Great changes begin with small steps
Evaluation of Liberia – Norway Partnership Community Development Programme

Final report, December 2011
This report is a result of an evaluation assignment given by the United Methodist Church in Norway Board of global Ministries and financed by them,

Diakonhjemmet Høgskole / Diakonhjemmet University College

Postboks 184, Vinderen
N-0319 Oslo

http://www.diakonhjemmet.no

Rapport: 2011/13

ISBN: 978-82-8048-114-6

Elektronisk distribusjon:

Diakonhjemmet Høgskole
Foreword

The United Methodist Church in Norway Board of Global Ministries invited Diakonhjemmet University College to evaluate their development programme in Liberia. The evaluation is also supported financially by them. This report presents findings, results and recommendations that came out from the evaluation.

The evaluation was conducted in collaboration with Mr. Mulbah S. Jackollie which is Principal at a Vocational College in Liberia. Mr. Jackollie conducted interviews, observations and partied in the data collection. He was also an important partner to help me understand, interpret and contextualise the information we collected and the observations we had. He has read and commented on the draft report. We are both responsible for the content and recommendations given. Secretary General of the United Methodist Church in Norway Board of Global Ministries Mrs. Tove Odland and consultant Mr. Nils Atle Krokeide have been important discussants through the evaluation process and have read and commented on the draft report. And last but not least the staff in the Department of Community Services in the United Methodist Church in Liberia Director Jonathan Kaipay and Associate Director Emma Okai, have been important and patient in serving us through the evaluation process.

I would like to thank The United Methodist Church in Norway Board of Global Ministries that gave me this opportunity to look into their development programme in Liberia and openly shared their experiences, challenges, ideas and hopes with me. They gave me the opportunity to learn more about their exciting work and the conditions for people of Liberia.

Oslo, December 2011

Elsa Døhlie

Associate Professor
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Executive summary

The United Methodist Church in Norway (UMCN) and its sister church The United Methodist Church in Liberia (LAC/UMC) have cooperated in different mission activities during many years. In 2007, a new mutual programme planning resulted in a proposal to Digni (former Bistandsnemnda), and a five years agreement from 2008 – 2012 to implement the Liberia – Norway Partnership Community Development Programme (CODEVPRO), Partnership in Development in Liberia (PID) was put in place. This report is a result of an evaluation of the programme after four years of implementation. The purpose of the evaluation was: 1. to make an assessment of CODEVPRO’s achievements in relation to its objectives stated in the corresponding programme plan and annual plans etc., to document the lessons learned in the programme and to present recommendations for the future of the programme. 2. To assess the methodology of Partnership in Development (PID) and its relevance to similar Community Development Programmes in other contexts.

CODEVPRO aims to secure PID and put its principles into practice. The idea behind PID is that local communities and local project committees should take a leading role in planning, implementing and management of the projects. The assumption of PID is that the outcome of development efforts is influenced by how the relationships between the partners UMCN, LAC/UMC, local communities, Government of Liberia and relevant Ministries are organised and how they cooperate. The programme is supposed to be based on important principles such as democratic structures, transparent management, accountability, good quality bookkeeping, etc. and by this the intention of PID is to reduce unnecessary bureaucratic burden in the development cooperation.

Some of the lessons learned in CODEVPRO are:
CODEVPRO operates where there are local churches of LAC/UMC. These are located in poor rural and in some cases isolated communities. In this regard the programme has been able to reach its objective. The beneficiaries are substantial in each project mainly because of the community base approach and the outreach in the local communities adding up to app 154 000 beneficiaries.

CODEVPRO utilizes to a large extend the money received in a cost effective and efficient way. Inputs from the local communities are important to sustain this efficiency. If CODEVPRO had liaise with representatives of MOE and MOH local staff right from the beginning, however, the compliance with the Liberian standards for constructing schools, health clinics and health centres could probably have increased efficiency. The interventions have to be holistic; a school project should be complete with all requisite facilities, not leaving out an auditorium and teachers quarters furnished and equipped reading rooms because of inadequate resources. Quality is important and it is better to reduce number of projects.

The spread of projects across the country is costly. An extensive time for follow ups in the field is used by the DCS staff and the Department can easily be overstretched by this amount of work. CODEVPRO needs to match its project management capacity with project portfolio in order to continue doing good and qualitative jobs. The wide range of geographic areas and activities coupled with poor road condition show that transportation is a limiting factor for effective project implementation, supervision and monitoring. This gives cost burden on project implementation-logistics and security risks.

The output of the programme has been in accordance to the plan. By the end of 2011 39 projects have been completed or are in the process of planning or implementation. More than 25000 people...
from local communities have been trained. This proves an enormous amount of work put in place by all partners and not at least by the communities, LAC/UMC and CODEVPRO/ DCS staff

All communities visited firmly defended their decisions and their projects. They were convinced that they had chosen the most relevant projects that would begin transforming their lives. The PID concept assures the possibility of supporting relevant projects and programme relevance is a very strong part of CODEVPRO. The evaluation found few income generating projects in the communities. They were mainly in the area of agriculture. The Guesthouse project has left a lesson learned that there is a need to conduct business/feasibility studies prior to supporting income generation projects. Income generating activities might be prioritised in the future. In addition none of the projects were set up to strengthen individuals’ personal businesses.

It is still early to assess the extent to which the programme has improved lives as well as the extent to which communities are empowered to meet development challenges. However a positive outcome can be expected of improved living conditions for the people in the communities. As examples, receiving better healthcare, education for the children, youth and grownups, clean water etc. are assessed as important and basic measures to improve living conditions, strengthening democracy, fighting poverty and facilitating development for the whole country.

Regarding CODEVPRO as a programme, it is naturally enough not possible to maintain all the activities without outside support. But since CODEVPRO is integrated into the LAC/UMC’s Department of Community Services and works directly under the Bishop’s authority, the programme doesn’t have to end if outside support is not available. It is therefore important to maintain CODEVPRO within the Department. DCS is also attracting other donors from Norway like Mission Alliance which proves the importance of the PID methodology. The important structure and layout of the LAC/UMC represent is an ideal model for facilitating structure in the development of Liberia.

CODEVPRO is successful in practising partnership in development because it allows local communities to play a leading role in decision making and implementation of projects. CODEVPRO encourages local partners’ participating in the planning and monitoring of projects. CODEVPRO shows that it is possible to simplify the process of application and reporting at all levels of the chain, from local communities through the local/national partner to the Norwegian partner, and finally to DIGNI and Norwegian authorities.

CODEVPRO has been able to facilitate that communities have elected project committees locally and democratically. The parties have been able to plan, budget and implement timely and efficiently. CODEVPRO and LAC/UMC together with the local project committees have to our knowledge been correct and transparent about financial management on the four management levels in line with the financial management manual. Good book keeping standards are put in place and monitored regularly.

