

50020424
4970247001501

4970247 (3)
PD-AAD-876-A1

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE RURAL SANITATION MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT		2. PROJECT NUMBER 497-U-043	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE INDONESIA
		4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <u>79-8</u>	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	

8p.

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>76</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>76</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>80</u>		A. Total \$ <u>15,000</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>Oct. 76</u>
			B. U.S. \$ <u>6,800</u>	To (month/yr.) <u>Sept. 78</u>	Date of Evaluation Review <u>OCT. 24, 1978</u>

B. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; site those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., Airgram, SPAR, PIC, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Revise overall Implementation Plan	a) Philip E. Smart b) Kenneth F. Smith	October/November 78
2. Make detailed Implementation plans for each site	a) Philip E. Smart b) Kenneth F. Smith c) Soebagio	June 79
3. Assign full time officer to oversee, expedite and monitor the preparation of detailed plans and specifications, site certification and preparation, construction and furnishing and equipping of all new schools.		
a. in USAID	a) Kenneth F. Smith b) Philip E. Smart	November 78
b. Center for Education & Training (Pusdiklat)	a) Director-Center Education & Training	
4. Complete selection of remaining Faculty members & arrange for the eleven participants destined for the United States to begin language instruction.	a) Director Pusdiklat b) Mr. Soebagio	Jan. 1, 1979

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A. Continue Project Without Change

B. Change Project Design and/or Change Implementation Plan

C. Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Mr. Sutia, Actg. Director MOH Center ED. & Training
UH/TA Team: Messrs. Harry Adrounie, Bruce Chelikowsky & David Hagen

H/N: PESmart _____ H/N: KESmith _____ PRO: RCohen _____
Evaluation Officer: RFZimmerman _____ DD: WGBollinger _____

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: Thomas C. Niblock
Typed Name: Thomas C. Niblock, Director
Date: 3/1/79

13. Summary

Major project elements are:

- a. Training of trainers abroad
- b. Training of trainers of University Indonesia/FKM
- c. Revision of Curricula
- d. Production of field kit & manual, ordering supplies
- e. Construction & establishment of schools
- f. Inservice training existing environmental sanitation staff
- g. Preservice training new environmental sanitation staff

The project is currently one year behind schedule. It slipped about two years from the original plan made when the PP was written. A revised plan which was made on February 1977, reduced this slippage to about one year.

Some specific delays were:

- a. GOI/USAID signing the loan (1/2 year to Oct. 76)
- b. GOI sending out RFP's (3 months to Jan. 1977)
- c. GOI signing of contract with University of Hawaii (8 months, to Oct. 6, 1977)
- d. University of Hawaii recruiting and providing the full three-man T/A staff. Delays in visas and work permits by GOI delayed the first two technicians for 3 months. The third arrived in August 1978.
- e. GOI providing acceptable detailed documents, plans for construction.

The actual project completion date will now be July 81 reflected by the last CPI to be met: approval of the last reimbursement for construction.

Present Status

Training of trainers (Elements a and b: above) has begun; the new curricula (c) have been completed by GOI and are under study by UH/TA team; a list of components for the field kit and supplies for the training center is under preparation (d).

Construction of the first training schools (e) will start early in 1979. The process of obtaining preliminary, then final plans from the GOI architect and securing their approval by MOH & USAID took over a year. If USAID/GOI agreement on the final plans for the remaining schools cannot be accelerated the construction will not be completed by EOP. Inservice training (f) will begin in 1980. Preservice training with the new style curriculum (without benefit of US/TA review) has already started in the two Academies and first graduates will emerge in February of 1979. (For more details refer to Appendix).

14. Evaluation Methodology

The methodology of this evaluation was developed with the Government of Indonesia Center for Education and Training and the University of Hawaii. The original draft was prepared by the USAID Project Officer, reviewed and corrected with the program office Evaluation officer and draft provided for review by GOI RSMD staff and UH technical advisors.

After separate review, joint discussion resulted in the final draft provided at this review meeting. In addition to this PES there will be two special evaluations carried out by one-month consultancies in September 1979 and August 1981.

