

PDAAA-951-0FI

520-0244-3

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION

For each address check one ACTION

INFO

TO - AID/W

TOAID A- 63

X

5p
AGENCY FOR INT'L. D.
CRN-TEL BRANCH
DATE REC'D
1970 JAN -4 P 2

DATE SENT
DECEMBER 29, 1977

D
DISTRIBUTION
ACTION
mail
no.
form
15/w
w/attach
back to
with diagram

FROM - GUATEMALA

SUBJECT - Project Evaluation Summary

REFERENCE -

FOR - MO/PAV

Following is Project Evaluation Summary for project No. 520-0244, Integrated Community Development and Water Methodology Development.

BOSTER

*Sent via mail 1/3/78
Rosa...*

PAGE 1 OF 5

INITIATED BY IDI:MEHauben:rah	OFFICE Program	DATE X 275 12-22-77	APPROVED BY ADIR:ECarrasco:
PREPARED BY PRM:GH11:	UNCLASSIFIED		DPRM:ADSilver:

1. Mission or AID/W Office Name			2. Project Number	
USAID/Guatemala			520-0244	
3. Project Title				
INTEGRATED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND WATER METHODOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
4. Key Project Dates (Fiscal Years)			5. Total U.S. Funding Life of Project	
A. Project Agreement Signed - FY-77	B. Final Obligation - FY-77	C. Final Input Delivered - FY-77	\$24,000	
6. Evaluation No. as Listed in Evaluation Schedule			7. Period Covered by This Evaluation	
78-3			From: 03-77 To: 09-77	
8. Action Decisions Reached At Evaluation Review, Including Items Needing Further Study			9. Date of this Evaluation Review	
			12 21 77	
			Month/Day/Year	
10. Officer or Unit Responsible for Follow-Up			11. Date Action To Be Completed	

USAID must consider the merits of a follow-on proposal to this OPG recently submitted by Agua del Pueblo, in the light of the reports resulting from this OPG. For example, the new proposal requests assistance in development of a curriculum for training of Rural
(Cont'd)

USAID

Second Quarter, FY-1978.

12. Signatures	
Project Officer	Mission Director, a.i.
Signature	Signature
George A. Hill	Eliseo Carrasco
Typed Name	Typed Name
Date	December 28, 1977
	Date

9. ACTION DECISIONS REACHED AT EVALUATION REVIEW, INCLUDING ITEMS NEEDING FURTHER STUDY (Cont'd)

Water Technicians, one of the things which should have been done under the subject OPG.

USAID must consider the appropriateness of field testing the methodology in comparatively well-off Chimaltenango, as Agua del Pueblo has requested, rather than in poorer areas of the Guatemalan Highlands.

13. SUMMARY

This project was an OPG to Agua del Pueblo, a PVO with some past experience in village water systems installation in Guatemala. A methodology was to be designed for a rural potable water supply and latrine construction program which would include two innovative elements: training and utilization of para-engineers (Rural Water Technicians) and financing of water systems and latrine construction on a loan basis. The methodology produced under this OPG was envisaged as a precursor to a possible follow-on OPG for the testing of this methodology. A methodology of sorts has indeed been submitted -- it is entailed in three reports: (1) Rural Water Technicians: Their Proposed Training and Utilization in Guatemala; (2) Financing Rural Water Systems: Some Economic Considerations; (3) The Integrated Program Strategy for Rural Environmental Sanitation and Community Development.

However, the reports reflect a considerable degree of sketchiness in several areas. The Grant Agreement required, *inter alia*, that the Grantee actually produce the curriculum to be utilized in the training of rural water technicians, something Agua del Pueblo fell short of accomplishing. The initial OPG proposal promises, as well, that the project would analyze "the whole procedure for loan payments and collection". Such nuts and bolts questions attendant to self-financing of village water systems unfortunately have received rather perfunctory treatment. On the other hand, the reports do present ample discussion of the rationale for the utilization of para-engineers and of self-financing of water system construction.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This is a regular terminal evaluation undertaken in accordance with the evaluation plan. The evaluation has incorporated insights into project progress and effectiveness which were obtained by the USAID's Public Health Division and Program Office in the course of monitoring the project throughout the life of project, as well as

an analysis by these offices and the Mission Evaluation Officer of reports submitted by the Grantee.

15. DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED TO REFLECT DECISIONS NOTED PAGE 2

N/A

16. EVALUATION FINDINGS ABOUT EXTERNAL FACTORS

N/A

17. EVALUATION FINDINGS ABOUT GOAL/SUBGOAL

Goal: To improve the health of rural Guatemalans. The relationship between availability of potable water and a reduction in the prevalence of infectious disease, i.e. improved health, is an accepted public health principle. In devising an innovative methodology to increase potable water availability to rural Guatemalans, the project can be said to contribute to the goal, although the actual water availability increase must await application of the methodology.

18. EVALUATION FINDINGS ABOUT PURPOSE

The project purpose was to develop an innovative methodology for a rural potable water supply and latrine construction program and to prepare for the field testing of that methodology. In essence, the methodology has been developed. A methodology for Rural Water Technicians training and utilization has been designed, and, in preparation for its application, institutions such as INTECAP -- the National Vocational Training Institution -- and the Ministry of Health were approached, and expressions of interest in the program were secured. A study of acceptability of the concept to Guatemalan institutions was undertaken. Suggestions for loan financing of village water system construction were propounded.

19. EVALUATION FINDINGS ABOUT OUTPUTS AND INPUTS

The required reports incorporating procedures for training and utilization of Rural Water Technicians and for loan financing of water system construction projects were produced. The most glaring shortfall was the failure of Agua del Pueblo to submit a curriculum for Rural Water Technician training. A general outline of courses to be offered was produced, however.

A useful study on income levels and comparative opportunities for income improvement extant in various parts of western Guatemala was included in the package submitted by Agua del Pueblo. The study clearly indicates Huehuetenango, northern San Marcos and northern El Quiché as the zone of greatest poverty in the Highlands.

It therefore appears paradoxical that the follow-on proposal for field application of the methodology, not evaluated herein, suggests comparatively well-off Chimaltenango as the locus of further Agua del Pueblo activity. Closer examination reveals that the devised methodology has rejected the poorest zone on grounds of inability to repay loans, which may suggest that a methodology which cannot address the problems of the poorest population is perhaps not the most appropriate methodology for a country in which income disparity is strongly skewed geographically.

Another consideration for the choice of Chimaltenango is availability of assistance from other donors, particularly the Behrhorst Clinic.

20. EVALUATION FINDINGS ABOUT UNPLANNED EFFECTS

N/A

21. CHANGES IN DESIGN OR EXECUTION

N/A

22. LESSONS LEARNED

The importance of evaluation to the project design process has been underscored in this case in which a follow-on project proposal has been generated by the subject OPG. The subject project resulted in a methodology which would be field tested under the follow-on. A critical examination of the project and the new proposal as well as an examination of inconsistencies and contradictions between the two are indispensable to judicious consideration of the new proposal.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS

N/A

+

BOSTER

UNCLASSIFIED