EVALUATION

FOOD FOR THE HUNGRY, INTERNATIONAL
EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAM

MAY 1, 1984

LA PAZ, BOLIVIA

EVALUATION TEAM:
SANDY DEL PRADO
MARTIN EDE
JOHN ELLIOTT
ERNESTO KANASHIRO
CURT SCHAEFFER

FOOD FOR THE HUNGRY, INT. EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAM

EVALUATION

I. INTRODUCTION

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

III. PROGRAMS

- A. Food for Work
  - 1. Program norms
  - 2. Findings
  - 3. Summary
  - 4. General Recommendations
- B. Other
  - 1. Nutrition Centers
  - 2. Every Child Program

IV. USE OF TITLE II COMMODITIES

V. COORDINATION

VI. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

- A. Regional Offices
- B. Warehouses

VII. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

ANNEX I - Regional Offices visited during the Evaluation
ANNEX II - Sample Data Collection Questionnaire

EVALUATION

FOOD FOR THE HUNGRY, INT. EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAM

I. INTRODUCTION

Food for the Hungry, International (here-after referred to as FHI), has been operating in Bolivia since 1977 and began to distribute Title II commodities in October, 1983 under an Emergency Program established to combat widespread hunger resulting from a severe draught. FHI's performance in the Emergency Program, as determined by this evaluation and conditioned on adherence to the recommendations here-in contained, will serve as the basis for Mission approval for FHI's participation in a Regular P.L. 480 Title II Program.

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the achievements of FHI during the Emergency Program (covering the period October, 1983 through April 30, 1984) and to specify those areas needing strengthening for the remainder of the Program (May 1 through July 15, 1984) and for participation in a Regular Title II Program during FY 1984 (July 15 through September 30).

The Evaluation methodology included visits to each of the six Departmental offices (Cochabamba, La Paz, Oruro, Potosí, Sucre and Tarija), where FHI staff and volunteers were interviewed on their Emergency Program operations, specifically: staffing, training, warehousing, projects, and inter-institutional coordination.

Evaluation activities were conducted between March 27 and April 27, 1984.

III. PROGRAMS

A. Food for Work

FHI's major participation in the Emergency Program was under FFW.

1. Program Norms

The goal of the FFW projects under the Emergency Program was to improve the agricultural conditions in the areas hardest hit by the draught or floods; to improve or establish road to market routes; potable water systems, community improvement projects; and to achieve public rather than private benefit.

Participants in Emergency FFW projects should have come from those areas designated by Civil Defense as having been affected by the 1983 draught or flooding and who are unemployed or underemployed.

2. Findings

FHI had distributed approximately 2,700 MT as of April 15, 1984, of a programmed 10,000 MT of Emergency Program commodities under the FFW category. During the months of November-December, 1983, approximately 2,000 MTs were borrowed from Caritas and SNDC due to the late arrival of FHI's commodities. Distribution has been hampered both by the late arrival of commodities (4,000 MT arrived the last week of April) and by the lack of funds to purchase vehicles expected from an Outreach Grant iniciated in October, 1983 and yet to be received. The vehicles remain crucial for organizing, supervising and evaluating FFW projects. In their absence, supervision has been almost totally lacking in all Departments but Chuquisaca, resulting in some communities receiving food from more than one distribution agency for the same project and in token participation by other communities (2 days of work) in projects requiring seventeen.

A USAID study conducted in February 1984 shows that the rural residents residing close to departmental capitals and with more experience in dealing with bureaucracies received a disproportionate amount of food.

FHI's FFW projects originated at the community level where a project request form (EF-01) was filled out and submitted to the departmental office for approval. Once approved, community representatives received instructions (in the majority of departments on the spot, at the office) on eligibility, rations, days of work, etc.) Commodities were received by community representatives at FHI's regional warehouses and transported to project sites for distribution.

All Departamental offices received instructions on the implementation of FFW projects.

The majority of the FFW projects followed Emergency Program guidelines on eligible projects (e.g. bridge and road construction, irrigation, agricultural, potable water, etc.) Unfortunately, due to a lack of supervision and technical assistance, many of the project results will be short lived. Sucre, again, represents an exception in that they worked closely with the Bolivian Institute of Agricultural Technology

(IBTA), and were able to provide technical assistance and supervision for their projects.

