

Prime Minister Office

Committee Leading Board for Rural Development and Poverty Alleviation

Poverty Reduction Fund

(PRF)

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT:

**RELEVANCE, EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY, IMPACT AND
SUSTAINABILITY**



Contact:

Poverty Reduction Fund

Vientiane Capital

PO BOX: 4625

Tel: (856-21)261479-80

Fax: (856-21)261481

E-mail: prflaos@laostel.com

www.prflaos.org

PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT TEAM

Editor: [Juliene Rossard](#)

Prepared by: [Hatthachan Phimphanthavong](#)

Monitoring and Evaluation Team

April 2010

Contents

PREFACE	iii
1. Background	1
2. Assessment Findings.....	1
2.1. Relevance.....	1
2.2. Effectiveness.....	4
2.3. Efficiency	7
2.4. Impacts.....	9
2.5. Sustainability	10
3. Conclusion and Recommendations.....	12
3.1. Conclusion.....	12
3.2. Recommendations	12
ANNEX.....	13
Annex 1: The VNPA requested by gender from Cycle 1 to Cycle 7.....	13
Annex 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries from PRF intervention	13
Annex 3: Items Eligible and Not Eligible	17
Annex 4: Outcome of PRF supported in each sector (2003-2010)	18
Annex5: The basic information about PRF activities	19

Table Lists

Table 1: Five Evaluation Criteria.....	1
Table 2: mechanisms to implement works activities Cycle I to Cycle VII	5
Table 2: Cost Comparison between PRF and Other projects.....	7
Table 3: The proportion of PRF Sub-grand and Community contribution in each cycle.....	8

PREFACE

The overall outcome of PRF is to contribute to the socio-economic development of Lao PDR especially in the area of rural development and poverty alleviation. The PRF is engaged in assisting the poorest community to develop small scale community-based infrastructure and other activities in the water, transport, education, health, agriculture and other sectors to reduce poverty in poor rural villages. Grants are made for communities to develop infrastructure and others priorities following a menu of options. The villages make the key decision on the type of subprojects for which they will use the budget allocated.

From 2003 to 2010, PRF has supported 2,885 subprojects located in the poorest community; a total of 259.34 billion kip has been allocated to fund subproject implementation, and 48.64 billion kip was the community contribution. 2,199 subprojects concern the construction of public infrastructure and 686 subprojects are related to training subprojects including the capacity building of the local authorities, income generation activities training, and environmental protection training. More than half of the total subprojects (65%) were implemented by the community, which illustrated the community participation

The impact assessment has been based on the PRF main objectives:

1. Assist villagers to develop community public infrastructures and gain improved access to services;
2. Build capacity and empower the poor, women and ethnic minorities in the poorest villages to assess their own needs and priorities, and to plan, manage and implement their own public investments in a decentralized and transparent manner; and
3. Strengthen local institutions in order to support participatory decision making and conflict resolution process at the village, khoumban (subdistrict) and district levels, involving a broad range of villagers, including women and the poor.

We have used the key criteria of the monitoring and evaluation assessment of the Project Cycle Management Method: Relevance, Efficiency, Effective, Impact, and Sustainability. Those aspects will be used to assess four main program components: Input, output, project purpose and overall goal, along with the concept of the PRF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System, as well as the project appraisal of the PRF for the first and additional phases. Those indicators are the key factors to monitor and check the progress of the project since the PRF is designed to be an active, adaptable, and learning program. The PRF is also responsive and transparent: complaints and requests for assistance are acted upon and all reports are publicly available. The program will monitor its own performance in relation to the stated development objectives, and is also open to external review, as detailed in the manual of operations.

1. Background

While building on the gained experience of the rural development programs especially those based on the implementation of the National Growth Poverty Eradication Strategy (NGPES), the Poverty Reduction Fund has adapted and developed tools and methodologies that are appropriate to the context of the poorest districts in Lao PDR.

