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Foreword

The Government of Sweden has provided technical assistance to the Government of Lao PDR in the Natural Resources Sector since 1977. Until the mid 1980s the assistance focused on support to the Department of Forestry and two State Forest Enterprises. From 1985 assistance was expanded to include support for the establishment of a Forestry Training Organization including the Forestry Technician School at Mouang Mai. In the late 1980’s the Lao Swedish Co-operation was further expanded to cover shifting cultivation stabilisation and nature conservation. During the first half of the 1990’s the co-operation gradually changed to institution building/strengthening of the Department of Forestry at the centre and in selected provinces.

The co-operation is based on the premise that national ownership of bilateral programmes will contribute significantly to sustainability after the programmes have been completed.

In more recent years the programme has addressed sustainable land use aspects in the village development context with the view that community participation in partnership with government services will enhance the potential for sustainable management of forest and agricultural resources.

The Phase IV of the Lao Swedish Forestry Programme (1996- 2001) has concentrated on three aspects of institutional building; competence development, model development and research management. The development efforts have covered a process of formulating, improving and disseminating models (methods and procedures) in four main areas including Participatory Village Development and Sustainable Land Use, Participatory National Bio-diversity Conservation Area Management, Natural Resources Management, and Institution Building. Monitoring and gender mainstreaming have been incorporated as cross-cutting efforts in the model development work. The development activities have been performed in partnership with national, provincial and district administrations and with village communities in response to Lao policies.

The LSFP has supported the strategy and policy development of the Government of Lao PDR and contributed to the emerging consensus on rural development that is taking place within the accepted Socio-economic Priorities of the Government of Lao PDR under which broad development policies have long been operative.

This document is one in a series of resulting documents, which have been produced in both Lao and English languages to assist and provide knowledge and ideas to personnel responsible for policy, planning, and implementation of agriculture and forestry development programmes. It contains lessons and experiences learnt during the programme.

I encourage the personnel of departments and agencies to study and assess the content of the documents and apply the relevant parts depending on local conditions.

I wish to commend the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) for it’s continued support during four phases of technical assistance to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, and the LSFP personnel and advisors, who have made a major contribution to this development and documentation.

20 March, 2001

Dr. Siene SAPHANGTHONG
About this Document

1. Intended Audience of this Technical Booklet
   - Heads of Provincial Forestry and Agricultural Sections.
   - Heads of District Agriculture and Forestry Offices.
   - District Land Use Planning and Land Allocation Officers.
   - Regional Forestry and Agricultural Training Centre (RTC) staff.

2. Explanation of “Manuals/Guides/Technical Booklets”
   Manuals/Guides and Technical Booklets are documents that provide practical information on procedures and methods for implementing activities at field level. They have been developed based on experiences at the local levels during Phase 4 of the Lao Swedish Forestry Programme (LSFP). Documents have been produced in both the English and Lao languages for each of the four systems in the model/method development programme.

3. Purpose of this Document
   - To describe the procedures and methods for monitoring and evaluating land use planning and land allocation (LUP/LA) activities at district and village level.
   - To provide guidance for provincial and district LUP staff responsible for monitoring the social and environmental impacts of LUP/LA. To provide a document for training provincial and district staff in LUP/LA monitoring procedures and methods at the Regional Training Centres (RTCs).

4. Information Provided in this Document
   - An introduction to M&E including definitions and explanations of different types of monitoring.
   - The purpose of monitoring at the village and district office levels.
   - Description of a seven step working methodology for monitoring including preparations, collecting and recording information, analysis of information and presentation, feeding back the results, planning for taking corrective measures, implementing the corrective measures and follow-up activities.
   - An example of problems encountered in a village and actions taken to solve them.
Introduction

In order to increase villagers’ involvement in managing natural resources such as forest and agricultural land, the Government of Lao PDR (GoL) has initiated a land allocation process in which villagers are allocated individual land parcels and zones of forest land. The villagers are given the rights to use the agricultural land through a land use certificate issued by the District Agricultural and Forestry Office (DAFO). The long-term objective is to stabilise the utilisation of land so that natural resources will be used in a sustainable way.

The GoL has adopted the “eight step process” for Participatory Land Use Planning and Land Allocation (LUP/LA) in which monitoring and evaluation is one of the last steps. It means that it is an activity carried out on a continuous basis after land allocation has been completed. The process has recently been revised by the Lao Swedish Forestry Programme to include a total of 10 steps, however the eight step procedure is still officially recognised. A proposal to adopt the 10 step procedure is being submitted by the Forestry Inventory and Planning Centre (FIPC) to the relevant authorities.

The main purpose of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activity described in this booklet is to follow-up on LUP/LA activities. It is a tool to help evaluate the work done in a village and to assess the environmental, social and economic impacts of land allocation on the community, to assess problems that may have arisen and to improve LUP/LA itself.

There are two different aspects to this activity, one a controlling function, for example checking to see that the village forest and agricultural land management agreement is being followed or that the village boundary is recognised by the villagers, or if villagers use their allocated plots in the correct manner. This is referred to as inspection or “hard” monitoring. Monitoring can be of a more participatory nature, for example, discussing village problems and extension needs. This is referred to as “improvement” or “soft” monitoring.

