

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

PD-ABC-969
72312

1. BEFORE FILING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS.
2. USE LETTER QUALITY TYPE, NOT "DOT MATRIX" TYPE

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit: Mission or AID/W Office <u>S&T/H/CD</u> (ES# _____)	B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Skipped <input type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY <u>0</u>	C. Evaluation Timing Interim <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final <input 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 No.	Project /Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent PACD (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
936-5973	Water and Sanitation for Health (III)				

ACTIONS

Action(s) Required	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director		
1. Increase S&T funding so as to be able to serve more Missions.	Van Dusen	Dec 90
2. Increase Mission involvement in funding O&M aspects of WS/S sector	Austin	on going
3. Encourage host governments to reward personnel who improve O&M in local systems.	Austin	on going
4. Increase use of third world nationals as WASH consultants.	Austin	on going
5. Increase use of WASH expertise with social institutions in community development in ID/HRD efforts.	Austin	on going
6. Carry out rapid assessment to determine effects of ID/HRD efforts on O&M.	Austin	30 Sept 91
7. Increase efforts to find solutions to cost recovery and system sustainability.	Austin	30 Sept 91
8. Develop marketing strategy.	Austin	30 Sept 91
9. Develop periodic summaries of accomplishments and distribute.	Austin Austin	on going
10. Increase Mission knowledge of WASH ability to provide assistance to private sector.	Austin	31 Mar 91
11. Develop a water policy for health.	Austin	30 Sept 91
12. Encourage travel opportunities to the field for direct hire A.I.D. staff responsible for WASH.	Van Dusen	on going

(Attach extra sheet, if necessary)

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: _____ (Month) _____ (Day) _____ (Year)

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

Name (Typed)	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Signature	John H. Austin	N/A	G. Pettigrew	R. Van Dusen
Date	<i>John H. Austin</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>G. Pettigrew</i>	<i>R. Van Dusen</i>
	11 Feb 91	<i>-</i>	4-4-91	

ABSTRACT

H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

The WASH III midterm evaluation represents the third evaluation undertaken of the WASH program since its inception in 1980. Like its predecessors, this evaluation found that WASH III management needs to be given very high marks. Persons interviewed within and outside of AID consistently maintained that WASH was responding effectively to its needs: whether by providing timely and quality technical assistance to missions and bureaus, or by providing what was said, several times, to be outstanding leadership to the global community of WS/S professionals.

WASH III is, clearly, well managed at both the S&T/Health supervisory and WASH levels. The Project is on track according to its original purpose, and according to its WASH III contract scope-of-work. It is, moreover, as flexible as it needs to be, in order to respond to newly emerging directions in water supply and sanitation, as AID's programming, prompted by massive rural to urban population shifts throughout the developing world, begins to change its focus from a rural to a peri-urban and urban one.

WASH III's 24.6 million dollar authorization brings AID's investment in Water and Sanitation for Health (WASH) to 54.8 million dollars. Yet in spite of this significant sum, the Agency continues to be without an effective health policy in the area of water and sanitation. Moreover, at its most senior levels, AID appears to be favoring a policy tack which depreciates the importance of water and sanitation for health. In so doing, the Agency seems to contradict the importance it gave to the founding of WASH when the program was established a decade ago, as well as seems to contradict the importance it currently is giving to the link between health and the environment. The WASH III evaluation team shares the concern expressed by the WASH II evaluators over the declining importance being given to water and sanitation for the Agency's health strategy, and to its omission from its child survival efforts.

The team did feel that there were some program areas which might be improved upon. But it is important to stress that the more serious problems, such as the lack of policy guidance and collaboration between and among contractors, cannot be addressed by WASH, or by AID's project officers. While these latter can and must contribute to the discussion, the decisions are for senior management only.

It was the team's sense that the issue of policy guidance is an urgent one, and needs to be addressed immediately. In so doing, AID has the opportunity to, once again, to provide the global community of major donors with vitally needed leadership in an area of policy that is lagging behind.

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds Program
Name	Affiliation			
J. Jude	Medical Care	IQC	27,000	
Joseph Haratani	Development International	POC-1406-I-00- 7134		
Kristin Loken	A.I.D.			
Sharon Fee	A.I.D.			
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional		
Person-Days (Estimate) _____ 25		Staff Person-Days (Estimate) _____ 25		

2

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART II

SUMMARY

J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided)

Address the following items:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of evaluation and methodology used • Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated • Findings and conclusions (relate to questions) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal recommendations • Lessons learned |
|--|--|

Mission or Office: AID/S&T/H/CD	Date This Summary Prepared: September 20, 1990	Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report: WASH III Evaluation September 20, 1990
------------------------------------	---	---

Purpose of Evaluation and Methodology Used

The evaluation scope-of work was broken down into 52 specific tasks and placed in a priority order by three working groups: by the evaluation team, by WASH staff, and by USAID project-related officers (the Division Chief and the Cognizant Technical Officer.) The results were compared and selections made on the basis of consensus (3 of 3), and majority (2 of 3) opinions relative to each of the specified tasks. Selected tasks were then assigned to the following categories: (1) Project Purpose; (2) Project Performance; (3) WASH Management of Project and (4) AID Management Issues. Each selected task was also associated with individuals within and outside of USAID, who the team believed would be capable of discussing the issues relative to that particular task, and who were available for consultation. (v. Appendix I: Persons Contacted.) These were interviewed: either in person in the Washington area, or by telephone in the case of USAID missions and international organizations.