Table 1: Five Evaluation Criteria

	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Impact	Sustainability
Overall Goal					
Project Purpose					
Outputs					
Inputs					

Source: Project Cycle Management, FASID 2008

The question may be asked why the implementation the five evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability are used in program evaluation. It is because they help to evaluate technical assistance projects from a comprehensive perspective. The five criteria evaluation analysis used for the PRF is detailed below:

2. Assessment Findings

2.1. Relevance

We want to check whether or not the project’s purposes and overall goals is conform with the needs and priorities of the beneficiary and the government strategy. The PRF project is a major contribution to the National Growth and Poverty Eradication Strategy (NGPES) and it becomes a part of the National Leading Board for Rural Development and Poverty Eradication. The PRF demonstrates its commitment to

support the Lao Government to achieve its goal of social and economic development of the country, in particular regards to reduce poverty. The purposes of the PRF are to reduce number of people in poverty in target areas:

- Assist villagers to develop community public infrastructures and gain improved access to services;
- Build capacity and empower the poor, women and ethnic minorities in the poorest villages to assess their own needs and priorities, and to plan, manage and implement their own public investments in a decentralized and transparent manner; and
- Strengthen local institutions in order to support participatory decisionmaking and conflict resolution process at the village, khoumban (subdistrict) and district levels, involving a broad range of villagers, including women and the poor.

After five years (2003-2008) of PRF activities, the relevance of the project is evaluated as being high; therefore, the government of Laos and donors decided to extend PRF activities with a 3-year (2008-2011) as the additional phase which began in October 2008 with grants from the World Bank (US\$15 million) and from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (US\$ 5 million). Up to 2010 (the seventh cycle of the PRF) a total of 2,885 subprojects have been selected and implemented. 2,199 subprojects are about basic infrastructure improvement and the less subprojects are about occupation training and capacity building for local authorities. The subprojects in the sites visited are very relevant to the livelihood of the communities in both economic and social aspects since the basic infrastructure poor community is improved and community can access to social service as the first objective of PRF (Subprojects' sustainability assessment, 2010).

On the other hand, in order for the second and third objectives , “local capacity building and Strengthen local institutions ” to succeed, The PRF has provided the

training for local authorities on PRF approach is to enhance local authorities' understanding of the bottomup participatory approach in local development, as well as to strengthen their support to the PRF participatory process. This will contribute to efficient PRF implementation and enhance capacity of local authorities to manage effective rural development which would include village communities and the decision-making process has involved more people not only government representative in targeted districts and also PRF staff but the whole community also involves in this process (PRF Operation Manual, 2008).

Moreover, PRF also provides the training for small local entrepreneurs/contractors as well as government officers and villagers in localities to be involved in civil works, contributing to their own development. This is achieved through a reorganization of the community at Koumban level and through a learning by doing process following subproject development cycles. The PRF allows a village's decision maker and encourage women to participate in the implementation process (annex 1), with the widest representation, the choice over what project type are selected and proposed, and further allows them to choose whether they will implement the project themselves or use contractor, and lastly hands over the financial control of the execution of the chosen activities, which is unusual in government financed programs, as well as NGO and other donor who funded development financed programs. All of these factors can demonstrate the achievement of community participation approach developed under the PRF activities.

The subproject identification and prioritization process entails subprojects being selected that are, in general, responding to the real needs of the communities. The PRF's subprojects benefit people the most in areas where there is a lack of rural infrastructures. The benefit from the installation of rural infrastructures is immediate and remarkable, especially in remote areas. We can conclude that the purposes of the PRF project are to support the Lao PDR government in its efforts to reduce poverty, through

empowering local communities and participatory approach development. With PRF support, they identify local development needs; manage smallscale development projects for the rehabilitation or construction of social and economic infrastructure; and also other socioproductive activities, including income generating activities.