Methods for collecting and analysing the information at village level have been developed and tested. Monitoring criteria and indicators have been identified to help the analysis. Furthermore, discussion topics and questionnaires have been prepared to assist with data collection at village level.
The process of village-based M&E involves several steps:

1. Preparation of material, available data and staff.
2. Collection and recording of village information through semi-structured discussions and the use of questionnaires and field observations.
3. Analysis of the information and compilation of an M&E report containing the results.
4. Feed back of results to concerned staff at district and provincial level, and if required, also to higher levels.
5. Planning measures to be taken in response to problems or needs encountered in the village, and problem solution identification.
6. Implementation of those measures or actions.
7. Follow-up the actions taken (return to step one).

This booklet contains further explanations of:

- Definitions of the different types of monitoring identified.
- Purposes and the importance of M&E.
- The working procedures in carrying out monitoring and evaluation.
- A description and use of indicators, and methods to analyse monitoring information.

The purpose of this booklet is to describe the monitoring and evaluation activity that district staff undertake, both at village level and office level. District staff involved in LUP/LA activities are therefore the main target group of this document.

**General Definitions**

A general definition of monitoring is:

“The systematic and continuous process of assessing the progress and changes caused by the implementation of an activity over a certain period of time, usually using pre-determined indicators or recurrent questions”, (Guijt, 1998).

The term “evaluation” is defined as:

“A process of identifying the broader positive and negative outcomes of an activity or process to reach conclusions about its overall value and whether objectives have been met”, (Guijt, 1998).
Types of Monitoring

Two main monitoring types were identified, namely:

- Monitoring of impacts of land allocation and land use planning activities at village level.
- Monitoring of LUP/LA work carried out by the DAFO office itself.

Monitoring of Impacts at Village Level

This type of monitoring deals with villages and communities to assess social, economic and environmental impacts both in the short and long-term, i.e., to determine if there is a better, neutral or worse situation than before land allocation. It also assesses village problems and whether villagers follow the village forest and agricultural land management agreement.

Depending on the purpose, this type can be subdivided into inspection or “hard” monitoring and improvement or “soft” monitoring, (further descriptions below). It is done through interviews and discussions with village committees and village men and women.

Inspection or “Hard” Monitoring

The term “hard” monitoring means that the intention of the monitoring is to make sure that various rules or conditions that have been agreed on, documented and signed for are being followed. This monitoring has an inspection, checking and control function. Nevertheless it is participatory in the sense that it is done in consultation and with the assistance of village organisations and individuals.

In the LUP/LA process various maps, agreements, certificates, and contracts are prepared with village communities and individuals. These are officially recognised by District representatives on behalf of the State, making them either official or legal arrangements. They are based on Laws, Decrees, Regulations, Instructions and Guidelines promulgated by the State.
The agreements and contracts have the primary purpose of protecting the natural resources within village boundaries, including various categories of forest, land, and water bodies. The agreements and contracts define both the rights and the responsibilities of communities and individuals. Various conditions and rules, and the sanctions for contravention of the conditions and rules are specified.

If “hard” monitoring is not undertaken, and enforcement not applied when it should be, the natural resources and the livelihoods of villages could be endangered. Although it may be considered a “non-friendly” form of monitoring, it is never the less an essential activity.

Such monitoring activity assesses if the various village rules and conditions are being observed or followed by village communities and individuals and if the appropriate sanctions as specified in the agreements and contracts are being applied. This monitoring also provides opportunities for provincial or district staff to resolve problems which the village committees are unable to resolve.

The following bodies or organisations have responsibility for the inspection, control and enforcement activities:

• District and Provincial Land Management and Forest Land Allocation Committees.
• Village Land Management and Forest Land Allocation Committees.

Improvement or “Soft” Monitoring

The term soft monitoring means the intention is that staff work in a participatory manner with communities and individuals to assess the impacts of the LUP/LA activity. The monitoring activity will provide information that can be used to assess if the LUP/LA activities are producing positive, negative or neutral impacts on natural resources and the villagers themselves. This information can be used to further improve land management in the villages.

The activity should be very participatory and friendly because the intention is to engage villagers in discussions, the results of which will enable staff and villagers to effect changes and improvements to LUP/LA and forest-land use management practices.

This activity provides valuable information that can be used for the following:

• Understanding what adjustments or improvements could be made to LUP/LA procedures and methods, e.g. ideas on low cost and practical methods for villagers (and or staff) to delineate the boundaries of agricultural land parcels.
• Identifying **forest-land use problems** which can be addressed during subsequent visits to the village by staff responsible for LUP/LA, e.g. problems where some families are in disagreement about parcels of land or some families have insufficient land parcels.

• Identifying **gaps in awareness or knowledge** which villages have about the management and use of forests and agricultural land, e.g. new or improved agricultural cropping practices which could be tested or demonstrated for farmers to evaluate.

An essential element of this type of monitoring is that the information gathered during village visits should be used to feed back into future extension plans. Follow-up village visits and activities can then be programmed to address the particular needs of specific villages.

The important features of this type of monitoring are that it aims at determining the quality of the activity, i.e., it is a type of qualitative monitoring. In order to determine the quality of the activity or work the monitoring information is analysed. This may be done at the time the information is being collected, i.e., through discussions between the villagers and the staff, or after the information is collected, i.e., by the staff who have collected the information.