The purpose of the first evaluation is to assess the progress of the project to date with particular reference to conformance with the PP, and the appropriateness of any changes or digressions in terms of outputs and likely impact on the achievement of project purpose. Special emphasis will be placed on reviewing the project financial plans and status, including funds authorized for housing with USAID Indonesia and the budget of the University of Hawaii Contract.

This evaluation will also assess progress toward achieving stated objectives and address the question of whether the U.S. technical team services should be extended. The second and last consultancy will evaluate EOP status as compared to that in the log frame and endeavor to assess the impact of the new training of trainees

Unfortunately, the funds for the evaluation were placed in the University of Hawaii contract (Direct Letter of Commitment). Thus, the selection of the evaluator will be made by the evaluated: - University of Hawaii. It is being strongly recommended that the University employ an impartial outside evaluator. If this is not done, USAID will request an outside consultant from AID/W to insure the needed element of impartiality.

15. External Factors

Present

The new Minister of Health has stated to the cabinet his priorities for Pelita III which placed the project in the highest priority. Of ten priority programs the Minister has placed environmental health as number 1. Also prospects for the use of the manpower developed are improved. To improve the prospects for successful execution of Environmental sanitation (ES) programs by the manpower from this project, GOI has collaborated with USAID in development of a PID for a follow-on

project to address constraints to ES programs other than manpower. The PID now called "Kampung Environmental Sanitation Delivery (KESDEL) was approved, but AID/W has agreed to provide a 5-6 month consultancy to further develop the project and rewrite the PID.

GOI has also indicated interest in the Predictive Sanitation Model Workshops and local manufacture of the AID Hand-operated Water Pump (AWP). The AWP Phase I, which is local manufacture of pumps to be tested in Phase II, (1978), is in progress. The first Predictive Sanitation Model (PSM) workshops are planned for January 1979. The PSM may, in some form, be used as a tool to encourage communities to select the appropriate technology for projects under the KESDEL project. The AID Water-pump will be coordinated with KESDEL, improving the likelihood of RSMD manpower being effectively utilized in the implementation of ES programs.

On the other hand, the difficulty of obtaining coordination of the GOI architect, the Ministry of Health, Health facilities and USAID engineering sections had not been foreseen. Also the problem of obtaining land certification from the several far flung provinces where centers are to be established proved to be far more complex than originally estimated.

Soundness of Assumptions

The input assumption that consultants are available was sound. The assumption that realistic organization and plans are developed was unsound, especially as to time schedules.

The main weakness in the organization is that responsibility for the project is divided among officials of disparate branches of the Ministry of Health, the local RSMD committees and the provincial health services. For example, the official project director who has the signatory responsibility for the project is the Director of the Center for Education and Training. The actual management of the project, however, is assigned to the Director of the Health Controller Academy of Jakarta D.K.I. On the other hand, the responsibility on the GOI side for the construction of facilities lies in the Directorate of Health Facilities.

The fact that these officers' responsibility for this project is a very small part of their duties has made coordinated action extremely cumbersome. Over a year was required in order to secure from the private architect plans which were acceptable to USAID. Due to the complexity of land title documentation the titles of some sites are still not sufficiently clear.

For this reason, the GOI has been requested to assign a full-time sanitary engineer to the project

The GOI budgeting provisions have been timely, but inputs with respect to the RFPs and construction plans were delayed.

The assumption for outputs that instructors are willing and eager to be upgraded has proven valid as 33 are now in training. The assumption that technical assistance, commodity procurement, and funds will flow and construction proceed as planned was optimistic in terms of time-frame. Budgeting provisions have been made, but did not include amenities such as water sewerage and power.

Evaluation of goal assumptions will be made at a later stage of the project when the interest and availability of sanitarians and the continued interest of GOI in water and latrine facilities can be verified. The linkage between sanitation and health will require post EOP evaluation. It should be mentioned at this point that the goal assumptions regarding water and sewerage are far too limited in scope to represent the broad impact of this project. For example, the new curricula will include the fields of food and water sanitation, solid waste disposal, vector control and other fields of environmental management.

16. Inputs

As indicated above in No. 13, the University of Hawaii team, while not provided on a timely basis, is now in place functioning effectively. The high quality of this team is expected to produce results which will compensate to some extent for the delay in their appointment.

