure proper record keeping and to complement the current coordinator on programmatic-strategic issues, the structure should be reinforced with a qualified Lao assistant cum trainer.

Instruments: The CP has no value for the coordinator as a management tool as it was not designed for the purpose. The coordinator believes that a future CP as a guiding instrument would have to define a clearer thematic focus, a geographical approach that focuses activities in the most food insecure regions, a concept to cluster programme components in provincial sub-pockets for facilitating easy exchange and efficient deployment of capacity building among the PO's over shared interests and an appropriate coordination structure to optimise programme delivery. Today, the main instruments in place are the specific agreements with PO's, their operational progress reports, the regular field visits and instruments related to training events, capacity building and exchange visits. The culture of translating project documents and the frameworks of objectives into monitorable action steps linked to a baseline and regular measurement of progress is not yet established among the PO's. This is however necessary not only to satisfy FO's own hierarchy, but also for a reliable, evidence-based communication and to inform external missions such as the evaluation team. There are indications in some reports (e.g. ARMI; ACD) that such a logical management structure was discussed, but the way this is translated in the respective documents remains accidental and insufficiently linked to the broad picture of the programmes.



FO Laos follows a pragmatic approach to programme management by avoiding prescriptive PCM-formats and instead accepting the reporting formats of other co-donors with addendums for FO-specific issues. This alleviates PO's from introducing an FO-specific format besides multiple formats already in place from other co-donors. For the FO coordination however this means time-intensive consolidation of different reports and extraction of FO-relevant information for its own internal reporting system with the Head Office. In our view this administrative arrangement is sub-optimal as it consumes precious time from the limited coordination mandate which should be invested for training, advisory services and monitoring/follow-up of activities with PO's. Introducing a lean set of shared PCM-procedures is indicated.

Gender: Empowerment and equality for women, children, the elders or ethnic minorities constitute an important component of most of the targeted groups in the partnerships. ACD is targeting the mothers and children under age of 5 directly, and in the beekeepers association the large majority of knowledgeable specialists are elderly men. Gender aggregated data collection has been introduced in some of the PO's. A more specific targeting of minorities in the village based organisations (VDC's etc.) however is socio-culturally difficult. Therefore the programme pursues the approach for food security for all with no exclusion, and to attract more young people into agriculture.

Thematic Success Factors: FO Laos has assisted a wide range of activities from advising smallholder agriculture in low external input farming practices, the collection of NTFPs, bee keeping, ecosystems management approaches, nutritional education to young mothers, strengthening the capacities of village development committees and village interest groups to ethical awareness raising and grassroots leadership training. The risk of fragmentation from a programmatic perspective is considerable, future programme strategies should envisage a more consistent thematic focus. The current programme contains already a red thread along the sustainable natural resource management for food security, but this does not translate in a consistent support strategy under a clear thematic profile. Such a thematic profile would allow for better optimising limited available resources, enhance specific competencies and widen the scope for networking.

PO-Perceptions of FO Comparative Advantages: Several PO's, but also peer donor agencies and INGOs have reaffirmed that an organisation like FO with its rather technical, but results-oriented approach to improve food security and support small local organisations at the grassroots level is widely appreciated. Most other international agencies concentrate their efforts on ambitious policy-related development initiatives at the regional or national level and on intermediary organisations. In this sense, FO is much closer to ground reality than others and occupies a niche that could help to showcase authoritative field experience on promising rural livelihood systems reforms. Such good practice inputs would be welcomed by agencies such as Oxfam Novib, Helvetas or CIDSE.



Risk Management

FO is dealing with political risks by keeping a low public profile and operating with a bottom-up empowerment approach through registered national or local level NPAs and an INGO. This mode of operation has both advantages and constraints (see chapter on Legal Status) but it essentially allows FO to ensure continuity in services and avoid bureaucratic constraints common to some other donor agencies. Perhaps the most important part of FO in risk mitigation consists in their approach to facilitate diversified livelihood options based on more sustainable natural resource management in the upland farming systems. This approach benefits the farmers by enhancing their food secure period, broad-base the income sources and ensure more nutritional diversity.

6. Evaluation Conclusions

Relative to the Lao development context, the above outlined authoritative encapsulation of civil society actors in development should not distract from the fact that many NPAs and INGOs in Laos continue to deliver vital services to the community which are not covered by State actors or private business.