The PID projects in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe should continue to learn from each other. However, learning should not only be organised around interchange visits and seminars, but should more be organised around a regional centre for development and continued improvement of good systems. Partnership with academic institutions and development of manuals, theoretical and practical exercises in this field should be developed.
Recommendations:

1. CODEVPRO needs to put in cross-cutting issues such as the environment, gender, violence against women, ethnicity and HIV/AIDS in their planning and implementation of projects in the communities. The training workshops are excellent opportunities for educating the local communities in these issues.

2. The CODEVPRO programme has to make sure of proper ownership of the lands given from the local communities as well as individuals to the projects. This will be of importance for the future.

3. The partnership between GOL through its relevant ministries and agencies, UMC/LAC local districts and CODEVPRO should be strengthened to ensure compliance and sustainability. Schools or health centre projects should be completed with all requested facilities in compliance with GOL standards.

4. Security procedures, insurance, allowances and routines for staff travelling and staff vehicles have to be put in place. Human resources are the most valuable asset in the programme. This has to be taken seriously from LAC/UMC and UMCN. One suggestion could be to have a committee lead by the Bishop to go through all security procedures and follow up on relevant issues.

5. There is a need to continuously ensure capacity building for management staff in CODEVPRO.

6. CODEVPRO has to balance the capacity of the staff and the amount of projects planned and implemented to keep focus on building civil society and to ensure the quality of the good work.

7. The regional collaboration and learning processes in PID should be continued and be strengthened by creating a regional centre where Liberia, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe could work together. Experiences can be shared to improve the methodology of PID in different contexts and to strengthen the capacity of developmental work within the Methodist church context.

8. To strengthen the PID concept in different contexts there is a need to document the PID methodologies in a handbook or sort of a manual, reflecting lessons learned and best practices. This can be done by joining partnership with an academic institution; as an example the Methodist University in Liberia. This partnership between theoretical and practical institutions and approaches in the field of PID can enrich the learning within academic disciplines and the Church structures.
1. Introduction
The United Methodist Church in Norway (UMCN) and its sister church The United Methodist Church in Liberia (LAC/UMC) have cooperated in different mission activities during many years (since 1947). Among other things, The United Methodist Church in Norway has sent several missionaries to Liberia and has supported various mission and social activities carried out by The United Methodist Church in Liberia. The two churches decided in 2006 to mutually carry out a feasibility study to see if and how there could be possibilities to extend the cooperation. The feasibility study concluded with a positive recommendation, and in 2007 a mutual programme planning started. The planning resulted in a proposal to Digni (former Bistandsnemnda) and a five years agreement from 2008 – 2012 to implement the Liberia – Norway Partnership Community Development Programme (CODEVPRO); Partnership in Development in Liberia (PID) was signed. This report is a result of an evaluation of the programme after four years of implementation.

Country and people of Liberia
Liberia is located on the west coast of Africa and has a tropical climate with two seasons: the rainy season; which runs from April to October and a dry season during the rest of the year. Liberia is the oldest African republic founded by African Americans (A group of freed American slaves) in 1822, and it declared its independence on July 26, 1847. Basic facts about Liberia include:
- Estimated population: 4 million (2010)
- Capital: Monrovia
- Area: 111,370 sqkm
- Official Language: English
- Adult illiterates: 40%
- Access to clean water: 68%
- Fertility rate: 5.9 births per woman
- Malnutrition children under five: 20%
- Child mortality per 1000: 112
- Life expectancy: 58 years
- HIV positive: 2%
- Religion: Indigenous beliefs 20%, Christians 60%, and Muslims 20%
- Ethnic group: Kpelle, Bassa, Gio, Kru, Grebo, Mano, Krahn, GolaGbendi, Kissi, Vai, Dei, Belle Mandingo, Mende, and Americo-Liberians

The present president Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf a US-educated economist and former finance minister who won the second round of presidential elections in November 2005 was inaugurated in January 2006 as Africa's first elected woman head of state. She was re-elected in 2011. The president has been an active member of The United Methodist Church in Liberia. The president was awarded with the Noble Peace Prize in 2011.

Context of the operating environment
Fourteen years of conflict devastated the human resource base and physical infrastructures of Liberia including institutions and agencies that were providing basic social services. Over two hundred thousand Liberians lost their lives and hundreds of thousands Liberians were displaced internally and in neighbouring and other countries around the world. Fleeing civilians left behind needed inputs and depended largely on hand-outs from the international community.

As Liberia emerged from the destruction brought by the war, resettlement and transforming the lives of internally displaced people (IDP) and returnees who for many decades, depended on hand outs
became serious a challenge to both the Government of Liberia and international partners in progress. Because of inadequate public institutions, most transitional and development assistance are presently channeled through local and international non-governmental and faith-based organizations.

Since the presidential and general elections in 2005, the Government of Liberia has created an enabling environment for transitional and development activities. The 2011 presidential and general elections offers hope for continuity of UMC humanitarian activities bringing hope to thousands of rural men, women and children with very little or no hope.

2. The Terms of Reference and evaluation methods
The purpose of this evaluation was twofold:

First: to make an assessment of CODEVPRO’s achievements in relation to its objectives stated in the corresponding programme plan and annual plans etc., to document the lessons learned in the programme and to present recommendations for the future of the programme.

Second: to assess the methodology of Partnership in Development (PID) and its relevance to similar Community Development Programmes in other contexts.

Methodology and data collection
The evaluation team has worked with the following data:

- Reading proposals, reports, documentation and other relevant information
- Presentation of the programme and the context by staff at DCS
- 4 days field visits (see programme in annex) interviews, observations and project presentations by the communities and DCS staff visiting 11 projects
- Discussions with UMCN Secretary General and her Consultant
- Data compiling and analysis of findings
- Preliminary recommendations

By the end of the two weeks in Liberia the evaluation team presented the findings and preliminary recommendations in a half-day workshop where LAC/UMC representatives on Central and District level where present in addition to representatives from the Methodist University

3. Why partnership in Development
CODEVPRO is based on the idea of PID. PID is a concept searching for a partnership model tailored for church/mission organisations that can result in more effective and efficient development practice. According to Krokeide (2004, p. 6) the objectives of PID are as follows:

- That the main focus of future development work shall be at the local level of civil society (congregation) and that the work contributes to the strengthening of civil society and the development of democratic organisations.
- That the responsibility for the planning, implementation and evaluation of development projects rests with the local partner.

http://www.bistandsnemnda.no/newsread/ReadImage.asp?WCI=GetByID&IMAGEID=4&DOCID=100926
See also Terms of Reference
• To simplify the process of application and reporting at all levels of the chain, from the local civil society level through the local/national partner to the Norwegian partner, and finally to BN and NORAD.

• To improve the quality of the development work carried out by churches and Christian organisations, with increased focus upon sustainable impact in local society.

Focus on local communities

When it comes to development efforts there are according to Mersland (2009, p7) basically three ways in which a local congregation can relate with a local community: in the community, for the community, and with the community. When a church is placed in a community but does not actively relate with the community in development efforts, the church’s operational mode is in the community. This type of a church often has limited diaconal engagement outside the church. Any development efforts therefore tend to concentrate upon serving their own members’ needs. This attitude and practice is still very common.

