

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE SANTA ROSA COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROJECT	2. PROJECT NUMBER 520-0269	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE 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) <u>82-05</u> <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 FY <u>81</u>	A. Total \$ <u>785,800</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>5/81</u>
B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>82</u>	B. U.S. \$ <u>421,000</u>	To (month/yr.) <u>10/82</u>
C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>84</u>		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
1. Develop and approve a revised bi-monthly reporting format which accurately reflects progress in meeting goals, purpose, outputs and EOPS of the project. The format should provide next quarter targets and progress made toward last quarter targets.	Gilberto Méndez, USAID Jacobo Nitsch, FUNDACED	11/15/82
2. Develop and approve a methodology whereby three to six months of sub-projects are submitted with budgets for approval as a group avoiding excessive documentation for small amounts of funds.	Gilberto Méndez, USAID Jacobo Nitsch, FUNDACED	11/30/82
3. Initiate a PIO/T to contract for three months of technical assistance from an established and experienced PVO, such as CARE or World Education, to assist the Grantee in designing, implementing and evaluating NFE activities and methodologies.	Gilberto Méndez, USAID	11/15/82
4. Complete the project's in-depth evaluation plan with baseline data indicators identified and data instruments prepared.	Jacobo Nitsch, FUNDACED	01/30/83
5. Reevaluate the project six months after completion of TA to determine whether continuation of the project is justified.	Gilberto Méndez	08/15/83

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS	10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) <u>Bi-monthly report</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan 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
Gilberto Méndez, USAID/EHR, Guatemala Alvaro Muñoz Betancourth, Director, FUNDACED Jacobo Nitsch, Project Coordinator, FUNDACED	Signature <u>Peter Kolar</u> Typed Name Peter Kolar, Acting Director Date December 13, 1982

13. SUMMARY

This grant to the Fundación Cristiana para la Educación (FUNDACED), a Guatemalan private voluntary organization, is to provide support to an integrated rural development program. The grant funds non-formal, community education activities involving promoters, village leaders and village committees as outreach agents, and established a fund to finance small projects which will be carried out using a community development approach by community leaders trained under the project. During the first sixteen months of the project, progress has been slow in relation to overall design of the program. FUNDACED has experienced many problems in initiating the project. The prospects of achieving the purpose and goal are possible, although both FUNDACED and USAID have to resolve some key implementation issues.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This is a scheduled evaluation which reviews the current project status and progress in relation to achievement of project outputs and purpose. Progress towards project outputs are measured and a review of project inputs was made. The evaluation included a complete review of AID files, the utilization of information from an internal evaluation prepared by FUNDACED in September 1982, interviews with key USAID and FUNDACED personnel (see Attachment 1), attendance at meetings, and field trips to USAID staff to observe project activities. The evaluation was prepared by USAID/Guatemala and AID/W TDY personnel at no cost to the project.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

During the period covered by this evaluation, the Government of Guatemala changed. USAID personnel feel that in the long-term this administrative change could strengthen the project given the new GOG's interest in providing improved rural services. However, FUNDACED believes the GOG change has slowed the initiation of activities since the grantee had to demonstrate the importance of the program to a new cadre of administrators.

16. INPUTS

AID inputs for the Santa Rosa Community Education Project have been available on a timely basis, but FUNDACED felt their lack of familiarity with AID procedures and personnel changes within AID adversely affected progress in the beginning. The USAID has increased the amount available for "a revolving fund" and is assisting FUNDACED develop a methodology whereby three to six months of sub-project approvals can be obtained from AID, thereby averting excessive documentation for small amounts of funding. All equipment programmed, except a photocopier, has been procured and delivered.

Some of the more salient input impediments to progress have been: (1) FUNDACED has only been established as a private voluntary organization for three years and its staff, though young and enthusiastic, has not had experience in complex and difficult NFE projects; (2) FUNDACED's lack of experience and knowledge of AID procedures and regulation; (3) very slow response to project reporting requirements (every bi-monthly report has been late and the last three bi-monthly reports have not been prepared at all); (4) the project has produced a number of sub-activities but the overall progress to goals and purpose has lacked direction; and (5) FUNDACED has made varied and frequent contacts with other agencies and institutions to obtain inputs for the project (essential for implementation) but has had very limited success in obtaining the needed services. In this initial part of the project, most funds have been used for salaries with only a small percentage used for training promoters, village leaders, community training programs, and small projects. FUNDACED reported in their internal evaluation that some factors in the assumptions important to progress have been developed: (1) key community participants were not always available in the time frame needed; (2) the Operations Center had to be changed to another site given the non-availability of appropriate facilities in the original site selected; and (3) counterpart contributions from other sources have not been forthcoming as planned.

