A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

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

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT:
USAID/Guatemala
(Mission or AID/W Office)
(ES# 89-05)

B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN?
yes ☒ slipped ☐ ad hoc ☐
Eval. Plan Submission Date: FY 89 Q 1

C. EVALUATION TIMING
Interim ☐ final ☐ ex post ☐ other ☒

PD-ABB-573

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)
Cross-Cutting Program Evaluation	Title: "Fourty Years on the Altiplano: A Cross-Cutting Evaluation of USAID-Supported Programs in the Republic of Guatemala from the Decade of the 1940s to the Present" March 1989.				

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) Distribute copies of the Evaluation among the Guatemalan ministries and agencies having participated in the evaluation together with briefings, as deemed appropriate.	Information/ Evaluation Specialist PRM Office	September 89
(2) Undertake a comprehensive data/ information needs analysis, with special longer term program impacts, within the USAID Mission and among GOG counterpart agencies as appropriate.	Information Evaluation Specialist PRM Office	January 90
(3) Develop sets of consistent, measurable development indicators to evaluate and monitor impact and progress of program project towards Mission goals/objectives.	Information/ Evaluation Specialist PRM Office	June 90
(4) Assist mission in design of an improved information system for planning, implementation and evaluation of program.	Information/ Evaluation Specialist PRM Office	

SEE CONTINUATION SHEET

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION: mo___ day___ yr___

G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:

	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Signature				
Typed Name	Gary H. Smith		Thomas Keilermann	Anthony J. Cauterucci
Date:	MAR 5 1990	Date:	Date: 3/5/90	Date: 3/5/90

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

This evaluation covered all of USAID/Guatemala and predecessor activities during the past forty years, as the culmination of a series of individual sector program reviews begun in 1983. The evaluation was conducted by a team of twelve US and Guatemalan contracted professionals and four USAID/G employees over a span of six weeks on the basis of a review of existing project and program documents, interviews with present and past USAID and GOG personnel, and extensive visits to sites of present and past USAID projects for interviews with beneficiaries and local public sector personnel. The purpose was to identify the outcomes of principal USAID/G programs to date from a long term perspective, assess appropriateness of past and present strategies, identify elements contributing to program sustainability, and underscore lessons learned and their applicability for future programs. "core" programs evaluated included agriculture, education, health, rural infrastructure, institutional development, and development information systems. The major findings and conclusions are:

* USAID/G core programs have been in-place since the early 1950's; during the 1960's emphasis shifted from urban, institutional strategies towards rural target groups and communities in the Indigenous Highlands, where it continues today.

* Agriculture Programs since 1975 have focused upon crop diversification, small-scale irrigation, soil conservation, rural credit, and rural cooperatives for small farmers. Positive income effects and diffusion of technologies are tangible and widespread; more attention is needed now in the areas of credit and rural marketing.

* Rural Education Programs have emphasized basic rural school systems and construction, bilingual education, and non-formal education since the early 1970's; bilingual programs have been well received; basic and non-formal education projects have successfully addressed problems faced in rural communities, but rapidly growing population mandates significant expansion of joint USAID/GOG efforts.

* Rural health Programs have been virtually the exclusive domain of USAID efforts, working with NGOs. Cadres of local health and family planning promotors are in place, and progress, while slow, has been marked over the past twenty years.

* Institutional development assistance has been a part of most USAID/G projects from the beginning. This has helped the GOG line ministries and other institutions acquire needed resources and expertise; however, much remains to be done to promote decentralization of decision making and budget management reform to make GOG more responsive to needs of target groups in all program areas. Improvements in development information systems would facilitate these efforts.