2.2. Effectiveness

To evaluate whether the project purposes are achieved, we have considered the implementing process of the PRF project. First, we have to look at the relation between the purposes and the outputs, in order to check how the outputs have contributed to the achievement of the project purposes. The outputs of the PRF project include both visible and invisible outputs. Visible outputs are related to the basic infrastructure improvement and small construction from 4 main sectors (education, public work and transportation, health and agriculture), and the invisible outputs are the knowledge and skills that poor people and local authorities have gained after undergoing training and attend meeting provided by the PRF, as well as the experience that those people have gained after participating in PRF activities.

Over five years of activities (2003-2008), 2,067 subprojects have been selected and have been completed with a total the investment of US\$16,616,000, out of total, 1,699 subprojects are concerned basic infrastructure construction and the other subprojects are about income generation activities. More than half of those subprojects were implemented by communities to improve the capacity building of the local community with comprises with the “participatory development and ownership concept”. In five years, the PRF activities had covered nearly 2,000 villages from 21 districts in five targeted districts with total population of 744,140 people and more than 1000 villages are direct beneficiaries (*annex 2*).

As the beneficiaries and the donors are satisfied with the results of the first phase, the Lao government and donors decided to extend PRF program with a 3-year additional phase (2008-2011) which started in October 2008 with grants from the World

Bank (US\$ 15 million) and from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (US\$ 5 million).

From Cycle VI (2008-2009), the PRF project has been extended its activities to one new province (LuangNamtha). In this cycle, PRF covered six provinces and 19 targeted districts including 14 districts already covered during the last phase, 195 Koumbans, and 1,458 villages were covered, reaching a total population of 620,164 persons with approximately US\$ 4,323,060 budgeted for the implantation of 355 sub projects.

In Cycle VII (2009-2010), the PRF project has been extended to one more province of Sekong (Kaleum and Dakchung districts). From Cycle VII, PRF has been working in seventh provinces and 21 targeted districts, covering 214 Koumbans, and 1,567 villages, reaching a total population of 660,540 persons with total of 463 subprojects selected and implemented and US\$ 5,244,100 budgeted for subproject implementation.

From 2003 to 2010, the subprojects supported by PRF and also the budget supported by PRF and community contribution can be summarized as follow:

Table 2: mechanisms to implement works activities Cycle I to Cycle VII

	Total from I-VII					
	Total from I-VII	Implemented by			Budget (kip)	
Sectors	subprojects	CFA	CFA+SW	SW	PRF Budget	Contribution
Education	733	449	16	267	82,472,608,075	9,414,350,545
Access and Energy	583	138	112	333	91,519,462,388	24,582,092,534
Health	736	520	19	194	56,421,993,205	11,166,477,731
Agricultural Infrastructure	147	85	3	58	10,895,369,637	2,957,410,543
ITE/CB	686	669	2	18	18,025,946,582	514,724,583
Total	2,885 ¹	1,861	152	870	259,335,379,887	48,635,055,936
%		64.5%	5.3%	30.2%	84%	16%
				Total Budget	307,970,435,823	

Source: PRF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, updated February 2010

¹ The number of subproject and the number of building may be different, one building may be constructed in two or three cycles in some districts because budget limited. On the other hand, the number of subproject, we counted in single number in each cycle after complete the final district decision meeting.

(The outcome of each sector is detailed in Annex 4)

Notice:

- Education Sector includes school construction and equipment, and teacher stipends
- Public Work and Transportation (PWT) includes bridge construction and improvement, footpaths, tracks, culverts, ramps, piers, road repairs and upgrading, and main electricity line access
- Health Sector includes water supply (dug well, drilled well, community water supply), sanitation, dispensary construction, medicine box, nurse's stipends, and health services.
- Agricultural Sector includes irrigation, weir, water tank, cables for water pipes and veterinary training including the agriculture and handicraft markets.
- ITE/CB sector includes animal raising and cropping training, village saving group, IGA training, and capacity building training for local authority of PRF.

Based on the data in Table 2, we found that in seven cycles, 64.5 % of all sub projects had been implemented by local communities (CFA), while only 30.2% and 5.3 % had been implemented by fully contracting work (SW) and mixed implementation, respectively.