Congregations working for the community observe many needs in their local communities: street children need lodging, kids need schooling, alcoholics and drug addicts need counselling, shelter and food and AIDS victims need medicine. These observations motivate the church to start serving these needs. The church becomes a service provider and works for the community. When a church starts working with the community, things change. Instead of being a service provider, the church becomes a promoter, facilitator, mobiliser and dialogue partner. Instead of the church deciding on which needs to serve, the church enters into partnership with the community. The church now asks, “What can we do together to improve our community?” Long-term planning (it often takes two years from planning to implementation), rigid and often irrelevant reporting, delayed financial transfers, measurement of irrelevant indicators (as seen from the community), complicated processes of adjustments, etc., can often make development efforts an exercise for specialists. Another consequence is that the people living in the communities become recipients.

The local community should be the starting point of all local projects. The community and its populations would be the entity which is best qualified to assess their own situation and their own needs. A local project should be based upon the local assessment and local solutions according to their own possibilities. The community should therefore be responsible for all steps such as to evaluate needs, plan, implement, monitor and report. This whole process should be managed by a body which is democratically elected, responsible and accountable to the community itself (Jethro Consult, 2009)

Within the framework of this development model, local communities are not isolated entities and may ask for outside assistance, and normally they will be supported in two main areas: Training to upgrade their competence and capacity and financial support for implementation of local development projects.

---

2. This paragraph is partly from Mersland, Roy (2009) p 7”Evaluation of the Social sustainable Development Programme in Angola (Prodessa) and from the document: Partnership in Development. A model and general principles for strengthening civil society February 2009. Jethro Consult
4. Presentation of CODEVPRO

The idea of CODEVPRO can in short be presented as follows: CODEVPRO aims to secure PID and put its principles into practice. The programme is supposed to be based on important principles such as democratic structures, transparent management, good quality bookkeeping, etc. All the local development committees are supposed to be trained in project planning, implementation and management. In this way the programme intend not only to empower the communities to plan and implement projects directly related to this programme, but also build lasting capacity in the communities so that they in the future can plan and implement other projects without the assistance of this programme.

The programme requires that local development committees will have good participation of both men and women. The programme intends to ensure female participation in community training and foster gender equality. As a requirement for participation in the programme, all the community development projects must have a sustainable plan from the beginning. The congregations/communities must have the necessary management capacity to plan, to implement and to evaluate their own projects. Financial support from the programme to the communities will only be given for initial costs and will not include salary support or any other support of recurrent cost. In this manner one ensures that all the local projects are sustainable within the local context. The programme administration will be done by the Central Church Office of LAC/UMC. It is not expected that the administrative cost of the programme can be covered by local income.

Every local project must have a project committee consisting of as a minimum:
- Local project coordinator
- Treasurer
- Secretary
- Two members

The project committee must consist of suitably qualified people who shall be elected democratically and most committees include members from UMC local congregation and from the community. The project committee shall be responsible for planning, implementation and evaluation of the project. The project committee must ensure that the project is managed with transparency that good book-keeping standards are observed and that project documents are well and orderly taken care of. Project proposals and applications shall be sent to the director of connectional ministries in consultation with the district superintendent.

The CODEVPRO programme described

After four years of implementation the programme can be described as follows: From the organizational chart figure 1. We see that the programme is fully integrated into the National Methodist Church structure and how staff is integrated into the LAC/UMC Department of Community services and working directly under the Bishop’s authority. Approval of funding to all local projects is done by the Bishop. Thus, in principle, all efforts carried out by CODEVPRO are efforts carried out by LAC/UMC. As far as the evaluation team could discover the reporting lines and responsibilities on different levels were well taken care of.
Three staff is managing the programme as planned. And as we will come back to later, the workload on staff is high. CODEVPRO is well structured administratively and organized as evidenced by its chain of command for dedication of responsibilities.

A well prepared manual for financial management and reporting were put in place consisting of four levels:

**First Level – Bishop**
To approve
- All grants to local projects.
- Investment and major purchases e.g. the purchase of a vehicle.
- All transfer of funds from Programme main accounts to the program operational accounts.

**Second Level – Director Connectional Ministries**
The Director of Connectional Ministries and the Treasurer of the LAC/UMC or a person of higher authority shall authorize payments from the program operational bank account for:

- Transfer of instalments to local projects once such projects have been approved by the Bishop and the correspondence contract between the program office and the local community has been signed.
- Payment of salary and payment of taxes, Social Security obligations etc. for program staff and other monthly expenses.
• Monthly transfer of funds from program bank account to program petty cash.

**Third Level- Program Office**
At the Program Level the Department Director and corresponding associate director of CODEVPRO authorise payments of monthly operational expenditures. For each withdrawal of funds there shall be a duly signed fund requirement fund.

**Fourth Level – Local Community Project**
Once a local project has been approved by the Bishop and the funds have been transferred from the Department office to the local projects, the local project committee shall jointly authorize all payments. Mayor purchases shall be approved in coordination with DCS staff. All payments shall be according to the approved project budget. At least two persons from the local project committee shall jointly undertake all purchases.

To the evaluation team’s knowledge the manual were put in place and properly followed. This manual seemed to be a professional tool to handle the flow of expenditure and to prevent misuse of funds.

**Projects outlined**
Thirty-nine (39) projects locally based have been or are in the phase of being implemented. As we see from the map below (figure 2) these were spread all over the country apart from the North West area towards the border of Sierra Leone where there are few Methodist Churches and were the Muslims are situated. Projects are based in rural areas and with difficult access to many of the places. It seems as local communities all of the country has had opportunity to utilise funds and being part of the CODOVPRO programme. The map also indicates a variety of projects.

Figure 2: Map of Liberia and projects
Diversity of projects
Based on the idea that it is the local communities that is the entity to decide what is mostly needed the following effect is a diversity of projects. There is also a huge difference in extensiveness of the projects, the complexity of implementation, duration, costs etc., and not at least the need for supervision and follow ups. Below we will present matrixes showing type of projects, location, number of beneficiaries, year started and duration of implementing, costs, distance to the project and number of visits to project site. These matrixes give us an overview over projects, activities and beneficiaries reached for the period of the four years.