The following personnel have the responsibility for improvement or qualitative monitoring activities:

• District (DAFO) LUP/LA staff.
• Provincial staff responsible for monitoring.

**Office Level Monitoring**

This type of monitoring is done by district staff in order to improve LUP/LA work at the DAFO office. It is a self-evaluation where office routines are reviewed and checked. An important example of this is the management of information and the storage of documents, maps etc.

In the land allocation process a range of data is gathered, e.g., socio-economic data from each family, land use / claims data and land measurement data. Moreover a number of documents are produced, such as the village forest and land management agreement, land use contracts (LUCs), temporary land use certificates (TLUCs), and land use maps. The data and these documents provide essential information for solving village conflicts, establishing a land parcel record book, or especially when up-grading the TLUCs to permanent status. It is therefore important that this information is stored and managed in a way that
makes the information easily available and protects it from dust and moisture. Procedures for proper storage and management of information are described in detail in Technical Booklet No. 4.

In connection with the above it is also important that monitoring data is kept properly. Analysis is made easier by having the monitoring and land allocation data together.

Another important issue is follow-up of the village work plans made by district staff. Time should be set aside in the work plan for regular monitoring or village visits, e.g. three visits per year. Progress monitoring assesses whether village follow-up and support activities are actually carried out according to the annual plan, and, if not, to find out the reasons.
The Purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation

There are many purposes for undertaking monitoring and evaluation. The purposes identified by the LUP/LA sub-programme are:

- To help evaluate and analyse the LUP/LA field work done by DAFO staff.
- To help improve the LUP/LA field work done by DAFO staff.
- To help improve forest and agricultural land use at village level.
- To help improve LUP/LA approaches, procedures, and methods at village level (method improvement).
- To help improve monitoring itself.
- To assist decision-making at the various levels.
- To improve DAFO staff work performance.

The objectives of monitoring are elaborated below.

Monitoring of Impacts at Village Level
(Inspection Type)

- To assess if the management conditions/rules for forest land use management within village boundaries are being practised by the villagers; i.e.:
  - maintaining forest-land use zone sign posting;
  - following the management conditions for forest-land zones as defined in the village agreement;
  - controlling forest fires;
  - controlling/reporting illegal tree cutting or logging practices (insiders and outsiders);
  - preventing cultivation in inappropriate land use areas; and
  - controlling/reporting illegal non-timber forest products (NTFPs) collecting activities.

- To assess if the land use conditions for allocated agricultural parcels are being observed by villagers; i.e.
  - marking of allocated agricultural parcels with durable marker posts;
- using only allocated parcels of agricultural land; and
  - farming within the delineated boundaries of agricultural parcels allocated.

- To assess if the village LUP/LA committee is performing its tasks in forest and agricultural land management.

- To identify constraints encountered by the LUP/LA committee in managing the forest and agricultural land.

- To identify and follow-up on intrusions and violations against the village forest and land management agreement.

- To improve working relationships between the DAFO staff and the village LUP/LA committee on forest and land use issues.

**Monitoring of Impacts at Village Level**

*(Improvement Type)*

- To assess the socio-economic impact of LUP/LA, i.e:
  - on families who have been allocated agricultural land; and
  - on communities for which forest use areas have been delineated within village boundaries.

- To assess the environmental impact of LUP/LA, i.e.:
  - on forest areas delineated within village boundaries and allocated to village communities to manage.

- To identify forest-land use problems arising from LUP/LA in villages and find possible solutions for addressing the problems with the communities.

**Office Level Monitoring**

- To ensure that LUP/LA information is kept and managed properly to avoid losing, degrading or destroying data.

- To facilitate efficient office work by ensuring LUP/LA information is available.

- To identify areas in the LUP/LA procedures and methods which can be improved by DAFO staff.
Working Methodology

It is important to establish a working methodology that explains the several steps contained in the monitoring process, e.g., preparatory work, the actual monitoring work and analysis, and follow up work after the visit has been made. This is aimed at increasing the understanding of the importance of monitoring and it also helps to improve other aspects of the districts' work, e.g., storage of maps and certificates, extension planning etc.

Monitoring Indicators

In most monitoring activities, indicators should be identified. Indicators are tools used to measure what should be measured, for example impacts. An indicator can be defined as: "A quantitative or qualitative characteristic of a process or activity about which changes are to be measured" (Guijt, 1998).

Indicators developed for several aspects of LUP/LA are described on page 15 of this document.

As mentioned earlier the monitoring and evaluation activity is divided into several steps as indicated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Monitoring Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preparation of material, available data and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collection and recording of village information through semi-structured discussions and the use of questionnaires and field observations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Analysis of the information and compilation of an M&amp;E report containing the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Feed back of results to concerned staff at district and provincial level and if required, also to higher level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Planning measures to be taken in response to problems or needs recorded in the village, i.e. problem solution identification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Implementation of those measures or actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Follow-up the actions taken (return to step one)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 1: Preparations

Preparations before going out to villages should be made thoroughly. Firstly the target village committees should be notified well in advance so they can reserve time for discussions.