Given the shared belief of team members that it was essential to question as many users of WASH services as possible, a decision was made to telephone appropriate persons in the USAID missions and in other WS/S related organizations worldwide. Questionnaires were also designed for AID bureaus and individuals (v. appendices.)

An important part of the evaluation exercise was done towards the end of the interviews and readings, when the team exchanged impressions about conclusions and recommendations and proceeded to discuss them in order to reach a consensus -- or not -- as each case turned out to be.

Purpose of Project: This project is designed to provide technical assistance, services, and information in urban and rural water supply and sanitation. These services include: project planning, institutional development, problem solving, evaluation, community participation, human resources development and training, technology transfer, water supply and sanitation engineering, operation and maintenance, water supply as a component of health services, information collection, synthesis and dissemination; and privatization.

Findings and Conclusions: The major and most immediate conclusion which the foregoing materials suggests, is that under the leadership of the S&T/Health AID officers assigned to the oversight of the WASH Project, Camp, Dresser & McKee's WASH Project once again needs to be given top marks for its work. As past evaluations have found, WASH has consistently stayed on track according to the requirements of its contract with the AID/S&T Health Office. It has followed evaluation recommendations; it has worked effectively not only with its immediate AID supervisors, but with AID bureaus and missions, and with a large network of international organizations, among whom WASH's contribution to the fund of knowledge about WS/S, and its leadership in the arena, is unquestioned.

3

This evaluation has indicated that there are problem areas, and recommendations are made to address them. However, it needs to be pointed out that the most serious problems which need to be addressed cannot be addressed by WASH, or by AID's WASH project officers. They need to be addressed by AID's senior management.

Two sets of recommendations are made; those for WASH to consider, and those for AID. The page number following the recommendation places it in its proper discussion context.

Principal Recommendations:

1. Recommendations for WASH

- 1.1 To the extent that it can influence AID task approval decisions, WASH needs to continue to push for S&T core funding being used extensively to augment the resources of those countries with the greatest water and sanitation needs regardless of their ability to pay. (Page 7)
- 1.2 WASH needs to encourage USAID missions to fund and implement programs which will publicly recognize contributions made by individuals (at all levels) and communities to the operations and maintenance of water and sanitation systems. (Pages 11-12)
- 1.3 WASH should explore the possible uses of employee dedication/satisfaction analyses for bettering the operations and maintenance aspects of LDC water supply and sanitation institutions. (Pages 11-12)
- 1.4 As many nationals can provide many quality services to development projects as competently as many of the expatriates regularly used by major donors, WASH needs to continue its efforts to identify and make greater use of indigenous and/or national professionals and para-professionals for its training and technical assignments in those countries. (Pages 16 and 22)
- 1.5 WASH should seek ways to utilize its experience with social institutions in community development to its work in ID/HRD. (Page 17)
- 1.6 WASH should undertake a rapid assessment study to determine the effects of ID/HRD activity for O&M. The study should examine the quality of operations and maintenance in facilities where ID/HRD programs have been implemented and in those where they have not been. (Pages 18-19)
- 1.7 Given the great difficulty of finding solutions to the cost recovery and system sustainability issues, WASH needs to continue its efforts in brainstorming these issues on a regular basis in its home office, in collaboration with other contractors and WS/S international agencies experiencing similar problems, and with WS/S beneficiaries in the field. (Pages 20-21)
- 1.8 WASH needs to begin to develop a marketing strategy for reaching out to the missions, and through the missions to the private sector. This marketing plan needs to include the roles to be played by WASH and AID officers. (Pages 22 and 33)

1.9 WASH should periodically compile short summaries of timely articles in English, Spanish, French, Arabic, etc., from around the globe, relevant to the three central issues of WS/S project sustainability: ID/HRD, O&M and Cost Recovery. (Page 24)

2. Recommendations for AID

2.1 AID/S&T needs to advise missions that WASH is able to provide technical assistance to the Private Sector of their respective countries, and that WASH needs their invitation to proceed. (Page 22)

2.2 The AID Procurement Office needs to reexamine its crafting of contract language in order that collaboration between S&T/Health contractors be required as a contractual obligation when the need for it arises. (Page 31)

2.3 AID/PPC, with the input of AID/S&T/Health, needs to draft a water policy for health as soon as possible. In the drafting of that policy, WASH should play a role. If at all possible, this policy should be developed in close collaboration with other major donors who also lack a water for health policy; and it should be developed with a strong bent towards health. (Pages 31-33)

2.4 AID/S&T/Health needs to provide AID project managers of WASH significantly more travel opportunities to the field and to WASH's international network. (Pages 29, 33 and 34)

Lessons Learned: See attached

ATTACHMENTS

K. Attachments (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier, attach studies, surveys, etc., from "on-going" evaluation, if relevant to the evaluation report.)

1. "WASH III EVALUATION", 20 Sept. 1990,
J. Jude Pansini, Medical Care Development International.
2. "LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE WASH PROJECT",
Ten Years of WS/S Experience in Developing Countries, 1990.

COMMENTS

L. Comments By Mission, AID/W Office and Borrower/Grantee On Full Report

6