* Community-level approaches have been the most fruitful means of reaching target groups in all USAID/G core programs

I. EVALUATION COSTS

1. Evaluation Team Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (US$)	Source of Funds
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES (8 professionals)		PDC-1406-I-00-7006-00	$ 150,159.00	PD&S
CONSULTORES AGROINDUSTRIALES (4 professionals)		520-0000-I-02-9698-00	66,667.00	PD&S loc. curr.
USAID/G STAFF		120 person days		

2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (estimate) 132

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: USAID/Guatemala

Date this summary prepared: July 28, 1989

Title and Date of Full Evaluation Report: "Forty Years on the Altiplano--A Cross-Cutting Evaluation of USAID-Supported Programs in the Republic of Guatemala from the Decade of the 1940s to the Present" March, 1989

The evaluation covered all of the principal activities of USAID/Guatemala and predecessor agencies during the past forty years. The focus was upon the Mission's "core" programs as they have evolved over the years with special attention to developments during the past twenty years: agriculture, rural education, rural health, rural infrastructure, and institutional development and information systems. Individual projects were examined, as appropriate, only as examples of "links" in specific series of projects comprising those programs; that is, the evaluation concentrated upon program impacts and their interrelationships. Other activities and projects were addressed as time permitted and as they related to the five core areas.

From the beginning, and especially since the mid-1960s, the purpose of USAID core programs has been to improve the well-being of Guatemala's rural poor majority in the Indigenous Highlands via improvements in incomes and agricultural technology, expansion of rural, community based education and health systems, strengthening of power and road linkages, and strengthening of key public and private sector institutions dedicated to serving the rural poor. "Improved well-being" has additionally been interpreted as helping to broaden target groups' participation in the social and economic fabric of Guatemalan society via support for cooperative organizations, improved legal and justice systems, greater equity in land ownership, and other equity-related activities.

The evaluation team was staffed with twelve contracted US and Guatemalan development program professionals and four members of USAID/Guatemala's staff. All were fully language qualified and had had many years' experience with AID programs in Guatemala and/or Latin America. A large volume of secondary materials was gathered for and by the team. These, together with intensive interviews and numerous visits to present and past sites of USAID-supported activities, comprised the team's basic sources of information. In all areas, these questions were addressed:

- What programs/projects has US economic assistance been supporting?
- Have these been appropriate in terms of the priority needs of Guatemala at the time?
- Has USAID focus been consistent, i.e., sustained?
- Are tangible results from USAID assistance observable today?
- Are they sustainable from a Guatemalan perspective?
- What problems and/or opportunities remain?
- Should USAID be doing anything differently from the standpoint of overall strategy?

Throughout the evaluation, team specialists focussing on specific areas met frequently to share impressions and to identify cross-cutting themes observed among the effects of US supported programs in the field. WHile there were minor differences of opinion about details, there was no significant disagreement among team members over fundamental findings.

SUMMARY

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

In general, US assistance programs in Guatemala have clearly had lasting, positive impacts upon the target groups in the Highlands--more people are earning more, working more, living longer, and receiving better educations. While these broad changes were obviously not due to USAID supported activities alone, the positive effects of the Mission's programs can be traced and have been clearly cumulative, especially during the past fifteen years. Nevertheless, there is still a long way to go; powerful factors combine to dampen the impacts of present and future efforts:

- Rapid population growth, particularly in the western Highlands and in urban areas;
- Accelerating deterioration of the rural environment--deforestation of watershed areas, soil erosion, pollution and depletion of water for irrigation and drinking;
- Overcentralized public institutions, inflexible budgeting, and inadequate field logistical support;
- Cycles of rural and urban violence conducive to political instability and distortion of national economic and development policies

From a long term perspective, the US assistance portfolio has been logical, consistent, and, in view of Guatemalan social, political, and economic swings over the past forty years, surprisingly well sustained. Present USAID strategy builds upon these in the context of the US Congressionally-mandated Central American Initiave's renewed emphasis upon Guatemalan macroeconomic stability and growth and improved management of the national budget and development programs.

In agriculture early emphasis was upon institution building; the present day Ministry of Agriculture and its agencies have developed much of their overall structure, program focus, and outreach capability from USAID-assisted efforts to create a Ministry responsive to rural development needs, especially in the Highlands. During the 1960's, the emphasis shifted from larger to smaller farms, from single export crop assistance to multifacited assistance for diversification, including soil conservation, small-scale irrigation, crop and livestock research/extension, cooperatives, rural credit, and rural marketing. Activities in these areas, many of which began as small scale, pilot efforts in the early 1970s have intensified since then and form the foundation of today's GOG small farm support portfolio, closely merging US assistance with national programs.