In terms of development challenges, a large majority of the scattered rural population in the country is confronted with multiple constraints, among them poor access to health and education, accentuated food insecurity and malnutrition and inadequate control over productive resources such as land, water, technology and credit. This challenge is even acknowledged by the latest government 5-year plan. The country, in the wider Asian context, is among the poorest nations, comparable to countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, with rapidly growing but highly concentrated wealth among a small elite and modernization of few urban centres while large tracts of productive land are sold or leased to international investors for resource exploitation, hydropower or plantation agriculture. The official mantra of “turning land into capital” is driven forward with priority. This leaves many rural communities exposed to largely uncontrolled market forces and the pressure for integration of formerly self-sufficient rural smallholders and forest users into modern production systems for which they do not have the required coping-strategies. Corruption around the allocation of land concessions further prevents rural communities from exercising their land rights as a precondition for sustaining their livelihoods.

With comparatively modest means, FO is currently engaged in capacity strengthening and organisational development through 6 implementing partner organisations with a thematic focus on food insecurity. The evaluation team is of the opinion that the thematic niche of FO at the grassroots level and the bottom-up empowerment approach constitute a very relevant rationale for continued development support to rural areas in transition. It has the potential to contribute to tangible results for the rural communities and organisational effectiveness and efficiency gains among the partner organisations.



In terms of the programmatic effectiveness and impact, the efficiency of its implementation and the sustainability of programme contributions, the present analysis concludes to have found a significant amount of tangible development results that benefit the target groups and which are directly attributable to the FO country programme. Delivery mechanisms have some scope for improvement, e.g. by seeking efficiency gains for farmer-to-farmer and PO-to-PO peer learning through the selection of less distant project areas. And programme sustainability may require a clear concept for ensuring lasting institutionalisation of those programme contributions which can be housed in the PO's, in government structures or in village level organisations and containing an exit strategy for the time after the FO-support. The overall programme quality of the CP Laos may be rated as good and cost-effective, also in comparison to other foreign funded programmes in Laos which are often operating at higher levels of input and are struggling with similar sustainability challenges.

Based on the above confirmed programme quality, the following conclusions can be drawn regarding the future orientation of the FO Laos programme:

- A continuation and further strengthening of the FO Laos programme makes much sense from a development policy and needs perspective as well as their focused approach to credibly address a key challenge for poor communities in the country, the food insecurity.
- In order to keep its relative influence within partnerships, Fastenopfer should attempt a critical mass of co-funding with each partner. As the overall budgetary envelope may be restricted to between 800'000 and 1 mio. CHF and the overhead component will have to be slightly increased (see management challenges above), the number of active project partnerships should not exceed 5.
- Depending on Fastenopfers' ambitions to actively contribute to sector policy processes in agriculture and food security in an advocacy role, a possible formalisation as an INGO should be considered while bearing in mind that this might go at the cost of losing current freedoms and flexibilities.
- Fastenopfers' thematic approach may be further focused to emphasize community-level and individual food security in selected upland livelihood systems under stress. Partners should be identified according to institutional selection criteria, but also with a regionally clustered approach to avoid dispersion with excessive logistical expense for program management and to simplify mutual collaboration through exchange visits at reasonable costs.
- The Fastenopfer country programme coordination could gain in both capacity and competence by being reinforced with a qualified Lao national assistant, the sharing of office space with appropriate other organisations (co-hosting arrangement) and a



reasonable increase of the coordination budget for the wide range of project follow-up, program management, results-reporting, learning and training activities undertaken.

Although some short term adaptations to the current programme management would be indicated from the analysis above, the evaluators suggest to focus efforts on a solid and more detailed situational assessment and design of a strategic framework for the coming CP-period.

7. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions above, the evaluation team offers the following six recommendations towards the future course of action for the FO CP in Laos:

- (1) Carry the CP forward into a truly programmatic future with a medium to longer term perspective linked to selected strategic goals on poverty reduction, sustainable agriculture and food security in the NSEDP (FO-rationale based on relevance; legitimacy).
- (2) Sharpen the CP profile. Define, based on a detailed situational analysis of the recent and likely future political opportunities, the current state of regional poverty and food insecurity, the mapping of and the institutional donor landscape the
 - a. thematic focus (food security),
 - b. the geographic focus (2-3 cluster areas, food insecure uplands),
 - c. FO's role and ambitions at the grassroots level, in strengthening intermediary partners, in the collaboration with regional authorities and in sector specific policy dialogue,
 - d. the criteria for partnerships and size of the portfolio (max. 6 with an overall budget of 1 mio. CHF/y.),
 - e. the thematic approaches
 - f. the management procedures
- (3) Clarify the legal status and policy-level ambitions for FO as an organisation in Laos
- (4) Design an appropriate management structure for the above CP-profile
- (5) Develop guidance for a risk management strategy, covering the political risks, the programmatic risks and the climate change and natural disaster related risks
- (6) As part of a wider family of FO country programmes, contribute to a regional/international network of exchange over selected issues of common concern, e.g.
 - a. Asia: how to deal with the influence of external investments in the project area; how to deal with local level corruption?