The implementation of the PRF is based on the demand driven priorities of the requests from communities within an item "eligible" that includes areas like water supply, transportation (access roads), education, health, irrigation and agriculture, income generation and environment activities (*annex 3*). Through a participatory process, project staff and selected villagers act as guides, trainers, and monitors in the preparation and operation of the projects that will address their established priorities. The income generation activity training is effective because the participants (poor villagers) can pass on the lessons learnt from training to their communities, and thus contribute to an improvement in the living conditions of poor target districts.

We can conclude that the subprojects provide many benefits to communities, both poor and non poor populations, in target areas: the supply of drinkable water has drastically reduced (in most cases eliminated) cases of intestinal diseases, increased food security with the supply of permanent irrigation facilities for paddy cultivation, increased income generation levels in communities with the construction of access roads, and also with the consequence of more time for women/children (no longer fetching water from a distance) to develop their productive activities.

2.3. Efficiency

To evaluate the **Efficiency** of the projects, we need to analyze the outputs and the cost effectiveness of the projects by comparing the plan with the actual result. In the ongoing projects, various forms of data were collected from benchmark projects by the technical specifications of similar rural infrastructure developments. Consequently, all other program data has been normalized in the consecutive sections to allow a comparison with this benchmark. The result of this exercise is summarized in the table below:

Table 3: Cost Comparison between PRF and Other projects

Subproject Types	Unit	Organization	Budget (US\$)
Rural Road	per Km	PRF	1,714 - 2,500
	Per Km	ADB	4,591- 7,518
	Per Km	SIDA	7,000
	Per Km	SRNP	10,000
Pipe Convert (80mm)	Cell	PRF	50
	Cell	CRWRC	112
	Cell	SIDA	90
School Construction	per m2	PRF	65
	per m2	ADB(GEP)	96
	per m2	World Bank	62
	per m2	ADB(IP)	115
Irrigation	per m3	PRF	494
	per m3	ADB	1889

Source: Community Driven Approaches in Laos, World Bank 2008

By comparing the cost of subproject construction between the PRF and other projects in Laos, it shows that the PRF cost is remarkably lower. Since the first priority of the Poverty Reduction Fund is ownership and sustainability, the approach of the program is to use labor based methods and community force account operations, rather than machines or contractors. For example, in the construction of a dispensary, the building materials such as cement, steel bars, corrugated roofing, and nails are supported by the PRF. The community contributed sand, aggregate, wood and labor. The supervisors and technicians are also from the local community. To evaluate that the efficiency of the PRF is highly positive, we can take a look at the outputs of projects made with lower (more than half) costs compared with similar projects, and we can conclude that the implementation of PRF activities has reached the plan in a way that met the expectation of the World Bank and the donors.

Table 4: The proportion of PRF Sub-grant and Community contribution in each cycle

	Cycle I	Cycle II	Cycle III	Cycle IV	Cycle V	Cycle VI	Cycle VII
Community Contribution	17%	18%	17%	15%	20%	15%	11%
PRF sub-grant	83%	82%	83%	85%	80%	85%	89%

Source: Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of PRF, March 2010

From Cycle I to Cycle VII, the data in Table 3 shows that the average of community contribution is about 11% to 20% of total grant used for subproject implementation. The community contribution is directly linked with one of the principle of PRF “ownership”. In this concept, the villagers must be willing to contribute to subprojects to show their support and ownership of the activity. The local contributions can be in cash, in kind, and/or in labor. As with every other aspect of the subprojects, villagers themselves make the main decisions. This information must be included as a part of the koumban proposal. To ensure sustainability, detailed operations and maintenance plans must also be included

in proposals, and villagers must be genuinely willing to operate and maintain any infrastructure that will be built. Operations and maintenance teams must be established before funds are disbursed. Encouraging high levels of ownership is critical if activities are to be sustained in the long term (PRF, 2008).