Incomes have clearly risen in the USAID project areas, and irrigated terraces supporting a variety of vegetable and fruit crops can be seen in many places. Research and extension workers, including growing cadres of "para-extensionists" (local village residents having received basic extension training to pass on to neighbors), received initial training and technical assistance under US-supported programs and are busy today in the Highlands. Farmers' homes have been improved, and more farmers are adquiring additional land and sending their children to school. Agricultural programs have yielded substantial and growing supplies of food available for urban consumption and for export.

Yet both credit and marketing are major constraints to further progress and to longer-term sustainability. The GOG's rural finance system is understaffed in the field and overcentralized in the Capital. Marketing policies for the small-farm sector are ill-defined, and well-articulated systems of market information and storage/handling facilities for small farm owners/operators are virtually nonexistant. USAID has not given sufficient attention to these matters in past years, although they are addressed in the Mission's present portfolio of agriculture projects.

In education, early project assistance was focussed on strengthening the existing health administration system, followed by heightened emphasis on education and training services available to Highlands communities during the 1960s and thereafter. More recently,

centerpieces of the joint USAID/GOG portfolio have included primary and higher education outreach, bilingual and nonformal education, schools construction, and teacher training. Of these, bilingual and nonformal programs have yielded the most dramatic results. They have worked together to strengthen community solidarity and to provide more local employment and leadership opportunities, especially for the Indigenous population. Education administration, however, continues to be hobbled by overcentralization, lack of materials relating to rural needs, and severely limited logistical support for rural schools. Recently revised USAID education strategies, carefully worked out with Guatemalan counterparts, are intended to address all these areas.

In health USAID during the 1950s worked with GOG authorities to strengthen the existing urban-based curative health system. During the 1960s, programs began to address the nearly total lack of rural preventive health services in the Highlands. Today, US assistance is the principal support for such Guatemalan programs as basic health care clinics, potable water and sanitation, and family planning. The evaluators encountered large numbers of individuals in the field who had been involve with US-supported health programs in the past. Yet the quality of basic health services, and the dedication of professionals presently in the field, is still variable. All GOG clinics are adversely affected by limited supplies, logistics problems, and personnel shortages. Central health authorities appear to be disinterested in strong rural initiatives. Family planning continues to be controversial; increasingly in recent times, projects which work through nongovernment channels and which package FP among a variety of community-based health alternatives seem to have been more successful.

Government institutions continue to be overcentralized, overburdened with a multiplicity of donor programs, and financially inflexible. Information systems and allied planning and analytic capability are inadequate. Poor conceptualization of projects and difficulties in project management for both USAID and the GOG have impeded program impacts in the past.

SOME LESSONS LEARNED

* Recognition of villagers' propensity for group decisionmaking and channelling development assistance through such groups makes acceptance and rapid diffusion of new ideas more likely; "bottom-up" approaches definitely promote sustainability.

* Consistent and sustained approaches to development lead to cumulative buildup of local expertise over a span of, say, twenty years which may not be immediately evident to those promoting change in shorter term "chunks" characteristic of four or five year projects. Patience, flexibility, and consistency are critical strategic elements.

* Controversial or unpopular programs (e.g., family planning) are more acceptable if packaged within a broader program of interventions offered to villagers amid a range of choices.

* "Supply-increasing" agricultural projects must be accompanied by coordinated activities in the areas of marketing and rural finance; analysis of likely changes in demand as well as in supply is a key factor in estimating future marketing patterns and impacts upon the consumption of the producers themselves.

* In lending assistance to public and private sector development institutions, attention must be given to decision-making processes, not merely to technical and logistical assistance.

* Private sector institutions and organizations comprise potentially fruitful and efficient agents for promoting "grass-roots" changes. At present, most GOG line ministries are too centralized to function effectively at municipal and village levels.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 5A

SUMMARY (continued)

* Continued focus upon developmental basics--appropriate agricultural technologies and rural infrastructure, primary and bilingual education, basic village health care, access roads and electrification--is politically neutral and provides bases for development of stable, public sector careers; these things are conducive to long term host country support, i.e., host-country sustained priorities.

* Yet achievement of efficiency in the use of public sector resources for development requires real deconcentration of decision-making.