The GOI architect and the MOH engineering section as mentioned above have been slow in providing satisfactory plans and tender documents. Numerous meetings between USAID/PTE & O/HN, University of Hawaii TA and GOI were also required before the GOI architect and engineers could come to an understanding of USAID/PTE requirements. Recent approval of one set of plans for Phase One indicates progress is being made, but must be accelerated for timely completion of the project.

17. Outputs

Outputs are competent instructors trained, revised curricula and manual and graduation kit completed, new schools and inservice training courses finished. None to date as explained in 13 above.

18. Purpose

To develop an (educational) system that will allow Indonesia to meet its quantitative and qualitative manpower need in the field of rural environmental sanitation.

EOP conditions include increased number of qualified field technicians and supervisors, the entire existing cadre re-trained and the eleven institutions equipped and enrolling annually 360 sanitarians and 100 Sanitarian Technologists.

By October 27, 1981, if constraints in construction can be removed all training centers should be operating at full capacity, 240 sanitation technologists and 600 sanitarians would have graduated. Retraining of the 1780 existing sanitation personnel should have commenced. Exact schedules of retraining are under study and preparation and should be finalized during 1979. It is anticipated that retraining will not commence before 1980. Current progress is far less than planned and unless the constraints impeding construction are removed immediately, hopes for timely realization of EOPs are dim. Action is needed at once to provide legal title to land, to prepare sites and provide amenities for installations and provide the staff and system to enable speedy approval of plans and initiation and completion of construction.

19. Goal/Subgoal

Improve the overall health of rural Indonesians by improving rural environmental sanitation through better educated and motivated environmental health workers.

Progress in Verifiable Indicators:

1. Morbidity and mortality of environmental sanitation-related disease, specifically gastro-intestinal, skin and eye diseases, are goal indicators. The project cannot be expected to impact on these indicators until considerable numbers of upgraded staff have been working in the field for some time.

2. Increase in water supply systems is another goal indicator. This will almost certainly occur because of increases almost doubling Inpres inputs which will amount to over \$100,000,000 in Pelita III.

The major impact on these indicators from this project should begin occurring when existing sanitation personnel have been retrained as shown in the following chart.

SANITATION PERSONNEL

	<u>HC</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>AS</u>	<u>AXS</u>
PROVINCE	32	54	11	22
KOTAMADYA	19	47	33	38
KABUPATEN	33	155	101	68
KECAMATAN	25	249	460	433
	109	505	605	561
	1780 Grand Total			

HC Health Controllers
S Sanitarians
AS Assistant Sanitarians
AXS Auxiliary Sanitarians

20. Beneficiaries

The main beneficiaries are the rural poor persons who will benefit from improved health which will result from more clean water, improved waste disposal, a more sanitary environment and improved environmental health education. Improved health, in turn, will increase agricultural productivity and economic welfare especially on rural farms where most Indonesians reside. Specific quantitative data on beneficiaries will be developed during preparation of a new PID for the Kampung Environmental Sanitary Delivery Project.

The reduction of overall morbidity and mortality will particularly affect the young who lack adequate immunity to water and food-borne diseases such as cholera and typhoid fever. Improvement of rural farm productivity will increase the tendency to more equal distribution of income by allowing the small farmer with improved health to derive a larger share of the income from agricultural production.

21. Unplanned Effects

As a result of reviewing technical standards for environmental sanitation impacting on the project it was discovered that different agencies were using a variety of standards which should be uniform. Therefore, an interagency committee is being planned to produce upgraded and uniform environmental health standards for the Government of Indonesia.

22. Lessons

Much more liberal time-frames must be provided for if substantial actions are out of the administrative control of

USAID. Direct letting of RFPs and negotiation of contracts by AID would be considerably more expeditious. The planned direct-hire project input of only one-fourth of one project officer's time was extremely conservative in comparison with the actual inputs which have been made to this project by USAID Staff.

A full-time project officer would have been justified and might possibly have been able to move the project along at a more satisfactory rate.

Also, the project officer should have been included in the tour of U.S. Universities to better equip him to assist GOI in the choice of institutions.