UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
FOOD FOR WORK - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ...A PL-480, TITLE II PROGRAM IMPLEMENTED BY CARE	N/A	USAID/Guatemala

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) 79-1

☐ REGULAR EVALUATION ☒ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 77	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 78	C. Final Input Delivery FY 78	A. Total. $ 89,000 B. U.S. $ 74,000	From (month/yr.) March 1977 To (month/yr.) May 1978 Date of Evaluation Review

8. 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
CARE has decided not to continue the Food for Work - Community Development Program in FY 1979; the GOG has been advised of this decision. USAID concurs.		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____

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)

George A. Hill
George A. Hill
Program Officer

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: Eliseo Carrasco

Typed Name: Eliseo Carrasco, ADIR

Date: October 11, 1978

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

13. SUMMARY

This CARE Food for Work Program was initiated in March 1977, in collaboration with the GOG Community Development Directorate. It was terminated in June 1978 as a result of CARE evaluation findings and of the Community Development Directorate's inability to continue to provide counterpart funding.

Food was provided to workers on 102 projects. The Community Development Directorate's "local centers" were responsible for working with local communities in planning and implementation of the projects, which were usually small infrastructure projects. Upon receipt by CARE of a request for food for a given project, a CARE field supervisor would visit the project site and approve a food allocation if the project met established guidelines. The Directorate would transport the food to the site; its representatives or the community authorities would supervise distribution, and CARE supervisors would monitor distribution.

EVALUATION RESULTS

One hundred percent of community members interviewed said that the particular CD-FFW project in their community would have been carried out with or without FFW; 89% of the community members said they would have worked an equal amount of time without food.

While in 96% of the projects records were kept of days worked per person, food was weighed or measured for distribution in only 78% of projects. Monthly reports were completed in only 43% of cases.

Different foods found varying degrees of acceptability among those interviewed: 44% found sorghum acceptable; acceptability of bulgur was 67%; flour - 86%; C.S.M. - 31%; oil - 83%; W.S.D.M. - 6%.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

CARE field supervisors visited 24 local offices of the Community Development Directorate and interviewed an average of 2 functionaries in each office. They also visited 40 project sites and interviewed 196 community members who worked on the projects.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

In 1978, the GOG acceded to civil servants' demands for a salary increase. In order to make available sufficient funds for this unforeseen exigency, a number of budget cuts were undertaken, among them a 20% cut in the budget of the Community Development Directorate. As a result, the Directorate admitted that it was no longer able to meet its commitment to the program. They had agreed to reimburse CAPE for part of the cost of administering the program; their actual contribution for the life of the program was $15,000.

16. INPUTS

The failure of the Community Development Directorate to continue to provide its counterpart contribution led in part to termination of the program.

17. OUTPUTS

One hundred and two (102) small infrastructure projects were completed. However, as all community members interviewed stated that the projects would have been carried out even without food inputs, ascribing these projects to the FFW Program as outputs is questionable.

18. PURPOSE

To support community efforts at organizing and carrying out projects of benefit to the community as a whole.

If, as the evaluation findings indicate, projects implemented would have been undertaken irrespective of provision of food, and community members would have worked an equal amount of time without food, then the program may be considered to have been largely irrelevant to community efforts at organizing and implementing projects.

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL

An assessment of achievement of the goal of the PL-480, Title II Program of improving the nutritional status of the target group will have to await completion of a planned nutritional impact evaluation.

20. BENEFICIARIES

Beneficiaries were inhabitants of rural communities -- often impoverished highland Indians, who worked on labor-intensive self-help construction projects.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

N/A

22. LESSONS LEARNED

Interestingly, the evaluation provides data which would refute the relevance of PL-480, Title II food as causative agent in the mobilization of villagers for implementaiton of community self-help projects.

23. A copy of the CARE report, Evaluation - Food for Work - Community Development, is attached.