As reflected on table 1 there has been 17 water and sanitation projects from 2008 -20011 with 40 pumps and 20 latrines. 956 people are trained and more than 64 000 beneficiaries. This big number of beneficiaries is because of the water pumps utilised in the local communities. The projects are fairly small, though with quite a few visits from staff in DCS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community/Training</th>
<th>Location/County</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Year &amp; Durations</th>
<th>Cost US</th>
<th>UMC District</th>
<th>No. of projects</th>
<th>Distance to project (Hrs.) from Monrovia</th>
<th>No. of visits to project site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Doegbon Training</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>625 + 50</td>
<td>2008 1 yr.</td>
<td>3,487</td>
<td>Kakata/Farmingtown</td>
<td>1 pump 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>1 hrs. 30 min</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Doewien Training</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>510 + 72</td>
<td>2008 3 months</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>Kakata/Farmingtown</td>
<td>1 pump 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>1 hrs. 30 min</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unification Town Training</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>18000 + 34</td>
<td>2011 3 months</td>
<td>8,138</td>
<td>Kakata/Farmingtown</td>
<td>2 sets 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>1 hrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Cotton Tree Training</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2500 + 75</td>
<td>2008 2 days 2 months</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>Gbarnga</td>
<td>1 pump</td>
<td>3 hrs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Murr Town Training</td>
<td>Bassa</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>150 + 24</td>
<td>2008 3 months</td>
<td>3,487</td>
<td>St. John River</td>
<td>1 pump 2 sets of latrine</td>
<td>3 hrs. 30 min</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dolo’s Town Training</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>1600 + 84</td>
<td>2011 3 months</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Kokoyah</td>
<td>Cons. 1 pump, Rehab. 3. 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Kpangba Town Training</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>403 + 42</td>
<td>2011 3 months</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>Weala</td>
<td>Rehab. 1 pump. Cons. 1 pump</td>
<td>4 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Yaribouri Training</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>2700 + 94</td>
<td>2011 2 days 2 months</td>
<td>7,660</td>
<td>Weala</td>
<td>Cons. 1 pump, Rehab. 1</td>
<td>4 hrs. 30 min</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Behla Training</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>1,370 + 61</td>
<td>2009 4 months</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td>Jorquelle</td>
<td>2 pumps 2 sets of latrine</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Wertiiken Training</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>2,346 + 70</td>
<td>2011 3 months</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Cape palmus</td>
<td>1 pump 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>12 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Cantonmentsi Training</td>
<td>Grand Gede</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>1,350 + 34</td>
<td>2010 1 yr. 2 days</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>Grand Gede</td>
<td>2 pumps 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>9 hrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Galapa Training</td>
<td>Nimba</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>2,500 + 116</td>
<td>2010 1 yr. 2 days</td>
<td>7,313</td>
<td>Gompa</td>
<td>2 pumps</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>New Israel Training</td>
<td>Montserra do</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>5000 + 74</td>
<td>2011 5 months</td>
<td>9,134</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>4 pumps</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Karweaken Training</td>
<td>River Gee</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>13500 + 60</td>
<td>2010 9 months</td>
<td>11,479</td>
<td>Grand Gede</td>
<td>4 sets latrine</td>
<td>11 hrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>GST Campus</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>2008 4 months</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>Kokoyah</td>
<td>Cons. 1 Rehab. 8</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Gbencon Training</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>1989 + 66</td>
<td>2011 4 months</td>
<td>6332</td>
<td>Garraway</td>
<td>Cons. 1 Rehab. 1 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>12 hrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Water and sanitation projects

Next table (table 2) gives an overview of 6 health facility projects, five clinics and one health centre. As we see these clinics have also a substantial catchment area covering for almost 50,000 beneficiaries and more than 450 local community people trained. There has been an important

3 The number on the superior line is the total number of beneficiaries and the number on the lower line the number of trained people.
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learning process for the staff and local communities in building health facilities. The compliance with the governmental standard has improved and the DHO’s are now part of the planning and construction process. Close partnership with Ministry of Health is also of great importance to have the facilities staffed with health personnel.

From the table we also see that constructing health facilities are far more expensive and time consuming both for the local communities and for DCS staff. The projects need close follow ups with from 9-14 supervisory visits and one of the projects is placed more than 10 hour’s drive away from Monrovia.

*Table 2: Health projects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Location/County</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Cost US</th>
<th>UMC District</th>
<th>No. of projects</th>
<th>Distance to project (Hrs.) from Monrovia</th>
<th>No. of visit to project site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Weala</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1yr 2 months</td>
<td>Weala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Boway</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>9500</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4 days Continuing</td>
<td>29,24</td>
<td>Jorquelle 1</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Palapolu</td>
<td>Grand Bassa</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4 days Continuing</td>
<td>7,730</td>
<td>Grand Bassa 1</td>
<td>4 hrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rock Crusher</td>
<td>Kokoyah</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3 yrs. 4 days</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Kokoyah 1</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Boyee</td>
<td>Nimbi</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>14,152</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2 days Continuing</td>
<td>26,24</td>
<td>Tippita 1</td>
<td>10 hrs.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Compound #3</td>
<td>Grand Bassa</td>
<td>Health Centre</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1 yr. 2 days</td>
<td>125,493</td>
<td>St. John River 1</td>
<td>4 hrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows three income generating agriculture projects. These are the only income generating projects in the programme so far. Two projects are animal raising, and one is cassava growing. The projects are targeting more than 8000 beneficiaries and almost 400 in the local communities are trained. The projects are not that expensive and with fewer follow ups.
### Table 3: Agriculture projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Location /County</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Cost US</th>
<th>UMC District</th>
<th>No. of projects</th>
<th>Distance to project (Hrs.) from Monrovia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wennzohn</td>
<td>Rivercess</td>
<td>Agriculture (cassava &amp; corn)</td>
<td>30 yrs. 18 yrs. 5 yrs.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2 yr.</td>
<td>3638</td>
<td>Rivercess</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rock Town</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Agriculture (animal raising)</td>
<td>475 yrs. 157 yrs.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>6,132</td>
<td>Cape palmus</td>
<td>9 cows</td>
<td>13 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Belwahn</td>
<td>Grand Kru</td>
<td>Agriculture (Animal raising)</td>
<td>500 yrs. 51 yrs.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garraway</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Agriculture projects (Income generating) (animals 13 cows) & (1 farm) Total number of beneficiaries 8,475 Total number trained 393

Four school projects are extensive parts of the programme: two elementary schools and two junior high schools. These are also very important projects for the local communities. As we see from table 4 below they are expensive and time consuming in the sense of supervision and follow ups. There are also lessons learned in this area of construction where compliance with the Ministry of Education standards are of great importance to secure full running of the schools from the Government. Partnership with the District Educational Officers has improved.

### Table 4: School projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Location /County</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Cost US</th>
<th>UMC District</th>
<th>No. of projects</th>
<th>Distance to project (Hrs.) from Monrovia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boegeeya</td>
<td>Rivercess</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>4550 yrs. 53 yrs.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>65,500</td>
<td>Morweh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building bridges is an important part of securing access to the local communities in Liberia. Having travelled across the country we can easily understand the importance of these priorities from the communities. Roads and bridges are in bad conditions and with a long rainy season and heavy rain the access to many local communities is very difficult. There are two small bridge projects targeting two communities with more than 4000 beneficiaries and 100 people from the local communities are trained.

Table 5: Bridges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Location/County</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Cost US</th>
<th>UMC District</th>
<th>No. of visits</th>
<th>Distance to project (Hrs.) from Monrovia</th>
<th>No. of visits to project site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Gaila</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Mini bridge</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>9,540</td>
<td>Kokoyah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 hrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Doegbon</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Mini bridge</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6,783</td>
<td>Kakata/Farmington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total bridges 2 Total number of beneficiaries 4,475 Total number trained 104
The CODEVPRO programme has also taken responsibility for in-service training for teachers and health practitioners. In addition they have sponsored training for 8 students to be able to staff two of the clinics with professional staff.

