

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

(BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS)

PD-AA4-393
15N 52344

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT: <u>S&T/H/CD</u> (Mission or AID/W Office) (ES# _____)	B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN? yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> slipped <input type="checkbox"/> ad hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Eval. Plan Submission Date: FY ___ Q ___	C. EVALUATION TIMING Interim <input type="checkbox"/> final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ex post <input type="checkbox"/> other <input type="checkbox"/>			
D. ACTIVITY OR ACTIVITIES EVALUATED (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; If not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report)					
Project #	Project/Program Title (or title & date of evaluation report)	First PROAG or equivalent (FY)	Most recent PACD (mo/yr)	Planned LOP Cost ('000)	Amount Obligated to Date ('000)
936-5942	Water and Sanitation for Health II February 1988	84	7/31/90	\$19,700	\$15,472

E. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR	Name of officer responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
Action(s) Required Use recommendations for input to PP for WASH III	John Austin	March 1988
(Attach extra sheet if necessary)		

F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION: mo <u>4</u> day <u>11</u> yr <u>88</u>			
G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:			
Signature	Project/Program Officer John H. Austin	Representative of Borrower/Grantee N/A	Evaluation Officer Mission or AID/W Office Director Kenneth J. Bart, M.D.
Date:	Date: <u>4 Oct 88</u>	Date: _____	Date: <u>11 Oct 88</u>

H. EVALUATION ABSTRACT (do not exceed the space provided)

The WASH II project is a mechanism for responding to LDC requests for assistance in water supply and sanitation (W&S). WASH services include engineering, project design and evaluation, information dissemination, and networking. The mid-term evaluation was carried out in October/December 1987, and based on interviews with project personnel, beneficiaries, and others; a survey of 34 Missions; and review of WASH reports.

Findings and Conclusions

All aspects of the project have been positive. Through field assessments, training workshops, and planning assistance, WASH staff have stressed the need for community participation in W&S, changing health/hygiene behavior, and developing cost-sharing strategies. WASH has also highlighted the importance of training and institutional development, and it has worked hard to provide information services, reinforce the international W&S network, and improve coordination with U.S. agencies and PVO's.

Project management by Camp Dresser and McKee has been effective. inputs have been provided on time and targets achieved on schedule. A.I.D. monitoring has also been effective.

One major area of concern is the declining importance of W&S in A.I.D. health strategy and its omission from A.I.D.'s child survival program.

Recommendations

A WASH program strategy is needed to provide clear guidance to the contractor on how to allocate resources so as to provide the greatest returns in terms of A.I.D. W&S objectives.

There is also need to strengthen WASH's efforts in sector planning, draw "lessons learned," sharpen the A.I.D./WASH international collaboration strategy, further develop multidisciplinary approaches, and focus on the composition of the WASH staff where, it is felt, more senior level input is needed. In addition, WASH should place more emphasis on operations and maintenance (O&M), develop a primer on core technical topics for workshops, and field-test financial management guidelines.

I. EVALUATION COSTS

1. Evaluation Team Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (US\$)	Source of Funds
James M. Kelly	- LTS/AFR	OIH-282-85-0032	\$97,747	RSSA
Paul V. Hebert	- LTS/HCI			
Abraham Horwitz	- LTS/PAHO			
Carolyn M. Long	- LTS Corp.			
Brijeshwar D. Mathur	- LTS/UITA			
Barbara Spaid	- AID/LAC/DR/HN			

2. Mission/Office Professional
Staff Person-Days (estimate) _____

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional
Staff Person-Days (estimate) _____

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART II

J. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Try not to exceed the 3 pages provided)

Address the following items:

- * Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated
- * Purpose of evaluation and Methodology used
- * Findings and conclusions (relate to questions)

- * Principal recommendations
- * Lessons learned

Mission or Office: S&T/H/CD

Date this summary prepared: April 6, 1988

Purpose:

The WASH II project represents a contracting mechanism for responding to LDC requests for assistance in water supply and sanitation (WS&W). Project services include engineering, field assessments, training, organizational development, project design and evaluation, and information dissemination and networking. The project is implemented by Camp Dresser and McKee International (CDM) and several subcontractors.

Purpose and Methodology of Evaluation:

This was a mid-term evaluation, carried out in October/December 1987, and based on (1) interviews with CDM, AID/W, and Regional staff, representatives of PVO's and other concerned organizations, and beneficiaries in several countries; (2) a survey of 34 Missions; and (3) review of WASH technical and trip reports.

Findings and Conclusions

A. Water and Sanitation Engineering Skills

Most WASH activities call for some engineering input; about 10% are primarily engineering. Several engineering activities have had a very positive impact. One example is a model assessment of well-drilling performance in Belize, from which several other countries are expected to benefit. Missions and other agencies have praised WASH for its rapid response and professional competence.