More data can be found in the report Community Driven Approaches in Laos, World Bank 2008

2.4. Impacts

To assess the impact of PRF projects to the living conditions of poor populations, we can consider the output of the PRF with the beneficiary population. The subprojects under the support of the PRF are significant for the livelihood of the communities in both economic and social aspects.

There were numerous positive impacts resulting from subprojects implemented under the PRF program; therefore, at the 13th PRF Administrative Board Meeting held in LuangNamtha province, it was agreed to upgrade the PRF to a National Project after completing the project's additional phase in 2011. In the future, this program plans to work not only in 47 priority areas, but in all poor villages and Koumbans of rural areas of Laos under the principles and the development plans of both the PRF as well as the policies of the government of Laos.

PRF subprojects benefit communities the most in areas where there is a lack of rural infrastructures. The benefit from the installation of rural infrastructures is immediate and remarkable, especially in remote areas. Benefits from social support in terms of primary education and primary health care follow the installation of rural infrastructures. Benefit from income generating activities, training and environment activities are uncountable but noticeable because the poor villagers who received training can contribute to activities (handicraft,

² Proposals and plans should be detailed but not overly complicated. It is of utmost importance to abide by the key principle of simplicity so that the process doesn't get bogged down in project proposal formulation because of low levels of education of villagers. Appropriate support and training should be provided to strengthen local communities' capacity.

cropping and animal raising training) that create income for their families.

The PRF conducted the assessments on subproject sustainability during beginning of 2010, the findings show that 96% of the 1,051 subprojects assessed, communities declared that those subprojects are bringing positive impacts to their living condition and each sector does bring different facilities. Moreover, Almost all subprojects supported by PRF are still functional, which provide facilitates to communities and improve the living condition of poor people such as: they gain more income, they can connect to outside with other villages and town, they are able to access to services and new information, reduced illiteracy rate and increased food production (Subprojects Sustainability Assessment of PRF, 2010).

One remarkable example in public works sector is upgrading rural roads from the central of SaMoij district (Saravan province) to koumban Asok which has improved the living standard of the community. Recently, the communities are able to communicate with the outsiders and do business with those traders from urban and neighboring countries. For instance, they are able to bring products and especially forest products (without depletion on the natural resource) such as broom grass and peel of Bong³ three for selling and earn more incomes which make their lives improved. Another notable example is that locals are able to communicate in Lao loun language much better than in 2006.

2.5. Sustainability

Sustainability issues are related to the long term effectiveness of sub project operations. This largely depends on the capacity of the village, koumban, and district to organize and manage the operations and maintenance of rural infrastructures after the completion of the PRF project.

One principle of the PRF is ownership, since villagers must be willing to contribute to subprojects to show their support and ownership of the activity. The local contributions can be in cash, in kind, and/or in labor as with every other

³ Bong is the name of the tree in Laos

aspect of the subprojects, villagers themselves decide (mentioned in 2.3). This information must be included as a part of the koumban proposal. To ensure **sustainability**, detailed operation and maintenance plans must also be included in proposals, and villagers must be genuinely willing to operate and maintain any infrastructure that will be built. Operations and maintenance teams must be established before funds are disbursed. Encouraging a high level of ownership is critical if activities are to be sustained in the long term.

The PRF provides capacity building through human resource development and organization development during the preparation and implementation of sub projects, but limited support is made after the completion of subproject construction and installation. Operation and maintenance of subprojects and their sustainability relies largely on the capacity and strength of established operation and maintenance organizations at the village and koumban level and of the local authorities at district and provincial level.

One of the reasonable information to explain about the sustainability of subprojects, from the last assessment we based on average condition of total subprojects assessed (1,051). The finding of subproject assessment shows that 91% of subprojects assessed are considered to be very good condition and are well maintained and will be able to be used in long period of time. One of the most important factors nominates in the good quality and sustainability of subproject is the responsiveness of the operation and maintenance committee that was set up after subprojects completed and many of those committee play very important role in the operation and maintenance activities. The operation and maintenance types are different from a sector to another. 47% of those committees are encouraging villagers to participate in maintenance, followed by the consumption fee as to establish a maintenance budget in their village (26%). Use of a budget for Operation and Maintenance covered 23% and the rest using other types (2%) such as the maintenance from external agencies (government or the other organization).