Table 6: Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Location /County</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Cost US</th>
<th>UMC District</th>
<th>No. of projects</th>
<th>Distance to project (Hrs.) from Monrovia</th>
<th>No. of visit to project site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Yarmensoh</td>
<td>Nimbi</td>
<td>In-service Teacher</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>6,00</td>
<td>Tippita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Zimmie</td>
<td>Rivercess</td>
<td>Health Practitioner</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>5,28</td>
<td>Morweh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Weala</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Nurse Aid Training</td>
<td>4 Students</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>1,50</td>
<td>Weala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Boway</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Nurse Aid Training</td>
<td>4 Students</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>1,50</td>
<td>Jorquell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Boyee</td>
<td>Nimba</td>
<td>Nurse Aid Training</td>
<td>4 Students</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>1,50</td>
<td>Tippita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Training and Education in Broad Terms 5 Total number trained 257

The last two projects presented in table 7, also bear the possibility of being income generating activities: a guesthouse and a training centre. The guesthouse is already in use but might be rented out. The Guesthouse project left us with a lesson learned that there is a need to conduct business/feasibility studies prior to supporting income generation projects.

Table 7: Other projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Training Venue</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Total Trained</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Pearchuzohn Training</td>
<td>Grand Bassa</td>
<td>Guest house</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2008-1 Year + 1 month</td>
<td>35,511</td>
<td>St. John River</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>11 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of beneficiaries: 18,533 Total number trained: 21

When we sum up all the projects we find that the community infrastructure projects are targeting more than 150,000 beneficiaries and more than 2,500 people from the local communities are trained.

**Grand total number of beneficiaries: 154,691 and grand total number of trained persons: 2,523**

**Local project committees**

Each project has a local project committee being responsible for the proposal and implementation of the project. During the field visits we met with members of the committees. They were all selected and played an important part of planning, community mobilisation and implementing of the projects. In annex 2, we see a presentation of the project committees. Of the 34 committees, 5 women were elected as coordinators and five as assistant coordinators, three were secretaries and as many as 17 were treasures. However, there is a long way to go for Liberia to have a gender balance. But these committees seem at least to be on the right track. From the matrix we can also see that far from all the members in the committees are members of the local Methodist Church. We see that the committees are community based more than church based as the intentions of the PID.

There is a substantial input from the local communities in all the projects that we observed (manpower, building materials, land etc.). All committees are trained and in some communities there have been several trainings to mobilise community participation. However, the issue of giving land from the local communities to the infrastructure projects will need to be looked into more closely related to the formal documentation of the ownership of the land.

So far, the financial support to the projects and the reporting system seemed to be functioning well. DCS staff was also very clear about not accepting any misuse of funds. That would end up with complete withdrawal from the project and no more support or funding.
5. Main findings
The findings will be presented in to separate presentations and related to the terms of reference

5.1 CODEVPRO achievements

5.2 PID methodology

5.1 CODEVPRO achievements
According to the TOR we are supposed to assess CODEPRO’s results along several dimensions. A short field visit cannot provide sufficient information to clearly indicate all types of results. We will however indicate that the direction of the outcome seems to be very positive. Although the Government of Liberia and partners including national, international and faith-based organizations have done remarkable jobs, rural communities’ needs are still immense for fully resettling and rebuilding rural lives

Target group
From the TOR: To which extent has the programme successfully reached the stated target group:

“The programme will be directed at the general population where there are local churches of LAC/UMC. This will therefore include women and men as well as young people and children. The specific local project plans will specify the target group included in each local project.”

CODEVPRO operates where there are local churches of LAC/UMC. These are located in poor and often remote communities. In this regard the programme has been able to reach its objective. Learning from the programme described and field visits, the different projects have specified target groups to benefit from the projects (see table 1-7). As a whole the programme is targeting men and women, children and youth with more specification of the target groups related to the type of projects implemented like schools, healthcare centres, water and sanitation, agricultural activities etc. The numbers of beneficiaries are substantial in each project based on the community approach and the outreach in the local communities adding up to app 154 000 beneficiaries. As we see projects mining the gaps between GOL and NGOS interventions – bringing hopes to isolated and perhaps neglected population segments to positively transform their lives.

Programme efficiency
TOR: Make an assessment about the efficiency of the resources used in the programme in relation to the conducted activities. Should the activities have been carried out in another manner? Could the same activities been achieved with the use of less costly resources?

Observations during the field visit indicate that CODEVPRO utilize the money received to a large extend in a cost effective and efficient way. Inputs from the local communities are important to sustain this efficiency. However, the use of competence like architects and engineers, and to comply with the Liberian standards put in place for designing schools, health clinics and health centres could probably have increased efficiency. The interventions have to be holistic; as an example, a school project should be complete with all requisite facilities, not leaving out an auditorium and teachers quarters because of inadequate resources and furnishing. Project portfolio emanating from sympathy and empathy can easily overweight resource levels.

A more efficient partnership with relevant Ministries and District representatives from the right beginning of the programme could probably have avoided additional work and changes of plans
which might have made the projects more cost efficient. It is a need to improve MOU structure with partners in the Government of Liberia (GOL).

Second, the spread of projects across the country is costly. A pertinent question is if a more carefully designed plan of outreach could have been preferred without creating any problems within the church system?

Third, related to the former point is the time spent for the follow-up of projects. An extensive time for follow ups in the field is used by the DCS staff and the Department can easily be overstretched by this amount of work. CODEVPRO needs to match its project management capacity with project portfolio in order to continue doing good jobs. The wide range of geographic areas and activities coupled with poor road condition would suggest that transportation is a limiting factor for effective project implementation, supervision and monitoring. (see table 1 - 7)

What is positive in CODEVPRO is that several overhead costs (e.g., office rent) are covered by LAC/UMC and not charged to CODEVPRO which they eventually have to pay themselves

**Programme effectiveness**
TOR: Make an assessment to which degree the programme has achieved the programme objective as stated in the programme plan:

Long-term overarching development goals:

“**Improved lives and sustainable communities**”

Outcome/ immediate objective of the programme/ programme for the entire period:

“**Improved living conditions for people in communities where there are UMC congregations**”

Anticipated results (outputs) for the entire period:

“**Implementation of a variety of sustainable community projects in accordance with the programmes priorities,**

*The output of the programme will be the number of sustainable local projects that are being planned, implemented and operated by the local communities and local churches. The second output is the number of trained communities.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of trained communities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of implemented projects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These targets will be reviewed by the end of 2008 when the programme has been working for almost a year. Additional indicators are included in the programme matrix at the end of the programme plan.*
It is still early to assess the extent to which the programme has improved lives as well as the extent to which communities are empowered to meet development. However a positive outcome can be expected of improved living conditions for the people in the communities. As examples, receiving better healthcare, education for the children, youth and grownups, clean water etc. are assessed as important and basic measures to improve living conditions, strengthening democracy, fighting poverty and facilitating development for the whole country.