A checklist of the materials required such as land use maps, discussion topics (see appendix 1), questionnaires (see appendix 2), village agreements, previous M&E results etc. should be prepared to ensure essential items are not forgotten.

Maps should be brought to the village to facilitate discussions about different locations and land use zones or to identify certain areas of concern. Tools such as questionnaires and recorded discussion topics help collect information in a structured or semi-structured way. This allows people from different village groups to participate and express their opinion in free discussions.

The monitoring staff should be trained in monitoring methods, and understand the purpose of monitoring. Moreover, staff should be well informed about the features of the target village, for example, the problems that have been recorded before in the village.

The monitoring indicators should be discussed and agreed upon, and staff should understand how they are to be used to elicit the information required in discussions with villagers. Further information on indicators is provided below in Step 3: Analysis and presentation of monitoring information.

Picture 1: Preparation of material and staff before going to the village.
Step 2: Collecting and Recording Information

On arrival at the village there should be a structured introductory discussion using guidelines and other documents to explain the objectives of the visit.

If there have been previous monitoring visits to the village, there should also be a feedback discussion and a review of results from that visit. Attention should focus on the progress made in solving problems based on the recommendations of the previous monitoring visit.

Before starting any interviews it is important to explain to the villagers the purpose of the visit, and to establish that the monitoring team is not there to “check” or “control”. If villagers are not relaxed the accuracy of the answers might be compromised. The use of discussion topics will partially ensure that information provided is correct.

In order to get a comprehensive description of the village situation and a wide range of opinions, various groups should be interviewed, including the village LUP/LA committee, a men’s group, and a women’s group. After the discussions are completed field visits to possible areas of concern or interest should be made.

Village Committee

The purpose of interviewing the committee is to obtain information on the village as a whole. It is during these discussions that the “inspection” aspects of monitoring are covered. A questionnaire, complemented with discussion topics, are used to assist in collecting relevant information. Questions are arranged in “blocks” of various topics, for which monitoring indicators have been prepared. Other materials used are maps and village agreements, which can be referred to when necessary.

The interview should be conducted in a participatory way, whereby the committee members are allowed to express their viewpoints and experiences. Results from the discussions should be carefully noted so that important information is not forgotten.

Special forms are used to record problems and shortcomings in each village. These are discussed with district staff during and after the visit, and presented to supervisors.

Village Men and Women

The purpose of interviewing groups of men and women is to assess the impacts on various social groups in the community. A number of people are brought together in a group representing about 10% of families in large villages and about 15% in small villages. Group discussions are held with the help of discussion topics. This is done
in a very participatory and friendly way to create a constructive atmosphere in which the farmers openly express their opinions. The results should also be recorded to help with the forthcoming analysis.

The group discussion with village women is held to assess problems and the impacts that LUP/LA activities have had on women in particular. Discussion topics are used in preference to questionnaires. A friendly and constructive atmosphere is created during discussions.

**Picture 2: Discussions with a group of village women**

Field visits

The interviews and discussions are complemented by field visits to areas of particular interest in the village. These might be demonstration sites, plantations, various forest and land use zones, conflict areas or other locations identified during the discussions. Field visits enhance the mutual understanding of the village land use situation.
Step 3: Analysis and presentation of monitoring information

Analysis

An analysis is made using a combination of the information obtained during the village visit, and existing data. General observations made at the village also contribute to the analysis. The results are used to identify problem solutions.

The analysis is made in two stages:

First, the answers to questions lead to analytical discussions with villagers. Some issues need further clarification, e.g. it is necessary to follow-up the answer “Do not collect NTFPs anymore” with discussion on the reasons for not continuing with NTFP collection. Similarly, the answer “did not have any access to agricultural land before land allocation” needs further explanation to establish the reasons and find out what was done to address the problem.

At this stage it may be possible to propose solutions to simpler problems that have been raised. For example, deciding to allocate more land to some families, or, if someone has lost a land use certificate, arranging for the issue of a copy from the DAFO. Changes can be recorded and adjustments made to land allocation records.
Secondly, the main analysis of the information is undertaken at the office after returning from the field visit.

The analysis can be divided into three sections: environmental, social and economic impacts. To assess these impacts several indicators have been identified which are represented by questions in the questionnaires and the discussion topics.

The issues for which both short-term and long-term indicators have been identified are as follows:

**A. Environmental impacts:**

A1. Forest and Land Management Agreements.
A2. Forest Land Use Types.
A3. Forest Land Use Intrusions or Violations.
A4. Agricultural Land Use Changes.
A5. Agricultural Land Use Intrusions or Violations.

**B. Social impacts:**

B1. Accessibility to Land.
B3. Land or Forest Disputes.
B4. Access to NTFP’s.
B5. Rice Production.
B7. Workload and Labour situation.

**C. Economic impacts:**

C1. NTFP Revenue.
C2. Timber Revenue.
C3. Family Income.
C4. Fruit and Commercial Tree Planting.
C5. Domestic Animals, Livestock.

Using both the data obtained from the different questions and the information coming from the discussions, it is possible to draw conclusions on different issues, e.g. management of the village agreement, rice production problems or tree planting difficulties.