3. Conclusion and Recommendation

3.1. Conclusion

From the above analysis, the results show that there has been significant improvement in the living conditions of poor target villages as a result of PRF activities. More than 65% of the total village beneficiaries were poor villages (annex 2). There was a high level of participatory decision making with more than 64.5% of all subprojects from Cycle I to Cycle VII having been implemented by the local community (CFA). Also, positive measures in terms of good governance at community level, voluntary contributions to community development and enthusiasm for project ownership have been convincingly demonstrated by communities. In brief, we can confirm that the outcome and impact of PRF from can reach its objectives and purposes.

The infrastructures built could directly support and benefit the communities, especially in life skill development; improving income generation activities to enhance family livelihood. We can conclude that the subprojects implemented by the PRF have succeeded in terms of economic development and poverty reduction, even if quantitative data will need to be collected, apart of the access to the infrastructures. More than one thousand villages now have a better life. It is a major contribution to the National Growth and Poverty Eradication Strategy and also a new development model in Lao PDR.

3.2. Recommendation

In order to effectively reduce poverty and to reach the objectives of the PRF, this project must cater to the specific requirements of the beneficiaries. The successful sustainability of many subprojects depends on raising awareness, good design and implementation, and a high level of participation to develop a sense of ownership. By launching the second phase, the PRF has to continue to improve tools and methodologies which will be used to support and ensure success in the following cycles for next phase of PRF.

ANNEX

Annex 1: The VNPA requested by gender from Cycle 1 to Cycle 7

Percent (%) of Subprojects proposed by:	Cycle 1 (2003-04)	Cycle 2 (2004-05)	Cycle 3 (2005-06)	Cycle 4 (2006-07)	Cycle 5 (2007-08)	Cycle 6 (2008-09)	Cycle 7 (2009-10)
Women-only groups and approved at VNPA meetings	9	7	8	5	7	21	20
Men-only groups and approved at VNPA meetings	14	10	10	6	8	20	19
Both women-only and men-only groups and approved at VNPA meetings	77	83	82	89	85	59	61

Source: PRF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, June 2010

Annex 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries from PRF intervention

Cycle I

Province /District	Number of villages	Number of Poor villages	Number of subprojects	Number of villages benefiting directly	Number of poor villages benefiting directly	Number of villages benefiting indirectly	Number of poor villages benefiting indirectly
Huaphanh	214	190	82	120	94	173	
Savannakhet	339	296	60	192	161	208	
Champasack	360	180	106	247	132	322	
Grand Total	913	666	248	559	387	703	
<i>Percentage</i>				61%	58%	77%	

Cycle II

Province /District	Number of villages	Number of Poor villages	Number of subprojects	Number of villages benefiting directly	Number of poor villages benefiting directly	Number of villages benefiting indirectly	Number of poor villages benefiting indirectly
Huaphanh	616	539	244	250	216	420	358
Savannakhet	456	370	104	158	123	193	177
Champasack	359	180	83	144	67	236	106
Grand Total	1431	1089	431	552	406	849	641
<i>Percentage</i>				39%	37%	59%	59%

Cycle III

Province /District	Number of villages	Number of Poor villages	Number of subprojects	Number of villages benefiting directly	Number of poor villages benefiting directly	Number of villages benefiting indirectly	Number of poor villages benefiting indirectly
Huaphanh	598	538	192	164	124	333	253
Xiengkhuang	320	202	96	81	69	181	165
Savannakhet	456	372	96	96	79	198	149
Saravanh	181	179	63	36	35	109	108
Champasack	358	173	86	92	58	182	106
Grand Total	1913	1464	533	469	365	1003	781
<i>Percentage</i>				25%	25%	52%	53%