A dilemma is however, whether to stay with the communities to allow development of further projects in order to improve building the civil society instead of spreading thinner out by entering into new projects in new communities all the time. The outcome of building social societies and strengthening the PID methodology can probably be even higher if communities are allowed repeated projects in order to improve the work building on former experiences over a longer time period and related to new challenges in the community.

The output of the programme has been in accordance to the plan. By the end of 2011 39 projects have been completed or are in the process of planning or implementation. More than 25000 people have been trained. This proves an enormous amount of work put in place by all partners and not at least by the communities, LAC/UMC and CODEVPRO/ DCS staff.

Somehow the staff can be overwhelmed with existing projects in very harsh locations. As the evaluation team have experienced themselves accessibility can be a nightmare for some projects and can put the staff at high risk. An option to this is to shift a greater aspect of project implementation and monitoring to the district office. This could increase LAC/UMC decentralization and project implementation capacity. But this requires capacity building process for the Church districts.

Another option which is commendable is to secure vehicles for the programme with good standard and put limitations on travel schedules for the staff. Security procedures should be put in place.

CODEVPRO has few limitations regarding what types of projects communities may get involved in. This creates a need for many different professional partners and professional staff in different areas in DCS. This is a challenge and the diversity might create more challenges than the staff can meet. The question is whether one should allow greater specialisation of knowledge in CODEVPRO and limit the projects to more narrow scopes?

We found few income generating projects in the communities. They were mainly in the area of agriculture. Income generating projects could be prioritised in the future. In addition none of the projects were set up to strengthen individuals’ personal businesses. They could have been projects to train farmers or self-help groups to learn about business. Instead, communities have decided upon community projects that deliver products and services to community members.

**Programme relevance**

**TOR: Make an assessment of the programme relevance in relation to the main challenges in the programme area. Can the programme be said to be highly relevant or less relevant in relation to the need of the people in the area?**

All communities visited firmly defended their decisions and their projects. They were convinced that they had chosen the most relevant projects. The PID concept assures the possibility of supporting relevant projects. Programme relevance is a very strong part of CODEVPRO. When it comes to women the results reported in table in the annex clearly illustrates the risk that the programme is not
able to support balanced gender efforts. This has to be understood in the context of the Liberian culture. An important step for the country is their female President. But here is still a long way to go to offer equal responsibility and to share equal power among men and women. Most project coordinators are men and most committee members are men. However, interesting to observe is that most treasurers are women. The fact is that of most of the projects just as many women as men and boys as girls are benefitting from the project. The importance is the improvement of gender balance in the project committees. From this perspective CODEVPRO is doing an important job of raising the awareness of women’s participation not only as workforces in the community but also as leaders building the civil society. A possibility is to have gender balance and violence against women as a crosscutting issue in all projects and included in all the community mobilisations and trainings.

Programme sustainability

**TOR:** Make an assessment of the programme sustainability. In particular give an opinion regarding the possibilities that the local communities have to maintain and to continue the local projects that have been initiated by the assistance of CODEVPRO. Preferably the sustainability model developed by Norwegian Missions in development should be applied in evaluating the programme sustainability in relation to the following three factors:

- Activity profile
- Organisational capacity
- Context

The activity profile is decided upon by the local communities. As mentioned before the diversity of projects might create some problems for CODEVPRO staff. Extensive competence in several different areas is needed. To prevent professional problems the partnership with other professions specifically MOH and MOE and their professionals on District level is vital. This goes both for the construction and for the running of the facilities.

CODEVPRO is an organization that has grown from being young and inexperienced to a relatively matured community development entity. CODEVPRO’s strengths lie in its transformational leadership and managerial vision and skills, (dedication of responsibilities/division of labour which promotes ownership amongst staff as an inspiration to achieve set goals). Second the use of innovativeness as a means of fostering success stories and using partnership as a solution to resolving development issues. Appreciation and integration of feedbacks and lessons learned from previous experiences into program planning and implementation has led to growth. The skillfulness in problem solving by finding alternative solutions for tough problems is visible. Specific examples were finding solution to use of the condemned clinic in Weala through collaboration with the community and Ministry of Health and a Parents and Teachers Association (PTA) meeting to create awareness leading to resource mobilization for Boegeezaye school project that had virtually come to a standstill at one point. Perseverance in accomplishing mission regardless of difficult challenges - roads, security risks and community fatigue etc. is a strength, but can also put staff on stretch and in dangerous positions. There is a constant need to keep qualified staff motivated for the huge challenges in this work.

Sustainability has at least two dimensions: CODEVPRO as a programme, and the projects in the communities. Regarding CODEVPRO as a programme, it is naturally not possible to maintain all the activities without outside support. However, since CODEVPRO is integrated into the LAC/UMC’s
Department of Community Services and works directly under the Bishop’s authority, the programme doesn’t have to end if outside support is not available. It is therefore important to maintain CODEVPRO within the Department. DCS is also attracting other donors from Norway like Mission Alliance which proves the importance of the PID methodology and the important structure and layout LAC/UMC represent as a facilitating structure in the development of Liberia.

Regarding whether projects initiated in the communities with support from CODEVPRO stand the chance of becoming sustainable, it is still too early to make an assessment. Some of them have only just started, while others have operated over a relatively short period of time. The fact that all the community projects lean on LAC/UMC and the local congregation increases the possibility for sustaining the projects.

5.2 Assessment of the methodology “Partnership in Development”

The concept “Partnership in Development” was developed by BN as an innovative alternative to traditional development cooperation. The main objectives of the new practice were to:

a) That the main focus of future development work shall be at the local level of civil society (congregation) and that the work contributes to the strengthening of the civil society and to the development of democratic organisations.

b) That the responsibility for planning, implementation and evaluation of development projects rests with the local partner.

c) To simplify the process of application and reporting at all levels of the chain from the local civil society level through the local/national partner to the Norwegian partner and finally to BN and NORAD.

d) To improve the quality of the development work carried out by churches and Christian organisations with increased focus on sustainable impact in the local society.

Main findings:
The partnership model for CODEVPRO programme is visualised in figure 4 below. On the left side is the Norwegian Methodist Church system, in the middle the LAC/UMC and on the right side of the figure the national and local authorities. This model shows the complexity of the partnership, but can also be used as an analytic tool to analyse where the partnership has to be strengthened. Not to make it too complicated the partnership with the Norwegian donors (Digni and NORAD) are included in the box of Norwegian partners on the right side of the model.
The findings are summarized in the following points:

- CODEVPRO is successful in practising Partnership in Development (PID) as presented in the proposal (2007 and the concept described in document 2005) for the programme. The CODEVPRO programme allows local communities to play a leading role in decisions and implementation of projects and let the planning and monitoring be with the local partner, in this case CODEVPRO/DCS.

- CODEVPRO shows that it is possible to simplify the process of application and reporting at all levels of the chain, from local civil society through the local/national partner to the Norwegian partner, and finally to DIGNI and Norwegian authorities.