**Presentation**

The presentation of conclusions is best done in report form where quantitative data is presented in tables or graphs and qualitative data in plain text format. A
report format which suits the analysis has been developed and is being used. (see Appendix 3)

Storage of the information can be in analogue form, in which case questionnaires and reports are stored in labelled hardback folders. If computer equipment is available it is possible to store information in a simple database.

**Step 4: Feeding back the results**

The results from the monitoring visit should be presented to concerned staff and supervisors at district level. If serious matters are discovered, provincial supervisors should be notified. A debriefing meeting is held at the DAFO when the recorded problems are discussed and possible solutions are drafted. This information should be fed back into the planning system and be used as an input for planning future activities.

*Picture 4: Feed back of the results to concerned DAFO staff*
Step 5: Planning follow-up measures

When the information has been presented and made available to the staff it should be used for planning the necessary measures to address the problems or the needs that were identified. In order to identify appropriate solutions it is important to reach understanding on the reasons for the problem, and those responsible.

- If the problem is the result of improper work by DAFO, then it should be corrected by the persons responsible.
- If it is a result of inadequate villager knowledge, then a plan for education or training should be made.
- If it is an obvious deliberate violation of the village agreement, then the appropriate fine for that offence should be imposed.
- When offences are unavoidable, e.g. the use of non-allocated land in order to secure food supply, fines should not be imposed. Consideration should be given to allocating that land or other land available in the delineated agricultural zone.

Some information could be used for planning extension activities in the village or for improving land use planning. Issues for which DAFO is not responsible should be passed on to other authorities for consideration or action.

Problems or proposals that are very serious or difficult to solve and require attention from higher authorities should be submitted to provincial offices, or even central level offices.

A budget should be prepared for the follow-up measures or actions planned. It is preferable to fund the most urgent activities first.

Step 6: Implementing the Action Plans

The measures or adjustments to field activities that were identified as a result of the monitoring activity should be implemented whenever possible, depending on priorities, staff availability and budget. The work should be done with the participation of the villagers, and possibly with other specialist staff if particular skills are required.

Step 7: Following up on the Implementation

When the remedial work is done it should be followed-up and monitored closely so that problems that might arise can be addressed promptly to prevent negative impacts. This is actually where the cycle of monitoring re-commences, i.e., there is a return to “Step 1” and a new round is started.
Example from a Village

The following example illustrates the kind of problems that were revealed in a village by the monitoring activity, and how they were addressed. The example comes from Ban Namtap in Hongsa District, Sayabouli Province. Land allocation was carried out in 1995 and a monitoring visit was made in 1998. During that visit the following four issues were identified:

1) Five families were using land that was not allocated.
2) Four families had to clear forested land because they did not have enough land to use.
3) One family wanted to return upland because the paddy land area was sufficient for rice production.
4) A conflict existed with Ban Thaen because Ban Thaen villagers cleared land along the village boundary in the irrigation water catchment area.

A year later, in 1999, a follow-up visit was made and the DAFO had dealt with the problems in the following manner:

1) The district and village co-operated to identify and allocate new land for those families needing more land.
2) Initially the district wanted to fine them, but since they were very poor they were provided with advice and training instead.
3) The land user relinquished the land that he thought he would need when LA was done in 1995, and it was returned to the village “land pool”.
4) Discussions were organised between Namtap and Thaen by district staff. During these discussions it was agreed that Ban Thaen villagers would discontinue cultivation in the water catchment area.

In each of these cases solutions, or apparent solutions, were found. Future monitoring visits will assess whether the agreed solutions are being followed.
Appendix 1: Monitoring Discussion Topics

1. If you wanted to change something to improve your livelihood in the future, what would that be and why?

2. What would you suggest to improve the way that land is managed or to improve land use itself?

3. In your opinion, what is the most evident advantage of land allocation?

4. What is the most important disadvantage?

5. What are your benefits from LA?
   Who are the beneficiaries?.................................................................................................................................
   (Observe: Are men and women equally benefiting?
   If not, why? and what is the difference?
   What can be done to overcome this?)

6. What is the most significant change in any aspect since LA?
   Why?

Discussion topics extracted from questionnaires

7. Do you feel that you have the same access to all types of land now as you did before LA?

8. Has there been any impact on rice production from LUP/LA?

9. Has the number of upland fields used been reduced since LUP/LA?
   Has there been more paddy development?

10. Is the land sufficient, or do you require more land to use?
    Are there families without any land?

11. Has LA affected the opportunities to collect NTFPs?
    Has the income derived from NTFP changed since LA?

12. Is your household economy better now than before LA?

13. Do you plant more fruit/commercial trees now than before LA?

14. Do you keep more livestock now than before LA?

15. Are you well aware of the rules and regulations of the village agreement on forest land and where the different land use zones are?

16. Have there been or are there any problems with boundary conflicts or land use disputes in the village?
17. Have all families got TLUCs or PLUCs?
18. Is there a village contract with a timber company or other enterprises concerning timber harvesting?

Questions for individual families

19. Have you developed more paddy land since LA?
20. What do you plant on your land this season?
21. What did you plant last year and the year before that?
22. What will you plant next year?
23. How do you manage your land? Do you use all your land?
24. Do you apply any soil conservation measures?
Appendix 2: M&E Questionnaire

MONITORING AND EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Village:........................................ Date:.............................
District:..........................................
Province:....................................... Population:............... 