Cycle IV

Province /District	Number of villages	Number of Poor villages	Number of subprojects	Number of villages benefiting directly	Number of poor villages benefiting directly	Number of villages benefiting indirectly	Number of poor villages benefiting indirectly
Huaphanh	638	578	230	238	191	378	305
Xiengkhuang	316	257	79	69	58	207	176
Savannakhet	393	316	93	106	83	155	113
Saravanh	179	178	52	48	46	138	134
Champasack	354	170	94	161	52	222	66
Grand Total	1880	1499	548	622	430	1100	794
<i>Percentage</i>				33%	29%	59%	53%

Cycle V

Province /District	Number of villages	Number of Poor villages	Number of subprojects	Number of villages benefiting directly	Number of poor villages benefiting directly	Number of villages benefiting indirectly	Number of poor villages benefiting indirectly
Huaphanh	479	436	112	112	99	767	459
Xiengkhuang	183	148	41	41	41	172	172
Savannakhet	354	220	59	112	112	30	30
Saravanh	131	128	52	74	60	411	397
Champasack	121	53	43	9	9	14	11
Grand Total	1268	985	307	348	321	1394	1069
<i>Percentage</i>				27%	33%	110%	84%

Cycle VI

Province /District	Total Number of villages	Total Number of Poor villages	Number of subprojects	Number of villages benefiting directly	Number of poor village benefiting directly	Number of villages benefiting indirectly	Number of poor village benefiting indirectly
Luang Namtha	187	82	65	65	24	170	83
Huaphanh	484	270	91	102	68	400	239
Xiengkhuang	226	179	44	44	35	156	133
Savannakhet	347	307	71	78	42	280	246
Saravanh	113	102	36	38	31	131	115
Champasack	101	54	48	49	31	137	40
Grand Total	1458	994	355	376	231	1274	856
Percentage				26%	23%	87%	86%

Source: Monitoring and Evaluation of PRF, January 2010

Notice:

- Village benefiting is based on the number of subprojects. If a village benefits from two subprojects, it is counted twice.
- The data of Cycle 7 is not yet completed during this assessment was conducted

Annex 3: Items Eligible and Not Eligible subprojects

Subproject Type	Items <u>Eligible</u>	Item <u>Not Eligible</u>
Access	Small bridges, footpaths, tracks, culverts, ramps, piers, road repairs and upgrading.	New roads and road surfacing/sealing
Community electrical supply	Mini-hydro generator, wiring, line extension	Gasoline or diesel generators
Primary health care facilities	Health centers (building, furniture, latrine, supplies and medicines, temporary allowance for contracted nurses/midwives ⁴ in cash or kind; village medicine kits; training; scholarships; medical equipment)	Generators
Domestic Water systems	Wells, gravity water supply, latrines, etc.	Piped household water hookups
Education	Schools & nurseries (buildings, latrine, temporary allowance for contracted teachers ⁶ , supplies, equipment, furniture, training, scholarship, textbooks, musical instruments).	Any supplies provided by the government
Agricultural Infrastructures	Weirs, ponds, canals, bunds, gates, spillways, and other structures ⁵	Electrical pumps
Markets, community halls	Buildings, drainage, wells, and furnishings.	Generators

Source: PRF Manual of Operation, 26 August 2008

⁴ PRF may fund special recurrent costs on a temporary basis, like small temporary allowances for non civil servants (nurses, teachers); such costs would need to be clearly justified and must comply with the limitations of the negative list. Temporary allowances should not be paid for more than 1 year unless under exceptional circumstances which need to be properly justified and validated by PRF Executive Director.

⁵ Agriculture infrastructures shall be eligible investment only when they are public goods, benefiting to 75% or more of the village population.