- b. Global: how to institutionalise capacity strengthening efforts beyond the programme duration?

The evaluation team reaffirms its overall recommendation to FO to continue its commitment in the Lao PDR as an advocate for the poor rural communities in their own efforts to ensure long term food security and as a professional provider of development services beyond 2016.

Vientiane / Oberscherli, June 2015



Annex 1: Terms of Reference



FASTENOPFER

Fastenopfer Country Programme Evaluations 2015

Evaluation of the Country Programme Laos

Terms of Reference

1. Background

Fastenopfer is a Catholic NGO based in Switzerland. *Fastenopfer* is currently running 14 Country Programmes in its priority countries Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Madagascar, Senegal, South Africa, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Laos, Nepal and the Philippines. In accordance with the overarching *Fastenopfer* strategy, they all cover the period 2011- 2016. The *Fastenopfer* strategy defines three fields of activities: 1) Improving living conditions of poor people in the South, 2) improving framework conditions in the North and in the South and 3) changing life style in Switzerland. It focuses on three core thematic areas 1) Food Sovereignty 2) Faith and Justice 3) Human Rights.

Fastenopfer has Headquarters in Lucerne and two branches in Lausanne and Lugano. Its structural set-up encompasses five divisions: 1) South, 2) Development Policy, 3) Marketing and Communication, 4) Education, 5) Services and Infrastructure. *Fastenopfers* yearly turnover of around CHF 21 million is mainly financed by an ecumenical campaign with *Bread for all*, donations and a contribution of the *Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)*.

The main operational features of *Fastenopfers* engagement are defined in the Programme Document "People strengthen people" (2013-2016). In its priority countries, *Fastenopfer* is cooperating on a long-term basis with local partner organisations. Programme officers in Lucerne and coordination units in the priority countries jointly manage this cooperation. The yearly expenditures per programme are around CHF 600'000 – 800'000 CHF.

In view of defining a new strategy and country programme period 2017 -2022, *Fastenopfer* embarked in a broad process of strategy and programme revision. The scope of work for this strategy process is defined in general Terms of reference. Early landmarks of this process were a Mid Term Review in all Country Programmes, with a focus on learning, a partner assessment, as well as regional coordination meetings with the aim to identify new challenges and issues. In the first half year of 2015, *Fastenopfer* is planning evaluations of all its Country Programmes, core thematic concepts and the structural set-up. The results of these evaluations shall inform on the one hand the formulation of the new *Fastenopfer* Strategy and on the other hand the credit proposal for *SDC*, which has to be submitted in spring 2016.

The Head of Department South commits four external evaluations of Country Programmes (Burkina Faso, Haiti, Laos, and South Africa) with international experts. Individual programme officers for the other

20



programmes may commit external evaluations with national experts or undertake a self-evaluation with their partner organisations.

Fastenopfer will synthesize the results of all evaluations (Country Programmes, thematic concepts, structural set-up), draw conclusions and discuss options for its future strategic positioning with its staff by end of August 2015 and at the coordinators meeting in September 2015. *Fastenopfer* has mandated an external consultant with a backstopping of the overall strategy process.

2. Purpose and objective of the evaluation

The evaluation shall be used by different stakeholders for the following purposes:

- The Board of *Fastenopfer* shall give its okay to use the evaluation for information and accountability
- The Board of *Fastenopfer* shall draw conclusions on the consequences of the evaluation for the formulation of the new *Fastenopfer* strategy
- The Head of Department South shall draw conclusions on necessary modifications in the next Programme period
- The Programme officers and coordinators shall use the evaluation as a basis for elaborating the new Country Programme 2017-2022