Concerns/Recommendations: (1) WASH expertise is frequently requested for routine engineering tasks which do not fully exploit the broad-based skills of WASH staff. (2) More emphasis should be put on operations and maintenance (O&M).

B. Training and Institutional Development

WASH II has trained 844 people in 153 activities, and is currently training another 430. Training sessions are well-planned and executed. WASH's three training objectives are training of LDC trainers, using an experiential approach, and creating sustainable training systems.

WASH examines requests for assistance with an eye to institutional improvement possibilities. Staff have prepared "Guidelines for Institutional Assessment," a guide for pinpointing strengths and weakness in WS&W organizations and selecting appropriate remedial measures.

Concerns/Recommendations: WASH should make better use of LDC trainers and consultants and it should develop a primer on all topics to be covered in workshops.

C. Community Participation and Health

WASH has incorporated community participation and health components into its TA activities, and has effectively collaborated with other organizations in research efforts and projects related to community participation and health.

Concerns/Recommendations: (1) A more systematic effort is needed to include community participation and health concerns in all A.I.D.-sponsored WS&S activities. (2) WASH should cooperate with the Primary Health Care Operations Research (PRICOR) Project and other primary health care (PHC) projects.

D. Financial Management

WASH recently began to sharpen its focus on financial management issues. It has developed a simplified PHC costing format as well as "willingness-to-pay" and water vending studies.

Concerns/Recommendations: WASH should field-test the financial assessment and tariff guidelines it has developed; include the low-income urban sector in its financial analyses; and consider collaborating with other donors on approaches to cost recovery.

E. Cross-Cutting Services

WASH has been used extensively to design, redesign, and evaluate projects; it has assisted with sector planning in several countries; and it has demonstrated the benefits that can result from sustained follow-up to its activities.

Concerns/Recommendations: (1) More resources should be devoted to sector-level planning and to obtaining feedback on WASH impacts. (2) WASH has not established an overall framework for systematically identifying lessons learned from its activities. This task should be given high priority. In the interim, a summary of key lessons should be drawn up for use in setting priorities for the remainder of the CDM contract.

F. The WASH Information System and Documents

WASH maintains several WS&W databases, issues a current awareness bulletin, and responds to approximately 120 information requests a month. WASH technical and field reports do a good job of presenting WS&W material for a diverse audience.

Concerns/Recommendations: WASH should strive to obtain periodic feedback from its information users.

G. WASH Networking

WASH has engaged in several networking or collaborative activities with other international, bilateral, and PVO agencies (e.g., WHO, the World Bank, the Centers for Disease Control) and has generally received good marks for its work. WASH has also become the data base and institutional memory for A.I.D. in WS&S matters.

Concerns/Recommendations: WASH staff embarking on collaborative missions often lack clear authorization or written guidance from A.I.D. Examples include disappointing efforts to follow up on LDC Water Decade Consultative Meetings, lack of a strategy for dealing with international organizations, and insufficient coordination between WASH and other centrally funded health activities.

H. Project Management

Contract management by CDM has been smooth, largely due to the participatory style of the CDM project manager and the rapport between the contract staff and the A.I.D. Cognizant Technical Officer. CDM is well along in effecting the outputs called for by the contract.

Concerns/Recommendations: (1) While participatory decisionmaking by the staff helps morale, it must be augmented by executive priority setting; otherwise, important priorities can be overlooked. For example, it was not until 3 years into WASH II that staff realized that too little time had been spent on improving WS&S evaluation methodology. (2) There is need for more involvement by senior S&T staff in conducting annual reviews and preparing work plans. (3) WASH should hire an additional community development/hygiene specialist. (4) A.I.D. should eliminate the requirement that WASH add 50 consultants a year. (5) A.I.D. should establish procedures to ensure that other A.I.D. W&S projects take full advantage of WASH experience.

Lessons Learned

1. Despite the many WASH accomplishments, A.I.D. needs to develop an overall strategy for WASH. This will include assigning priority activity areas and integrating reactive and proactive approaches. A.I.D. also needs to prepare guidance for the contractor on how WASH energies should be allocated.

2. Despite the declining emphasis on WS&S and the concomitant rise in oral rehydration therapy (ORT) in A.I.D.'s health portfolio, it is important that A.I.D. complement ORT inputs with continuing efforts to improve community water systems.

K. ATTACHMENTS (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier)

WATER AND SANITATION FOR HEALTH II (WASH); MIDTERM
EVALUATION, LOGICAL TECHNICAL SERVICES CORP
29 FEB 89, 17 PP.

L. COMMENTS BY MISSION, AID/W OFFICE AND BORROWER/GRANTEE