Annex 4: Outcome of PRF supported in each sector (2003-2010)

No	Achievement	Unit	Cycle 1-5	Cycle 6	Cycle 7	Total
I	Education sector					
	School construction and improvement	site	411	51	69	531
	Provide Learning and Teaching Material for School	set	1,460	580	1,205	3,245
	Teacher Stipend	person	72	8	55	135
	community hall construction	site	N/A	8	-	8
II	CTCP					
	rural road upgrade and construction	site	327	46	47	420
	bridge construction and Maintenance	site	61	10	13	84
	Main electrical line access	site	34	4	7	45
	Culvert	site	29	2	33	64
III	Health					
	Dispensary Construction	site	38	6	10	54
	Provide Nurse's Stipend	person	27	1	13	41
	others **	set	50	1	10	61
	Latrine Construction	site	23	3	2	28
	Drilled well Construction	site	522	3	83	617
	Spring gravity fed system	site	337	64	149	550
IV	Agriculture					
	Irrigation system construction	site	126	12	17	155
	Veterinary training	person	9	9	221	239
	Water tank	site	N/A	1	-	1
V	Income generation and training					
	Income generation	set	1,399	268	20	1,687
	Capacity building	set	176	5	54*	181
	Village saving group	group	115	7	9	131
	Poultry Raising and cropping Training	Village	16	57	157	230
	Awareness on Environment Management	site	232	20	44	296
	Market	site	13	2	-	15

Source: Data Updated at Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, June 2010

* Included: Books and Furniture, ** Included: Medical equipment, Medical Box. *** Included: channel, dam, Weir

Annex5: The basic information about PRF activities

No.	Details	Unit	Cycle I (2003-2004)	Cycle II (2004-2005)	Cycle III (2005-2006)	Cycle IV (2006-2007)	Cycle V (2007-2008)	Cycle VI (2008-2009)	Cycle VII (2009-2010)	Total
1	Province	Province	3	3	5	5	5	6	7	7
2	District	District	10	14	20	21	21	19	21	28
3	Koumban	Koumban	121	188	239	252	161	195	214	309
4	Number of Villages	Village	913	1,412	1,913	1,880	1,268	1,458	1,567	2,185
5	Poor village	Village	666	1,089	1,464	1,499	985	994	1,197	
6	Number of Villages per Koumbanh	Village	8	8	8	7	8	7	7	
5	Population	Person	380,681	549,131	718,707	744,140	443,475	619,423	660,540	909,975
6	VNPA (Village Need and Prioritization Assesment)	subprojects	2,557	4,230	5,592	5,602	3,341	9,136	9,860	
7	DPM (District Prioritization Meeting)	subprojects	232	374	668	596	422	406	750	
8	DDM (District Decision Meeting)	subprojects	248	431	533	548	307	355	463	2,885
9	Villages Implementation	village	559	496	469	622	496	376		
10	Population in implementation village	person	238,100	389,800	539,000	482,334	443,475	Pending		
11	Benefiting village (direct and indirect benefit villages)	village	703	849	1,003	1,100	718	1274		
12	Poor village benefiting	village	387	488	488	781	324	856		
18	PRF budget (USD)	USD	1,070,000	3,101,000	4,165,000	4,580,000	3,700,000	4,423,000	5,244,100	26,283,100
13	Average budget per subproject	USD	4,315	7,195	7,814	8,358	12,052	12,459	11,326	9,110
14	PRF budget in Kip (LAK)	Billion	11	32	44	45	35	38	58	263
15	Community Contribution	LAK	2,216,238,252	6,975,790,376	9,120,159,110	8,011,421,364	8,589,724,143	7,282,648,233	6,439,074,456	48,635,055,935
15	Community contribution (number)	LAK	2	7	9	8	9	7	6	48
16	PRF budget in kip(LAK)	LAK	11,124,295,153	31,831,898,762	43,722,195,271	44,860,073,498	35,274,784,682	40,829,329,828	51,692,801,778	259,335,378,971
17	Budget Disbursement to Koumban	LAK	13,340,533,405	38,807,689,138	52,842,354,381	52,871,494,862	43,864,508,825	48,111,978,061	58,131,876,234	307,970,434,906

Source: Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of PRF, May 2010