

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

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

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT: <u>USAID/Guatemala</u> (Mission or AID/W Office) (ES# 89-03)	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 <u>87</u> Q <u>1</u>	C. EVALUATION TIMING Interim <input type="checkbox"/> final <input type="checkbox"/> ex post <input type="checkbox"/> other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> P.D. - AAZ-232			
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)
520-0335	Rural Potable Water & Sanitation	1995	6/89	1000	1000

ACTIONS

E. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR Action(s) Required	Name of officer responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
1. USAID to work with Agua del Pueblo (ADP) staff to accomplish the following: a. ADP to change its board of directors to provide autonomous representation by non-staff members with recognized interest in its work and the confidence of the Guatemala community; b. ADP carefully examine, with its new board of directors, its organizational and managerial structure in relation to achieving most effectively its goals and policies as an institution, and make adjustments in present grants and requests to reflect the new scale of operations decided on. c. That ADP add one or more women at a professional level to the central ADP staff to participate in the planning and feasibility studies and to carry out water use health education more effectively at the community level.	Victor Dardón Carlos Gómez Victor Dardón Carlos Gómez Victor Dardón Carlos Gómez	3/87 4/87 4/87
(Attach extra sheet if necessary)		

APPROVALS

F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION: mo 0 day ___ yr 86

G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:

Project/Program Officer Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Typed Name: <u>Victor Dardón</u> Date: <u>4/11/89</u>	Representative of Borrower/Grantee Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Typed Name: <u>Rubén Xuyón</u> Date: _____	Evaluation Officer Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Typed Name: _____ Date: <u>4/26/89</u>	Mission or AID/W Office Director Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Typed Name: _____ Date: _____
--	--	--	---

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

This a mid-term evaluation (1/84-6/86) of the project 520-0335, in Guatemala to improve the environmental sanitation in rural communities. The institution responsible for implementation of the project is Agua del Pueblo a PVO. The evaluation was conducted by the private firm International Science and Technology Institute (ISTI) on the basis of a review of project documents, visits to sub-projects and interviews with project personnel. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine the achievement of the project purpose and assess the progress of the project with an eye to improving project implementation.

Findings and Conclusions

- The project should attain most objectives by PACD: June 30, 1988.
- The evaluation revealed that the program for water and sanitation systems is responding to urgent needs in the communities, which are actively participating in the planning and implementation despite technical and managerial problems encountered during the first stage of the implementation.
- The main lesson learned is that project objectives for ADP should be more flexible to allow resources to be used to serve the greater number of beneficiaries with the full range of support services rather than a specific number of systems and should emphasize the effective and long-term viability of the water systems.

I. EVALUATION COSTS For the three projects 520-0298, 520-0335 and 520-0336

1. Evaluation Team Name	Affiliation	Contract Number <u>QR</u> TDY Person Days	Contract Cost <u>QR</u> TDY Cost (US\$)	Source of Funds
International Science & Techonology Institute (ISTI)	8 (A)	LAC-0000-C-00-6059	\$37000	520-0000.4 (SD)=\$19,000 520-0000.2 (HE)=\$18,000

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: _____

Date this summary prepared: _____

Title and Date of Full Evaluation Report: _____

1. Purpose of the activity or activities evaluated.

In Guatemala more than 75 percent of the rural population is still without adequate potable water coverage; infections and intestinal diseases, many water related, are the major causes of rural deaths.

The goal of the Project is to improve the health and nutrition status and overall welfare of the rural poor in the target area.

In general, the purpose of the project is to improve the environmental sanitation in approximately 62 rural communities in Guatemala, who currently do not have access to potable water and sanitary service by providing potable water systems and latrines.

2. Purpose of the evaluation and methodology used.

The purpose of the evaluation is (a) to evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency and significance of the water and sanitation projects of the private, voluntary organization (PVO) Agua del Pueblo (ADP) - with respect to the following project elements: methodology; technical, managerial and financial practices; health education; environmental impacts; and benefits to the users.

International Science and Technology Institute (ISTI) was contracted to perform an evaluation of the three water projects: 520-0298 Rural Potable Water and Sanitation, 520-0335 Rural Potable Water and Sanitation II and 520-0336 Rural Water Project.

Since two of the projects evaluated (520-0298, Rural Potable Water and Sanitation, and 520-0335, Rural Potable Water and Sanitation II), were implemented by the same implementing unit Agua del Pueblo, the evaluation team performed a simultaneous evaluation of both projects.

Evaluation started with a Team Planning Meeting (TPM) for the evaluators. Meetings with Agua del Pueblo and CARE personnel were subsequently held followed by field visits to the construction sites. At the end, a debriefing meeting was held between the evaluation team and AID representatives and later the final report was submitted to AID.

Effectiveness and impact were assessed based on physical observations and interviews made during the visits to the sites.

Findings and conclusions.

The Project 520-0335 is behind schedule.

Agua del Pueblo faced managerial problems which were delaying implementation of its projects.

Due to devaluation of the Quetzal, the funds available for project 0298 tripled, causing a serious implementation problem; Agua del Pueblo threw its entire staff into the implementation of that project to assure disbursement of funds before the PACD. As a consequence implementation of the 0335 project was delayed.

At the time of the evaluation, Agua del Pueblo has not integrated women into environmental sanitation implementation.

Positive environmental benefits of latrinization were noticed by the evaluating team in those communities where ADP had carried out the program in cooperation with the Ministry of Public Health or a cooperating agency.

Local institutional capacities are being developed by ADP to assist the development of local water committees, which collect community contributions and disburse funds for construction costs and for operation, maintenance, etc.

ADP should consider establishing an advisory board composed of representatives of primary donors as well as some of the original founders, to work with the agency through its reorganization process.

A brief evaluation by USAID staff or a consulting team made up of a sanitary engineer and a social scientist should be made of all systems under these grant to examine both technical and community aspects to determine whether completed projects are working and designs are appropriate for long-term service, operation and maintenance.

ADP should consider selecting only small gravity-flow system sites to serve populations of around 600 or less and where Technician in Rural Aqueducts can be stationed to give close supervision to a small number of projects simultaneously, to provide better preliminary studies/approaches and to coordinate activities with other intervening agencies.

- Lessons Learned:

- Environmental sanitary education to the beneficiaries is a very important factor to ensure that operation, maintenance of the system and usage of the water and latrines is going to benefit the users.
- The technical capacity of the Technician in Rural Aqueduct was overestimated when the design of large projects was assigned to them.
- Health education programs should begin at the same time that construction starts.
- Construction of latrines should not be delayed until the construction of the water system is completed.

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

Copy of the Evaluation Report

ATTACHMENTS

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

L. COMMENTS BY MISSION

Generally the evaluation met the demands of the scope of work and the time dedicated to the task by the team was sufficient to cover all issues.

The Team Planning Meeting (TPM) held at the early stage of the evaluation was fruitful for the subsequent development of the task.

2248C

MISSION COMMENTS ON FULL REPORT

AID EVALUATION SUMMARY
520-0335 RURAL POTABLE WATER & SANITATION

DRAFTER:
PDSO/ENG., VDardón  DATE 9/27/88

CLEARANCES:
1. PDSO/PDSO, RFigueroa 
2. DC/PDSO, RSteelman 