Section 1: Village Committee Questions: Environmental Impacts

Indicator A1
1.1 Were there any village rules or agreements concerning forest and land
management before LUP/LA was done? Yes / No

Indicator A1
1.2 Were village rules or forest and land management agreements prepared when
LUP/LA was done in the village? Yes / No

If Yes, Did government staff assist the committee to make the agreement? Yes / No

Who signed the agreement?........................................

Indicator A2
2.1 What forest categories had the village agreed on before LUP/LA? (Yes / No)

Conservation forest? Area.........ha
Protection forest? Area.........ha
Village Use forest? Area.........ha
Regeneration forest? Area.........ha
Production forest (agriculture)? Area.........ha
Reserve agricultural land? Area.........ha
Water source protection? Area.........ha
Special village areas? Area.........ha
Other? (explain).......................... Area.........ha
Indicator A2

2.2 What forest categories were agreed on during LUP/LA?

- Conservation forest? Area........ha
- Protection forest? Area........ha
- Village Use forest? Area........ha
- Regeneration forest? Area........ha
- Production forest (agriculture)? Area........ha
- Reserve agricultural land? Area........ha
- Water source protection? Area........ha
- Special village areas? Area........ha
- Other? (explain) Area........ha

Indicator A1

2.3 Have you received a copy of village agreements for neighbouring villages? Yes / No

Indicator A1

2.4 Have copies of the village agreement been distributed to neighbouring villages? Yes / No

Indicator A3

2.5 Have there been any intrusions or violations against the village agreement in forest areas? Yes / No
   If yes, has there been any penalty imposed? Yes / No

Indicator A4

3.1 How many upland fields were being used for crop production in the village before LUP/LA was done?.............Total area of fields.............ha

Indicator A4

3.2 How many upland fields were allocated for crop production in the village when LUP/LA was done?.............Total area of fields.............ha
Indicator A5

4.1 How many families used only the plots allocated in the temporary transfer document? ………………………………

How many families used plots which were not allocated? ……………………………

If families used plots not allocated, what are the reasons?
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................

Indicator A5

4.2 Have there been any intrusions or violations against the village agreement in agricultural areas?  Yes / No

If yes, has there been any penalty imposed?  Yes / No

Indicator A6

5.1 Land Use: In the land use contract, recommendations were given on which crops are suitable for flat land, slightly sloping land, quite steep land and very steep land. (Interviewer explains the options) Do you think farmers followed those recommendations?  Yes / No

If No, about how many farmers? ........... What were the reasons..............................
......................................................................................................................................................

Indicator A6

6.1 Soil Conservation Measures: When farmers plant crops on upland fields do they practice any soil erosion control measures?  Yes / No

If Yes, which ones?
- contour ditches........... If Yes, How many farmers.......... 
- vegetative strips........... If Yes, How many farmers.......... 

Section 2 Village Committee Questions: Social Impacts

Indicator B1

7.1 Number of families who do not have land for agriculture:
Before LUP/LA...................... After LUP/LA......................

Indicator B2

7.2 Number of families who have Temporary Land Use Certificates.............
Indicator B2
7.3 Number of families who have Permanent Land Use Certificates ............

Indicator B3
7.4 Were there any land disputes with other villages before LUP/LA?
   Yes......No..... If Yes, How many?........... With which villages
   .................................................................................................................

Indicator B3
7.5 Are any of these disputes still continuing since LUP/LA?
   Yes......No........ If Yes, How many?............

Indicator B3
7.6 Were there any land disputes within the village before LUP/LA?
   Yes......No..... If Yes, How many?............

Indicator B3
7.7 Are any of these disputes still continuing since LUP/LA?
   Yes......No........ If Yes, How many?............

Indicator B4
7.8 Number of families that collect NTFP
   Before LUP/LA...........After LUP/LA............

Indicator B4
7.9 From which forest lands did villagers collect non timber forest products:
   Before LUP/LA was done? Specify the forest zones..................................................
   ..................................................................................................................................................
   Area of forest from which NTFP were collected...........ha

Indicator B4
7.10 After LUP/LA was done? Specify the forest zones..................................................
   ..................................................................................................................................................
   Area of forest from which NTFP is now collected...........ha
Section 3: Village Committee Questions: Economic Impacts.

Indicator C1

8.1 Estimate the total annual income which the village derived from NTFP:
   Before LUP/LA K...............After LUP/LA K.................

Indicator C2

8.2 Has there been an agreement or contract made between the village and the
district or a company, for the harvesting of timber from village forests?
Yes........No.......... 