The evaluation has the following objectives

- assess the relevance of the Country Programme as well as the effectiveness and efficiency of its implementation
- assess the impact of programme activities on the target groups and sustainability of improvements in their living conditions
- assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Country Programme as a management tool for steering the cooperation between *Fastenopfer* and the partner organisations
- assess strengths and weaknesses of the implementation arrangements, namely the collaboration with partner organisations and the coordination units
- identify potentials and obstacles for a possible reorientation of the Country Programme
- The recommendations will feed into the process of the formulation of *Fastenopfer's* future country strategy for Laos

21

3. Subject matters of the evaluation

The evaluation shall cover the following subject matters:

- the Country Programme Laos and all referring organisational and contractual arrangements (coordination, partner organisations, other)
- the ongoing implementation period 2011–2016 and the perspectives for the next programme period 2017-2022
- the relevant *Fastenopfer* documentation (see list in section 10).
- the relevant governance, strategy and project documents of the partner organisations
- the relevant policy documents of the Government of Laos governing international cooperation in the NGO-sector



4. Evaluation Questions

The following topics shall be analysed:

Effectivity

- To which extent will *Fastenopfer* and the partner organisations (PO) meet the defined objectives of the programme by the end of the programme period?
- To which extent and regarding what thematic issues are Advocacy and Lobbying activities being undertaken in the Country Programme? How successful are they?

Efficiency

- What is the relation between efforts and results of the programme?
- Do *Fastenopfer* and the PO use their potentials? Where are the bottlenecks?

Relevance

- How consistent, appropriate and relevant is the Country Programme?
- How do *Fastenopfer* and the PO analyse the needs of the target groups?

Impact

- Which advantages do *Fastenopfer* and the PO promise to the targets groups?
- Who has which benefits from the Country Programme?

Sustainability

- How do *Fastenopfer* and the PO foster the sustainability of the effects of their common undertakings: (e.g. capacity development in resilience and coping strategies; organisational development; exit strategies; changes of the political framework, etc.)?

22

Networking

- How do *Fastenopfer* and the PO network with different stakeholders in the region/country? What are the results of this networking?

Operational Issues

- How effective is the implementation structure and the programme management?
- How consistent and meaningful are the instruments (PCM Manual, Monitoring, reporting and planning document; policy statements)
- To which extent and how has the transversal theme Gender been integrated in the Country Programme?
- What are thematic success factors (promising practices)?
- How do PO and other development actors assess *Fastenopfers* comparative advantages?

Risk management

- How do *Fastenopfer* and the PO deal with risks (political and economic crisis, armed conflicts, catastrophes, etc.)?
-



5. Methodology

The evaluation consists of three phases.

a) Preparation

- Study of documents provided by *Fastenopfer*. Please refer to section 10 of the ToRs (including possible clarifications by phone)
- Interview/Discussion with Programme Officer
- Submission of a draft inception report (max. 10 pages) that must contain at least the following points
 - Preliminary findings/assumptions to the evaluation questions
 - Conclusions for the methodology during the field mission, key information to be obtained during the interviews in Laos, interview partners to be met, participants of a restitution workshop, indicators for verification/falsification of the preliminary findings/assumptions
 - planning of the field mission (in collaboration with the coordination unit in Laos)
- Comments will be provided by the Head of Department South, the programme officer for Laos and the coordination unit within one week after receipt of the draft inception report.
- Incorporation of the written comments into the draft inception report.

b) Field mission

- Interviews and visits of programme sites in Laos
- Restitution to coordination unit and partner organisations about preliminary findings/recommendations based on the inception report, the interviews and visits in Laos

c) Report

- Submission of a draft report to the Head of Department South at least one week before the agreed date of presentation of the final report at *Fastenopfer* Headquarters
- Comments will be provided by the Head of Department South, the programme officer for Laos and the participants of the workshop within three days after the debriefing meeting
- Incorporation of the written comments and submission of the final version of the report.

The evaluation will build up its work on the standards for evaluations of the OECD DAC.

An international expert will carry out phase a) and c) of the evaluation. *Fastenopfer* will recruit a national expert for phase b). In phase b) the international expert will be the team leader.

The participation of the target group(s) is to be foreseen as part of the evaluation by using methods of qualitative impact assessment.

6. Time plan



The evaluation shall be carried out in the period from January 20th 2015 to June 30st 2015.

The field mission is foreseen in the period of March 10th-20th 2015.