- CODEVPRO has been able to facilitate that communities have elected project committees locally and democratically. The parties have been able to plan, budget and implement timely and efficiently.

- CODEVPRO and LAC/UMC together with the local project committees have to our knowledge been correct and transparent about financial management on the four management levels in line with the financial management manual. Good book keeping standards are put in place and monitored regularly. Finances are well managed at the administrative level as indicated by documentations and records. However, monthly financial request is not specified on months, only dates are presumed to
reflect the month. Also, balance from previous months not reflected on subsequent request to indicate a true picture of what is there to operate with during the month. Project is experiencing losses from transfer of funds relative to exchange rates and transfer fees. This refers to transfer of funds from Norway to Liberia because of restricted limits of transfer.

- CODEVPRO is mindful of corruption risks; as an example, an incidence of theft (zinc) that was solved, has led to some level of micro-management of community projects resources. This

- The local committees have been able to mobilise the local communities, and to participate and contribute with substantial inputs to the projects (manpower, building materials, land etc.). The land given by the local communities has to be secured to the project by legal measurements.

- CODEVPRO/DCS has been of great importance for supporting and training the communities in project proposals, financial management, democracy and civil society building. To keep the motivation, participation and aspirations among the communities several trainings and different mobilising strategies have been put in place (see tables). Community awareness and project leadership training appear to be effective in achieving project goals and objectives from the perspective of community ownership and contributions

- The district DS’s have been active and instrumental to support and take a partnership role within the communities and project committees and by this they have facilitated the implementation of the projects and strengthened the ownership of the projects within the communities. Guidance and support of the church is critical to sustaining and strengthening the institutional and managerial capacity of CODEVPRO.

- Lessons learned from the first years: partnerships between CODEVPRO and Government through responsible Ministries and District representatives have been strengthened on both national and district level. This relates mainly to Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education. This partnership has been important to keep up the standards required and will secure sustainability of the projects.

- The PID concepts needs good systems, methodologies and monitoring as well as dedicated staff and close follow-up from UMCN (the donor) to assure effective and efficient outputs and outcomes. This system is to a large extent put in good order by the United Methodist Church in Norway/Board of Global Ministries, including the Norwegian consultant and CODEVPRO/DCS staff.

- It takes time to capture what working with the community means and how this can be done. The communities need constant training, capacity building follow ups and monitoring. This goes just as much for the LAC/UMC as well as in the Norwegian mission organisation

- The PID concept has proved that it could be relevant also in similar community development programmes in other countries relevant for UMCN. Before introducing it in other contexts there is a need for better documentation of the PID methodologies.

- The PID projects in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe should continue to learn from each other. However, learning should not only be organised around interchange visits and seminars, but should
more be organised around a regional centre for development and continued improvement of good systems. Partnership with academic institutions and development of manuals, theoretical and practical exercises in this field should be developed.

- Whether the projects initiated in the communities with support from CODEVPRO has the chance of becoming sustainable, it is still too early to conclude. The fact that all the community projects are closely linked to the LAC/UMC system and the local congregation increases the likelihood of becoming sustainable.

6. Recommendations

1. CODEVPRO needs to put in cross-cutting issues such as the environment, gender, violence against women, ethnicity and HIV/AIDS in their planning and implementation of projects in the communities. The training workshops are excellent opportunities for educating the local communities in these issues.

2. The CODEVPRO programme has to make sure of proper ownership of the lands given from the local communities as well as individuals to the projects. This will be of importance for the future.

3. The partnership between GOL through its relevant ministries and agencies, UMC/LAC local districts and CODEVPRO should be strengthened to ensure compliance and sustainability. Schools or health centre projects should be completed with all requested facilities in compliance with GOL standards.

4. Security procedures, insurance, allowances and routines for staff travelling and staff vehicles have to be put in place. Human resources are the most valuable asset in the programme. This has to be taken seriously from LAC/UMC and UMCN. One suggestion could be to have a committee lead by the Bishop to go through all security procedures and follow up on relevant issues.

5. There is a need to continuously ensure capacity building for management staff in CODEVPRO.

6. CODEVPRO has to balance the capacity of the staff and the amount of projects planned and implemented to keep focus on building civil society and to ensure the quality of the good work.

7. The regional collaboration and learning processes in PID should be continued and be strengthened by creating a regional centre where Liberia, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe could work together. Experiences can be shared to improve the methodology of PID in different contexts and to strengthen the capacity of developmental work within the Methodist church context.

8. To strengthen the PID concept in different contexts there is a need to document the PID methodologies in a handbook or sort of a manual, reflecting lessons learned and best practices. This can be done by joining partnership with an academic institution; as an example the Methodist University in Liberia. This partnership between theoretical and practical institutions and approaches in the field of PID can enrich the learning within academic disciplines and the Church structures.

Attachments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>KIND OF PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNDAY, DEC 4</td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>BREAKFAST&lt;br&gt;WORSHIP AT THE ST.JOHN RIVER CONFERENCE CLOSING&lt;br&gt;TRAVEL TO RIVERCESS&lt;br&gt;VISIT WHENZOHN &amp; DARSAY TOWN&lt;br&gt;LUNCH (FINGER FOOD)&lt;br&gt;RETURN TO BUCHANAN, MEET WITH PEARCHUZON WOMEN&lt;br&gt;DINNER AND SPENT THE NIGHT AT GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>AGRICULTURE PROJECT-2011&lt;br&gt;GUEST HOUSE – 2008/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY, DEC 5</td>
<td>6:30-7:30</td>
<td>BREAKFAST&lt;br&gt;VISIT COMPOUND 3&lt;br&gt;VISIT BOEGEEZAYE COMMUNITY&lt;br&gt;LUNCH&lt;br&gt;VISIT DOLO’S TOWN&lt;br&gt;TRAVEL TO GANTA&lt;br&gt;DINNER, SPEND THE NIGHT</td>
<td>HEALTH CENTER – 2011&lt;br&gt;JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL – 2009/2011&lt;br&gt;WATER &amp; SANITATION – 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY, DEC 6</td>
<td>6:30-7:00</td>
<td>VISIT BOYEE COMMUNITY&lt;br&gt;VISIT ZAHNZAYEE COMMUNITY&lt;br&gt;LUNCH&lt;br&gt;RETURN TO GANTA&lt;br&gt;DINNER AND SPENT THE NIGHT</td>
<td>CLINIC – 2009/2011&lt;br&gt;JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL-2009/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY, DEC 7</td>
<td>7:00-8:00</td>
<td>BREAKFAST&lt;br&gt;VISIT GAILJ COMMUNITY&lt;br&gt;LUNCH AT GOLF CLUB&lt;br&gt;RETURN TO MONROVIA&lt;br&gt;DINNER AT HOTEL</td>
<td>BRIDGE -2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please note that the remaining two (2) projects are education in broad terms and do not have community committee members.