Indicator C2

8.3 If Yes, What benefits do the villagers get from the agreement...........................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

Indicator C2

8.4 Was this agreement or contract made:
   Before LUP/LA was done..........After LUP/LA was done.............

Questions for Families: Social Impacts

Indicator B1

9.1 Which of the following production forest land categories did you have access
to:
   Before LUP/LA: Village use forest Yes / No
       Agricultural land Yes / No
       Reserve land Yes / No

Indicator B1

9.2 After LUP/LA: Village use forest Yes / No
       Agricultural land Yes / No
       Reserve land Yes / No
Indicator B5

10.1 Rice Sufficiency: What was your annual rice production? Average: ............

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 Years Ago</th>
<th>2 Years Ago</th>
<th>1 Year Ago</th>
<th>This Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paddy Rice (Kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Rice (Kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator B5

10.2 Rice Surplus: Have you had a rice surplus in the past? If Yes, please indicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 Years Ago</th>
<th>2 Years Ago</th>
<th>1 Year Ago</th>
<th>This Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paddy Rice (Kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Rice (Kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator B5

10.3 Rice Deficit: Have you had a rice deficit in the past? If Yes, please indicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 Years Ago</th>
<th>2 Years Ago</th>
<th>1 Year Ago</th>
<th>This Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paddy Rice (Kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Rice (Kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator A4

11. How much upland did you farm before LUP/LA?
   No. of plots..............Area............ha

   How much upland do you have since LUP/LA?
   No. of plots..............Area............ha

   How much paddy did you farm before LUP/LA?
   No. of plots..............Area............ha

   How much paddy did you have since LUP/LA?
   No. of plots..............Area............ha

Indicator B2

12. Has any of the land allocated to you temporarily (3 years) been converted to permanent land use status by the GoL? Yes / No

   If yes, how many plots?..............Area............ha

   In which year did you acquire permanent land use status for your land?
   ........................................(year)
**Indicator B6**

13. Does the village have reserved agricultural land which families can request if they require more land? **Yes / No**

   If yes, have you requested any more land since the LUP/LA was done? **Yes / No**

   If yes, how much land? .........................ha.

   Was your request approved? **Yes / No**

**Indicator B4**

14.1 Did you collect non timber forest products before LUP/LA? **Yes / No**

   Specify the forest areas........................................................................................................

14.2 Do you collect non timber forest products since LUP/LA? **Yes / No**

   Specify the forest areas........................................................................................................

**Section 5: Questions for Families : Economic Impacts**

**Indicator C3**

16. What is your annual family income (Kip) from the following activities?

   Before LUP/LA  After LUP/LA

   Livestock..............................................................................................................................

   Forest Products....................................................................................................................

   Agriculture...........................................................................................................................

   Home occupations................................................................................................................

   Outside work.........................................................................................................................

17. How much paddy land did you own and develop?

   Before LUP/LA..........................ha,  After LUP/LA..........................ha

   How much paddy land did you own and not develop?

   Before LUP/LA..........................ha,  After LUP/LA..........................ha
**Indicator C4**

18. Number of permanent tree crops planted?

- Fruit trees  
  Before LUP/LA......No.  After LUP/LA......

- Commercial trees (teak etc)  
  Before LUP/LA......No.  After LUP/LA......

**Indicator C5**

19. Number of animals owned? Before LUP/LA After LUP/LA

- Buffalo..............................
- Cattle.................................
- Pigs....................................
- Small animals........................
Appendix 3: Example of an M&E report

Monitoring and Evaluation of LUP/LA activity

Village: BAN KANIN
District: Phin
Province: Savannakhet
Date: 10 Dec 1998

Introduction
This report is based on observations and interviews made in the village, including the village committee and three families.

Land allocation was carried out in February 1997 and this was the first monitoring visit to the village although two attempts were made before. The first in August 1997 was cancelled due to heavy rains, however work at the DAFO office was possible. The second visit in August 1998 was cancelled altogether due to the impassable access road. Ban Kanin is a target village of the LSFP.

Summary
This village is reputed to manage their forest areas in a very good way. There have been no intrusions or violations in the forest areas or in agricultural zones. Previous conflicts with neighbouring villages have been partly solved. Tree plantations and livestock have increased. Rice production, however, has not changed.

The general conclusion is that land allocation has had good impacts in this village and that the villagers are able to manage the agreements.

Section 1. Environmental Impacts (committee)

1.1 Forest and Land Management Agreements
Before land allocation there was a written agreement that specified sacred forest and a cemetery area. In the LA process an expanded village agreement was created, including for example conservation forest and protection forest.

According to the DAFO, Ban Kanin is very good at managing their forest land. There is no timber trade and this indicates good forest protection in the village.
This is known to the government, which has supplied the village with fish for the recently constructed village dam.

The village agreement has been distributed to the surrounding villages, but not the other way around, simply because the other villages do not have any written agreements.

1.2 Forest Land Use Types

Sacred (1 ha)
Cemetery (3.7 ha)
Conservation (509 ha)
Protection (796 ha)
Village use (355 ha)
Production (0.25 ha)
Regeneration (140 ha)

1.3 Forest Land Use Intrusions or Violations

No intrusions or violations have been reported

1.4 Agricultural Land Use Changes

Before LA approximately 25 upland plots were used for agriculture. It is not known how many of those were allocated. When looking at the family interviews, however, it is clear that the area of upland fields farmed has decreased to about 50%. One family has reduced from 1 to 0.5 ha, and another from 1 to 0.6 ha. If this is a general trend then the upland agricultural area would have decreased by about 50%. Two of the three families interviewed have increased their paddy land with between 0.5 to 1 ha to compensate for upland loss.

1.5 Agricultural Land Use Intrusions or Violations

Only one family was reported to use land not allocated to them. The reason was reported as being a lack of soil moisture which made them shift to more suitable land. No other intrusions were reported.