7. Deliverables of the evaluator

The international evaluator is expected to provide the following deliverables

- draft and final inception report (max. 10 pages, without annexes, in English)
- restitution workshop at the end of the field mission
- draft and final version of the evaluation report (in English). The evaluation report must contain an executive summary and a list of recommendations. It should not comprise more than 25 pages (not including annexes)
- presentation at *Fastenopfer* Headquarters

8. Deliverables of Fastenopfer South Department

The South Department provides the following services to the evaluator:

- continuous coordination of the mandate
- organisation of a briefing meeting with the evaluator
- provision of the relevant documentation in Switzerland
- all arrangements for interviews and meetings in Laos
- feedbacks to the draft inception report and the draft final report
- approval of the final report

24

9. Management of the evaluation

The mandate comprises max. 20 working days for the international expert and max. 10 working days for the national expert.

The coordination unit in country will contribute to the preparations and the realisation of the evaluation by organising and facilitating all meetings and discussions in Laos.

The South Department and the coordination unit in country will be responsible for all logistical arrangements.

An advance payment will be transferred upon acceptance of the inception report by *Fastenopfer*. The remaining costs will be settled by *Fastenopfer* after the presentation of the final invoice and its acknowledgement.



10. Annex: Documentation

Fastenopfer in general

- Strategie *Fastenopfer* 2016, Version 3.3.11 (german)
- *Fastenopfer* Programmdokument z.H. der DEZA, 29.10.2013 (german)
- *Fastenopfer* Südstrategie 2011-2016 (german)
- Handbuch Süden/PCM Manual (2012)
- Operativer Jahresbericht 2012 (german)
- Operativer Jahresbericht 2013 (german)
- Study *Relevance and Effects of Action in the Faith and Justice Field* (Executive Summary), Elisa Fuchs, Luciano Padrao, December 2012
- Two evaluations (Executive Summary) on the core theme Food Sovereignty (german)
- Terms of Reference für die Erarbeitung der Strategie 2017-2022 (german)
- Policy Statement Gender

Country Programme Laos

- Country Programme Laos 2011-2016 Document, February 2011
- Annual Monitoring and Reporting 2011 - Planning 2012
- Annual Monitoring and Reporting 2012 - Planning 2013
- Annual Monitoring and Reporting 2013 - Planning 2014
- Annual Monitoring and Reporting 2014 - Planning 2015
- Mid Term Review 2011-2013 of the Country Programme Laos, March 2014
- Synthesis of the three Regional *Fastenopfer* Coordinators Meeting (2014/2015)
- Partner Assessment of the Country Programme Laos
- Relevant project documents



Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix

Dimension	ToR Evaluation Questions	Evaluation Hypothesis for CP Laos 2011-2016	Means of verification
Effectivity	To which extent will <i>Fastenopfer</i> and the partner organisations (PO) meet the defined objectives of the programme by the end of the programme period?	FO, through its PO's, contribute to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improved and diversified food security strategies in communities - catalyse income generating activities from agriculture and NTFP - support the community level awareness and organisation re. land tenure, public services and civic rights 	Measurable and attributable results documented by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - M&E systems - Reporting, documentation - Interviews
	To which extent and regarding what thematic issues are Advocacy and Lobbying activities being undertaken in the Country Programme? How successful are they?	FO succeeds in advocating innovative food security and income generation approaches and in raising awareness on marketing, trade opportunities and land rights through targeted A&L activities	Examples of successful A&L from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews Reporting
Efficiency	What is the relation between efforts and results of the programme?	CP Laos achieves significant and measurable development results with an optimised human and financial effort.	Measurable results attributable to the CP Laos. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimates of cost-effectiveness ratio of key activities.
	Do <i>Fastenopfer</i> and the PO use their potentials? Where are the bottlenecks?	FO and their PO's generate synergies and leverage by combining their comparative institutional advantages.	Examples of synergy/leverage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of/ reasons for unused synergy potentials.
Relevance	How consistent, appropriate and relevant is the Country Programme?	CP Laos tangibly addresses one of the country's key development challenges (food security/sovereignty) with a consistent and implementable development strategy.	Thematic / geographic focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP consistency and implementability CP compliance with SEDP
	How do <i>Fastenopfer</i> and the PO analyse the needs of the target groups?	FO and the PO have developed an appropriate methodology to capture and analyse the needs of their target groups.	Field interviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation
Impact	Which advantages do <i>Fastenopfer</i> and the PO promise to the targets groups?	FO, through the PO's, advocates tangible and realistic development outcomes to the target groups	Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
	Who has which benefits from the Country Programme?	The CP Laos generates significant benefits for village communities, well defined target groups as well as for its partner organisations.	Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> interviews
Sustainability	How do <i>Fastenopfer</i> and the PO foster the sustainability of the effects of their common undertakings: (e.g. capacity development in resilience and coping strategies; organisational	FO, through their POs, is fostering lasting development outcomes and structural change in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - capacity development - organisational development - programme exit strategies 	Reporting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews



	development; exit strategies; changes of the political framework, etc.)?	- positive change to political framework	
Networking	How do <i>Fastenopfer</i> and the PO network with different stakeholders in the region/country? What are the results of this networking?	FO and the POs engage in successful networking with value addition among themselves and within the iNGO community	Examples of value-generating networking results from: Reporting Interviews
Operational Issues	How effective is the implementation structure and the programme management?	FO has optimised its implementation structure and programme management under the given frame conditions	Interviews Documentation
	How consistent and meaningful are the instruments (PCM Manual, Monitoring, reporting and planning document; policy statements)	The CP Laos is based on a consistent set of management instruments which are: - providing strategic guidance - fostering planning in partnership - allowing to capture results - encouraging to identify and learn from constraints - flexible to adapt to changing frame conditions or lessons on the way.	Documentation Interviews
	To which extent and how has the transversal theme Gender been integrated in the Country Programme?	Gender is an integral part of the CP Laos strategic framework, the PO's projects and the organisational culture	Reporting Interviews
	What are thematic success factors (promising practices)?	CP Laos has generated successful approaches and development results fit for replication	Examples from field visits and interviews Documentation
	How do PO and other development actors assess <i>Fastenopfers</i> comparative advantages?	PO's and other development actors confirm FO's organisational profile as a small but complementary niche funding partner with distinct comparative advantages	Interviews
	Risk Management	How do <i>Fastenopfer</i> and the PO deal with risks (political and economic crisis, armed conflicts, catastrophes, etc.)?	FO and the POs are risk conscious organisations with appropriate approaches to mitigate those risks and as a part of the international community in Laos, they engage in permanently improving the risk environment for development cooperation.



Annex 3: List of People Interviewed

Date	Person	Organisation	Function
11.2.	Markus Brun	Fastenopfer CH	Bereichsleiter Süden
	Sandrine Cottier	Fastenopfer CH	Fachverantwortliche Südprogramme
	Helene Jeppesen	Fastenopfer CH	Programmverantwortliche Laos
10.3.	Filip Debruyne	Fastenopfer Laos	Programme Coordinator
11.3.	Helene Jeppesen	Fastenopfer CH	Programmverantwortliche Laos
	Anne Schooffs	Fastenopfer Laos	Advisor
	Vilayphone Chouramany	Meraki Consultants	Lao Co-Evaluator
	Sengthong Phothisane	SDC	National Programme Officer
	Sean Foley	Samdhana Fdt.	Independent Consultant
12.3.	Celestine Kroeschell	Helvetas Laos	Country Representative
	Antonino Faibene	Oxfam Novib	Assoc. Country Director
	Rio Pals	CORD	Country Representative
13.3.	Bounlian Volakod	PAFO Udomxay	Director
	Elisa Sily	CCL Laos	Project Advisor
	Khongmany Thamavong	CCL Laos	National Coordinator
	4 Lao TA's	CCL	Technical Advisors
	Chansouk Douangvilay	AESBO	Director and Team
14.3.	5 bee keepers		
	Village Meeting 40 villagers	Ban Mokhong	Village Head; PAFO Team; CCL- Team
	Farm visit		Master bee keeper
15.3.	Mr. Amphone Souvannalath	ARMI	Director
	Ms. xx	ARMI	Programme Officer
16.3.	Project Team	ARMI	
17.3.	6 villagers	VDC	Naiban, farmers representatives
	xx	DAFO	Deputy Director
	Phianchith Phoupaseuth	ARMI	Community Development Facilitator
	Sengkeo Thongvanna	ARMI	Programme Officer
	Phetdavan Nouthangongdeth	ARMI	Administrative Assistant
	Boualaphet Chounthavong	ACD	Director
	Vilasorn Thongmanivong	ACD	Project Coordinator
18.3.	Mariko Hayashi	JVC	Country Representative
19.3.	Khankham Douangsila	CIDSE	Director
	Ven. Athipatay Maytrijit	Lbfd	Director
20.3.	Dr. Urs Lauper	Swiss Lao Hospital Project	Director