3. Summary

FHI's FFW projects run the gammet from very well executed but not particularly well targeted projects (Sucre) to practically non-existant or short term (2 day) projects in La Paz. The lack of vehicles for supervision, plus the initial efforts of getting a complicated and many faceted (e.g. shipping, warehousing, staffing, training) operation off the ground account for these deficiencies and it is felt that with all the offices now staffed, the emergency winding down, and the assumption that the Outreach Grant will provide necessary funding for vehicle and warehouse equipment, that future FHI FFW projects can make a viable contribution to Bolivia's development.

FHI is making a concerted effort to obtain technical assistance for their FFW projects through the National Community Development Service (SNDC), IBTA, and other technical entities. According to the National Program Supervisor, Willy Aliaga, the IBTA Office in Sucre has agreed to place an architect with FHI to assist with FFW rural construction projects in the Department of Chuquisaca.

4. General Recommendations

a. Once geographic work areas are determined by the Departamental Committees, meetings should be held in targeted communities to explain the objectives of FFW projects.

b. When an application from an eligible community is received, a visit should be made to the community by the FHI staff to discuss project implementation (work to be performed, eligibility criteria, number of work days, rations, technical assistance, supervision, evaluation, etc.)

c. Regular, unannounced visits to the projects site should be made.

d. Technical assistance requirements of each project should be assessed and provided wherever possible.

e. Each project should be evaluated upon completion.

f. The National Office should provide each Departmental Office with clear concise guidelines in English and Spanish on the implementation of FFW projects.

g. Accessibility to more distant and harder to reach provinces (agreed upon in the departmental committee) should be possible and made a priority once vehicles are available.

B. Other

1 .Nutrition Centers

FHI, in addition to the Emergency Program, is operating five nutrition centers in the Department of La Paz (three in El Alto, one in Cota Cota and one in Tairo) with USDA 416 commodities. While these centers are not part of the Emergency Program, Mission staff visited the five centers and made recommendations for their improvement in preparation for their possible inclusion in a Regular PL 480 Title II Program. Suggestions include:

a. Changing from a take-home to an on-site feeding program to assure consumption by the vulnerable group (children under six and pregnant and/or lactating mothers);

b. The formation of Mother's Clubs at the Centers and hiring a Bolivian Nutritionist to develop and supervise nutrition and health activities and implement income generating projects;

c. Quality control (sample testing of prepared commodities from time to time);

d. Improve medical services by providing beneficiaries with privacy consisting of a small or screened off room for examinations; and

e. A lessening of the "paper work" requirements of volunteers which would leave them more time for productive activities.

FHI has already implemented several of the recommendations, plus some of their own and has agreed to use the USAID/MOH/CARITAS developed Minimum Standards for Mothers' Clubs as a guide in establishing their Mother's Clubs.

2 .Every Child Program

FHI administers, or is beginning, a "Cada Niño" (Everychild) program in each departamental office. This program is run by U.S. Volunteers and consists of cash donations from U.S. donors to meet school, medical, and incidental expenses of selected participating children.

The Evaluation team feels that the Every Child Program should be kept separate from the Title II Program. Specifically, that selection as a "Cada Niño" participant would not grant the child automatic inclusion in or rations from a Title II Program. Any attempt to combine the Cada Niño program with a Title II program should be consulted with USAID to assure that participants meet Title II program eligibility criteria.

IV. USE OF TITLE II COMMODITIES

The end-use of the Title II Emergency products is important for the obvious reason that nutritional benefits will be lost if the recipients do not like or utilize them.

Leatils were introduced as a new product during the Emergency Program. In general, their acceptance appears to be good to very good, but given their sale value, leatils were an easily marketable item and were believed to be sold rather than consumed in many cases. The other produces utilized in the Emergency Program (veg oil, wheat flour, milk and rice) were all well known and well received and the recipients are aware of how to utilize them.

Due to the emergency nature of FHI's first involvement in a PL 480 Title II Program, no special instructions were provided to beneficiaries on the use of commodities. With the approval of a Regular program it is recommended that instruction in the utilization of Title II foods be a regular part of each program, including the distribution of recipes and actual on-site food preparation demonstrations.

V. COORDINATION

FHI Departamental staff members were active and willing participants in the Inter-Institutional Emergency Program Coordination Committee meetings. Unfortunately, as the USAID Distribution Report points out, coordination has been minimal to date. One example, taken from the report,

shows that the Province of Arque, total population 37,626 with 26,000 affected by the draught received 496 MTs of food. The commodities were distributed to approximately 64,741 beneficiaries for a coverage of 249%. All cooperating sponsors working in Cochabamba and OFINAAL covered Arque, as did FHI and Caritas offices from Oruro. In contrast, the remote Province of Misque, with a population of 35,306 and 26,000 affected by the draught, received 2% coverage.