1.6 Land Use and Soil Conservation Practises

There were recommendations given on suitable land use options in the land use contract and some of these have been implemented. The farmers practise some soil conservation measures, such as preserving trees along river banks and planting trees on the contours.
Section 2. Social Impacts (committee)

2.1 Accessibility to Land
Every family has access to agricultural land (before and after land allocation).

2.2 Land Use Certificates
25 households have got TLUCs. Today there is a total of 29 households, which means that 4 new households have not got certificates yet.

2.3 Disputes
Before land allocation there were conflicts with 3 other villages, Ban Apok, Ban Vankoum and Ban Mulou. It concerned NTFP’s in all three cases, and shifting cultivation with the first two. Those conflicts have not been completely solved but they are not of a serious nature anymore. According to the committee land allocation has helped to solve them.

No internal conflicts were reported.

2.4 Access to NTFP
Every family collects NTFP’s, as they did before LA.

Section 3. Economic Impacts (committee)

3.1 NTFP Revenue
The annual NTFP income rose from 200000 K before LA to 3-400000 K after LA. It is not known if this is due to the change in the value of the Kip or an actual increase in NTFPs sold. However, in view of rice deficiencies experienced and the fact that villagers are not concerned with the amount of farming land they have, the information points to higher exploitation levels of NTFPs.

3.2 Timber Revenue
There is no income from timber trade since they have no contract with logging companies.

Section 4. Social Impacts (families)

4.1 Accessibility to Land
All of the three families interviewed claim that they now have access to both village use forest and agricultural land which they did not have before. It is
believed the probable interpretation of this is that they now have access to land that has been clearly defined to serve those purposes, whereas before LA there were no specific areas called “village use forest” or “agricultural land use zone”.

4.2 Rice Production
There is no visible change in the amount of rice produced over the last couple of years. All three families suffer from rice deficiency and have to buy rice to sustain a full year’s consumption.

4.3 Land Sufficiency
No one has asked for more land since land allocation, so families appear not to be concerned with the amount of land they have. However, according to the committee there is no reserve land zone in the village, so with population increase there might be a land pressure problem in the future.

4.4 NTFP
All the sample families collect NTFP in each area as they did before. LA appears to have had no impact on this activity, either in terms of reducing amounts or helping to maintain sustainable quantities.

Section 5. Economic Impacts (families)

5.1 Family Income
On the question whether income from different sources has changed since LA most answered no change. Income figures from NTFPs actually indicate less income now than before.

5.2 Fruit and Commercial Tree Planting
There has been a significant increase in tree planting since LA. Two of the families interviewed have started fruit tree planting and now have 15 and 30 fruit trees respectively. Whether it is the land security created by LUP/LA or extension work that has resulted in this is not known.

5.3 Domestic Animals
The same can be said about the number of animals owned. Numbers have increased substantially among the families interviewed. There has been an increase of between 25% to 200% in poultry for example.
**Issues Raised by Villagers**

The village committee raised some problems, the need for a new road being the most urgent. Secondly they mentioned the need of a village school. At present children have to go the next village, which is quite far away. The village needs a nurse or a doctor and also an improved water well. Another problem was mice infestations of the rice.

The families interviewed mentioned the same problems, and furthermore, the need for buffaloes for ploughing paddy land, agricultural tools such as spades, and barbed wire to protect land from animals.

Finally the village head said that land allocation was generally good as it helps control deforestation and stabilises land use. Rules that they did not have previously have helped in controlling deforestation.

**Answers to Comments by DAFO**

DAFO has helped the village to improve the road by paying villagers wages for repairs. Not much progress has been made, so they now believe that a timber company may improve the road. The construction of a school is difficult because there are insufficient children in the village to warrant funding.

With respect to health facilities, the village is too small to warrant its own hospital. A pharmacy would be sufficient.

Digging wells is difficult since the soil is very shallow and there is hard bedrock underneath.

The rat problem is difficult to solve as poisons are very strong and dangerous. The only possible solution is to set out traps to catch them.
**General Village Information**

**Background Data**
- Altitude: 200 m
- Ethnic group: Ma Kong, (Lao Theung)
- Village head: Mr Bounkeurt

**Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec-98</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>73/55</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People per family (avg.): 3.66

**Interview Information**

Interviews made with:
- Village committee
- Mr Soui, 8 people
- Mr Khaman, 5 people
- Mr Sengsawan, 3 people
- Accompanying DAFO and/or PAFO staff:
- Mr Khampuay, DAFO Phin
- Central team:
- Mr Soukanh, M&E team
- Mr Noven, M&E team

**Note:** In subsequent village monitoring and evaluation visits (i.e. since 1998), separate interviews were held with groups of women, as described in the methodology above.
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Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAFO</td>
<td>District Agriculture and Forestry Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIPC</td>
<td>Forestry Inventory and Planning Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOL</td>
<td>Government of Lao PDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Land Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUP/LA</td>
<td>Land Use Planning and Land Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSFP</td>
<td>Lao Swedish Forestry Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTFP</td>
<td>Non-timber Forest Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUC</td>
<td>Permanent Land Use Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Regional Agriculture and Forestry Training Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLUC</td>
<td>Temporary Land Use Certificate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>