* There is no substitute for close USAID monitoring of real change in areas selected for program focus; frequent field visits (e.g., once per quarter) should be an integral part of project management.

SOME RECOMMENDATIONS

* USAID should continue its present emphasis upon basics; given present high rates of Guatemalan population growth, accelerated efforts in small farm research and technology transfer, rural infrastructure, and basic health and education are amply justified.

* Efforts towards institutional strengthening should be focused upon encouraging policies for effective decentralization of public sector decision-making, especially within the ministries of agriculture, education, and health.

* USAID should establish an integrated information/monitoring system encompassing (1) internal information, (2) project level monitoring (both financial aspects and results in the field) and (3) longer-term program performance; the GOG should be encouraged to upgrade its own information management and planning systems.

* USAID's present exploration of means to strengthen the Guatemalan private sector and private mechanisms to promote development (e.g., via NGOs) has shown promising results and merits contunued support; this, however, should be done within the broader framework of consistent long-term GOG public policy, recognizing the need to seek flexible balancing of public and private mechanisms as external conditions change over time.

* Heightened attention should be given to monitoring social change affecting, and affected by, program strategies and project design in view of Guatemala's complex socio-cultural environment. Cross-cutting issues and impacts relating to rural/urban, Indigenous/Ladino, and public/private sector dichotomies need to be identified.

NOTE: The lessons learned and recommendations listed above have been restricted to longer-term cross-cutting issues identified by the evaluation team. Lack of space here precludes detailed items by sector. These can be found in Volumes I and II of the final evaluation report.

ATTACHMENTS

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

Altiplano Report (Volumes I, II and III)

MISSION COMMENTS ON FULL REPORT

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

None

CONTINUATION SHEET

E. Action Decisions Approved by Mission or AID/W Office Director (Cont'd)

Actions Required	Person Responsible	Completion Date
(5) Continue present focus upon fundamentals in agriculture, education, health and infrastructure Programs oriented towards rural, small-farm areas.	Program Officer	Continuous
(6) Heighten emphasis upon improved rural marketing and credit delivery mechanisms for agriculture development.	Program Officer and Chief Rural Dev. Office	Continuous
(7) As appropriate and feasible, seek to maximize private sector and decentralize public sector mechanisms for field management of projects in all development sectors.	Program Officer	Continuous
(8) Continue support for GOG 8% constitutional "set aside" for municipalities; as feasible and appropriate, enhance capacity of municipalities and USAID community-based strategies and programs.	Program Officer	Continuous
(9) In all sectors, maintain and strengthen focus upon community-level grass roots associations as participants in, and targets of rural development programs/projects.	Program Officer	Continuous
(10) In the area of institutional strengthening support GOG's policies on decentralization and, concurrently, the improvement of management and evaluation/information systems within the GOG development agencies.	Program Officer	Continuous or designee
(11) In Agriculture, maintain primary focus upon combined systems of diversification, irrigation, and soil conservation for small farms in the Central and Western Highlands.	Program Officer and Chief Rural Development Office	Continuous
(12) Give high priority to policies and strategies aimed at reducing deterioration of the rural environment generally and of watershed areas in particular.	Program Officer and Chief Rural Development Office	Continuous

E. Action Decisions Approved by Mission or AID/W Office Director (Cont'd)

Actions Required	Person Responsible	Completion Date
(13) In Health, encourage greater GOG support for rural preventive health services delivery in collaboration with local private efforts to accomplish child survival objective.	Program Officer and Chief Office of Human Resources Development	Continuous
(14) In education, continue present efforts towards innovative ways of reaching primary school levels children in rural areas, including radio-assisted outreach and related activities.	Program Officer and Chief Office of Human Resources Development	Continuous
(15) In infrastructure, increase efforts to improve rural market access roads, especially for those areas targeted by existing or projected rural development programs/projects.	Program Officer	Continuous
(16) Encourage and support program-related studies to acquire information in the areas of (a) extent and severity of poverty; (b) rural marketing, (c) food consumption/ demand and (d) effectiveness of municipality level development efforts.	Program Officer or designee	Continuous Studies in three areas indicated by 1991.