As a result of this evaluation, it was recommended that technical assistance be obtained from an established and experienced PVO, such as CARE or World Education, to assist FUNDACED in designing, implementing and evaluating NFE project activities and methodologies. During interviews with FUNDACED, it was apparent that they were aware of their weaknesses and have already agreed to a reprogramming of the project. Funds need to be reprogrammed to cover the suggested PVO technical assistance. Suggested line items which could contribute to funding the needed TA and would not severely alter project implementation are equipment, sub-activities and salaries.

17. OUTPUTS

Overall the output indicators are behind schedule. A major constraint to both USAID and FUNDACED in evaluating the project has been the poor FUNDACED record on presenting reports which are on time and truly reflect progress made. FUNDACED has been experiencing difficulty in planning and implementing output activities and there is concern regarding the quality, utility and appropriateness of the FUNDACED outputs to the project. The recommendation for the addition of some strong PVO technical assistance to the project reflects this concern. The five major output areas and their status are summarized below.

A. Under the output "trained community-selected promoters (ten each year, LOP total of thirty) to organize classes in their respective villages in different subject areas and to plan and implement small community development sub-projects", FUNDACED has trained a total of ten promoters for three months from ten communities. FUNDACED has not demonstrated clearly what these individuals have or will be expected to accomplish. Work has proceeded on "Lorena" stove projects, courses for women, animal care and control, and home economics. No distinction has been made whether the promoters are responsible for these activities except for the "Lorena" stoves, where each promoter has built an average of five for demonstration purposes.

B. Under the output "organization of five local committees each year (LOP total of fifteen), ten local committees were organized during the first year of project activities. FUNDACED reports each is functioning with varied results, but data processing on committee organization and operations has been minimal.

C. Activity to create forty-five new specific committee positions and train all project participants including prior members of existing committees has not started.

D. Activity to train fifteen leaders in the development of cooperatives and small enterprises has not been initiated.

E. The following number of direct participants by subject matter of instruction have been trained:

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LOP TARGET</u>	<u>ESTIMATED TRAINED TO DATE</u>
Agriculture	1,200	200
Health & Nutrition	60	150
Water & Sanitation	60	0
Cooperatives and Small Enterprises	60	0
Bee Keeping	60	0
Environment/Lorena Stoves	30	30

FUNDACED has initiated other activities which they plan to coordinate within the framework of the project. These include:

-- A supervised study program in conjunction with the University of San Carlos whereby three advanced students are assigned to work on projects in agronomy, veterinary practices, and architecture.

-- Three beginning courses in weaving, embroidery, and home improvement were designed for women in five communities.

-- DIGESA (General Directory of Agricultural Services) has assigned one technician to train agricultural guides.

-- A feasibility study for the introduction of potable water for five communities has been completed but FUNDACED has not decided on how they will proceed on this matter.

-- Three studies have been completed on possible construction projects.

18. PURPOSE

The purpose of this project is to facilitate the participation of the rural poor of the Santa Rosa area in community development activities through a non-formal community education program. The conditions expected at the end of the project are: fifteen communities using their own resources and credit carrying out projects in beekeeping, potable water systems, agriculture, family gardens and Lorena stoves; village committees, under the guidance of local promoters and supervisors, identifying needs, organizing and providing self-help inputs to respond to needs, and raising funds; and local development committees, supported by community committees, assuming overall project coordinator role currently played by FUNDACED.

In reality this project is just being started and only isolated instances of progress have been made towards reaching the project purpose. The set of end of project indicators is considered a good description of what will exist when the purpose is achieved. This evaluation has resulted in the recommendation of strong remedial actions which can be realized during the next six months. Another evaluation should be scheduled in August 1983 to determine whether continuation of the project is justified.

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL

The goal of this project is the initiation of a self sufficient development process for the poor marginal population in Cuilapa and Casillas whereby the beneficiaries will be able to improve their living environment, increase their agricultural production, and find alternative income mechanisms. A description of status is not pertinent at this time.

20. BENEFICIARIES

Not pertinent at this time.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

None noted.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

It is probably not prudent to select an inexperienced PVO to manage a large complex rural NFE program. New PVOs should be given opportunities to work in simpler and smaller projects so that the necessary skills and human resources can be developed.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS

None at this time.

ATTACHMENT 1

Key agencies and individuals who participated directly and indirectly in the evaluation were:

FUNDACED

- Lic. Alvaro Muñiz Betancourth, Director
- Lic. Jacobo Nitsch, Project Coordinator

USAID/Guatemala

- Dr. Gilberto Méndez, USAID/Project Manager
- Dr. Frank Fairchild, USAID/EHK
- Dr. Donald F. Enos, USAID/EHR
- Ms. Ciara Carr, USAID/Evaluation Officer

AID/Washington

- Mr. Hunter Fitzgerald, LAC/DR/HR