

CLASSIFICATION  
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) – PART I

Report Control  
Symbol U-447

|  |  |   |                                  |
|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. PROJECT TITLE<br>PD 1387-1-3<br>FUELWOOD AND ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES<br>(ICAITI) |  | 2. PROJECT NUMBER<br>596-0089   | 3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE<br>ROCAP |
|  |  | 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) |                                  |
|  |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION  |                                  |

|   |  |   |                                |                                 |                            |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES           |  |   | 6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING:  | 7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION |                            |
| A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent<br>FY <u>79</u> | B. Final Obligation Expected<br>FY <u>85</u> | C. Final Input Delivery<br>FY <u>85</u> | A. Total \$ <u>3.4 million</u> | From (month/yr.) <u>9/82</u>    | To (month/yr.) <u>8/84</u> |
|   |  |   | B. U.S. \$ <u>3.2 million</u>  | Date of Evaluation Review       |                            |

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

| A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite 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, PIO, which will present detailed request.)  | B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION | C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Extend PACD through June 1986 with an addition of \$1.3 million in grant funds.  | PDO/GDO                                   | 3/85                           |
| 2. The amendment will extend the life of the project and increase total AID Grant funding in order to permit ICAITI to undertake a more substantial dissemination effort to take full advantage of the specific technologies which have been developed to date and assure their successful transfer through counterpart institutions and commercial mechanisms. | GDO                                       | -                              |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS  | 10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Paper <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T      _____<br><input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P      _____ | A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change<br>B. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan<br>C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles) | 12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval   |
| Carl Duisberg, REA<br>Gustavo Ruiz, AREA<br>Richard Delaney, PO<br>John Eyre, DD                     | Signature: <u>Madine Plaster</u> 5/30/86<br>Typed Name: <u>Madine Plaster, Director</u><br>Date: _____ |

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART II  
FUELWOOD AND ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES

1. Overall Quality of Report, Including Adherence to Scope of Work, Utility of Evaluation and/or ROCAP Plans to Use Evaluation

In July 1982, the project received a full mid-term evaluation by Volunteers in Technical Assistance (VITA). The evaluation report summarized herein was prepared by the USAID/Ecuador Energy Officer during a TDY to Guatemala in the fall of 1984, and represents an update of the status of the project since the VITA evaluation. The purpose of the second evaluation was to assess the project's progress in light of the VITA recommendations and determine if project extension was justified.

The report discusses in detail progress under each major project component following the issues/recommendations of the first evaluation conducted by VITA and provides its own recommendations on the type and nature of activities necessary to give continuity to the project through June 30, 1986.

ROCAP found the evaluation highly useful as a guide for reaching a decision as to whether to extend the project and as a basis for the subsequent project amendment.

2. Evaluation Recommendations Including Explanation for Non-acceptance of Any Recommendation

In general ROCAP was in agreement with the evaluation findings and recommendations. The evaluation found that ICAITI was able to respond to the recommendations of the previous evaluation by VITA and that the major objectives outlined in the PP were being accomplished.

The success of the project and the fact that many of the specific technologies (i.e. bakery ovens, lime kilns, biogas digestors, solar hot water salt systems, lumber kilns, etc.) were starting to have significant commercial applications provided the basis for recommending project extension.

An industrial survey proposed in the evaluation will help shift the emphasis of the project to commercial applications and to meeting private sector requirements.

The evaluation recommended that the Project Assistance Completion Date be extended through June 30, 1986 and that \$1.3 million in additional grant funds be provided to carry out

a more substantial dissemination effort than was originally contemplated, with particular emphasis on taking advantage of ICAITI's institutional capabilities to assist small and medium sized industries and commercial farms with energy technologies developed under the project.

All recommendations in the evaluation report were accepted.

3. Adequacy of Executive Summary

The evaluation report was not required to and thus did not include a summary. All ROCAP evaluation scopes of work now include such a requirement.

4. Quality and Accuracy of Development Impact and "Lessons Learned" Section of Report

The scope of work for the evaluation did not require a discrete development and "lessons learned" section. All ROCAP evaluations now require these sections.

Nonetheless, some of the most important project concepts have been accepted satisfactorily in rural areas and farms and are being disseminated with the participation of national institutions and PVO's. National Committees have been formed to continue the dissemination of the most promising technologies in areas not yet covered by ICAITI. This dissemination is expected to result in less use of fuelwood and in more conveniences for users.