### Water and sanitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Location /County</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Cost US</th>
<th>UMC District</th>
<th>No. of projects</th>
<th>Distance to project (Hrs.) from Monrovia</th>
<th>No. of visit to project site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Doegbon Training</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>625* 50</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1 yr.</td>
<td>3,487</td>
<td>Kakata/Farmington</td>
<td>1 pump 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>1 hrs. 30 min</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Doewien Training</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>510 72</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>Kakata/Farmington</td>
<td>1 pump 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>1 hrs. 30 min</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Unification Town Training</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>18000 34</td>
<td>201 1 2 days</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>8,138</td>
<td>Kakata/Farmington</td>
<td>2 sets 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>1 hrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cotton Tree Training</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2500 75</td>
<td>200 2 days</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>Gbarnga</td>
<td>1 pump 3 hrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Murr Town Training</td>
<td>Bassa</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>150 24</td>
<td>200 2 days</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3,487</td>
<td>St. John River</td>
<td>1 pump 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>1 hrs. 30 min</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Dolo’s Town Training</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>1600 84</td>
<td>201 1 2 days</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Kokoyah</td>
<td>Cons. 1 pump, Rehab. 3. 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Kpangba town Training</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>403 42</td>
<td>201 1 2 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>Weala</td>
<td>Rehab. 1 pump. Cons. 1 pump</td>
<td>4 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Yaribouri Training</td>
<td>Margibi</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>2700 94</td>
<td>201 1 2 days</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>7,660</td>
<td>Weala</td>
<td>Cons. 1 pump, Rehab. 1</td>
<td>4 hrs. 30 min</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Behla Training</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>1,370 61</td>
<td>200 2 days</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td>Jorquelle</td>
<td>2 pumps 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Werteken Training</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>2,346 70</td>
<td>201 1 2 days</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Cape palmus</td>
<td>1 pump 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>12 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Cantonmentsitte Training</td>
<td>Grand Gedeh</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>1350 34</td>
<td>201 0 1 yr. 2 days</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>Grand Gedeh</td>
<td>2 pumps 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>9 hrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Galapa Training</td>
<td>Nimba</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>2,500 116</td>
<td>201 2 days</td>
<td>7,313</td>
<td>Gompa</td>
<td>2 pumps</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>New Israel Montserrat</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>5000 201 5</td>
<td>9,134 Monrovia</td>
<td>4 30 min</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1 2 days</td>
<td>months</td>
<td>pumps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Karweaken</td>
<td>River Gee</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>13500 60</td>
<td>201 0 2 days</td>
<td>Grand Gedeh 4 sets latrine</td>
<td>11 hrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 GST Campus</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gbarnga 1 pump</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Gbencon</td>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>1989 66</td>
<td>201 1 2 days</td>
<td>Kokoyah Cons. 1 Rehab. 8</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Ghonyah</td>
<td>Grand Kruu</td>
<td>Water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>201 1 6 months</td>
<td>Garaway Cons. 1 Rehab. 1 2 sets latrine</td>
<td>12 hrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of pumps & latrines (Infrastructure & services) (40 pumps) (20 latrines) Total number of beneficiaries 64,543 Total number trained 956
FIELD NOTES:

Weala clinic project

Six (6) clinic staff, four (4) trained by project in Ganta

Staff salaries currently paid by the District

Nine (9) successful deliveries of over 2,000 patients

Medicine partly paid for by patients, some patients do not occasionally have funds to pay bills and they let them go free

Rennie is referral hospital, sometimes assist with ambulance

Southern Illinois Hospital assisted with medical equipment and outreach team 11 days visit to Liberia.

Medical supplies donated by Hands of Hope observed in warehouse

Needs are to expand facility through laboratory establishment, laboratory technician, X-Ray machine and ambulance.

GOL/County Health Team (CHT) provides guidance and direction, free antigens and vaccinations.

CHT announced the initiation of birth registration process and indicated the privacy of the clinic forbids GOL from accruing recurrent cost.

Gbamokollie Town schools construction project

Elementary school under construction at foundation level,

4,500 residents in town and surrounding villages

Over 50 kids ages from 3 – 9 were present during visit

600 kids without opportunity for primary education thus gave rise to project concept

DEO supports project and pledge teachers. He however appealed from teachers’ accommodation to encourage and retain teachers

Wennzohn Town agriculture project

28 acres cassava project to be ready for harvest in March
Project intends to generate funds for establishing a vocational school
Training scheduled for December 16-17 and to brush extension site for project
Vision to establish a self-help vocational school project to train youths in carpentry, agriculture and computer is admirable in light of need in an isolated geographic area. However, considerations have to be given to running costs and sustainability.

**Pearchuzohn Women guesthouse project**

Meeting attending by 25 women and their leadership. Assumed that attendance is limited due to the isolated site of the guest. Currently documenting management policy. Suggestion is to lease the building for higher income and better maintenance care. The issue is maintaining the moral reason for which the building was constructed. A subsequent meeting will be held to further discuss this issue and find the way forward.

**Observations:** Pearchuzohn Community Women seemed very organized and cognizant of their goal and objective. While holding discussions about alternative use of the building due to low income, the moral aspect of the project is firmly in their minds. The situation suggest market feasibility studies be conducted before considering that future guesthouse projects especially as it relates to location and culture.

**Bogeezaye school project**

7 classroom building with three offices and two bathrooms completed in operational
Primary education from pre-school to 9th grade
11 teachers and assorted textbooks provided by Government of Liberia
Considerable female enrolment in pre-school section to grade 6
Need auditorium, principal want students to learn public speaking
School gardening for sustainability under discussion
5 acres of land granted by community but Principal want more land for school farm
Teachers concerned about their payroll handling by MOE-walk days to Sestos for salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT ENROLMENT BY GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF TEACHERS**

| Male | 14 | | | | | |
| Female | 1 | | | | | |

**Dolo's Town water and sanitation project**

Three hand pump wells rehabilitated and in use

One new hand pump well constructed, an elderly woman was fetching water at arrival

Two community latrines constructed and equipped with commodes

Community discussing security and sanity for the pump area and intend to fence the pump.

Community discussing maintenance strategy, probably collection of minimum monthly fees L$10-L$15 per household

Project supervisor trained as pump maintenance mechanic

**Boyee clinic project**

Huge extension by request of MOH to meet standards

Main building 80% complete

Heath center for immediate environment extending to villages in outline districts
Diakonhjemmet Høgskole har røtter tilbake til 1890, og er en virksomhet under stiftelsen Det Norske Diakonhjem. Høgskolen har 2200 studenter og i underkant av 200 ansatte, fordelt på avdeling Oslo og Rogaland.

Diakonhjemmet Høgskole skal utruste til tjeneste i samfunn og kirke, nasjonalt og internasjonalt gjennom utdanning og forskning. Høgskolens faglige fokus er diakoni, helse- og sosialfag.

Formidling er en viktig del av samfunnsoppdraget til Diakonhjemmet Høgskole. Denne rapportserien skal bidra til dette ved å skape dialog med praksisfelt og samfunn. I tillegg skal formidlingen bidra til at FoU-resultater blir omsatt i praksis.
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