Future endeavors should include active and consistent participation in the departmental Inter-Institutional Committees. Emphasis should be placed on defining geographic areas of work, exchange of up-to date information to avoid duplication, obtaining technical assistance where needed, and building solid relations with all development agencies in each department.

The FHI representative at the Inter-Institutional meetings should be fluent in Spanish, knowledgeable of the program and possess decision making authority.

VI. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

FHI's weakest link in building their Title II Emergency Program has been in program administration. The resignation of the Country Director Patrick O'Brien in February, appointment of a temporary director Robert Ashe for one month, his replacement by a willing but inexperienced former FHI volunteer Jim Gibson in March, and finally, the pending departure of FHI's USAID liaison David Beltz in June have had definite impact on the program. The experience and efforts of Willy Aliaga, National Supervisor, have done much to keep the program functioning through all these changes.

In addition to the administrative disruptions at the national level, three different groups of volunteers (for a total of six plus one spouse) have served in the Department of Cochabamba since October, 1983. Five of the seven have returned to the U.S. Several of the thirteen volunteers remaining in Bolivia have been given the responsibility of Departmental Co-Directors, despite a general lack of development experience and/or language skills.

VII. COORDINATION

FHI Departamental staff members were active and willing participants in the Inter-Institutional Emergency Program Coordination Committee meetings. Unfortunately, as the USAID Distribution Report points out, coordination has been minimal to date. One example, taken from the report,

The Evaluation team feels that U.S. Volunteers can play an important and valuable role in FHI's Bolivia program, especially in the organization of specific programs such as Mother's Clubs, Nutrition Centers, School Feeding, and projects along the lines of those managed in Cota Cota, but that the responsibility and authority for managing a Title II Program should be placed in the hands of competent, experienced, national staff. Confusion exists as to lines of authority and who is responsible for what in every department but Chuquisaca and La Paz where a national coordinator manages the Emergency Program.

Future volunteers should possess adequate language skills before arriving in Bolivia and be selected for their development experience whenever possible.

The Volunteers in-country should receive intensive language classes until conversant in Spanish. Until they become conversant, both volunteers and the program will suffer.

A. Regional Offices

FHI has established five departmental offices (Cochabamba, Oruro, Potosi, Tarija and Sucre) which are adequate for program needs.

The Evaluators feel that the Department of La Paz would be more efficient and productive operating in a separate facility, as they are presently located in the National Office of FHI and get caught up in the broader program, resulting in the Department of La Paz receiving insufficient attention.

B. Warehouses

Warehouse inspections encountered the following problems to a greater or lesser degree in the majority of FHI warehouses:

1. Commodities unevenly stacked.
2. Commodities stacked close to the wall making accurate inventorying difficult.
3. Warehousemen unable to give an accurate account of warehouse stocks.
4. Kardex system not being utilized.
5. Paper work (e.g. dispatch orders being prepared by warehousemen) was excessive and time consuming.
6. Insufficient security.
7. In need of cleaning.

VII. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

A. Upon receipt of Outreach Grant funds, provide each Departmental office with vehicles and warehouse equipment (scales, sewing and packaging tools, pallets, etc.).
B. Hire sufficiente program staff in each Department to assure proper supervision of project organization, implementation and evaluation.
C. Continue efforts to acquire technical assistance for FFW projects.
D. Prepare and provide each Departmental office with clear, concise Regular Title II Program Guidelines in English and Spanish for each Program category (FFW, School Feeding, MCH, etc.).
E. Provide each Departmental office with the 1985 Operational Plan in English and Spanish.
F. Coordinate and target areas of work at the Departmental level.
G. Utilize the Minimum Standards for Mothers' Clubs in the organization of any new clubs.
H. Develop mechanism to assure proper utilization and awareness of Title II Commodities (recipes, demonstrations, etc.).
I. Initiate inter-institutional committees where they are inactive or ineffective and participate actively in those which are functioning.
J. Establish clear definitions of authority within staffing of FHI.
K. Re-evaluate recruiting procedures to attract U.S. Volunteers with development experience and Spanish language skills.
L. Review warehouse procedures and provide adequate on-the-job training of personnel, including proper stacking, inventory procedures, the use of a Kardex system, proper security and hygenic conditions.
M. Determine Title II food commodities and ration levels based on recommendations made by a nutritionist.

ANNEX I

REGIONAL OFFICES VISITED DURING THE EVALUATION

Evaluation Team Members	Dates	Regional Offices
Sandy Del Prado Martin Ede	March 30	Oruro
Ernesto Kanashiro John Elliott	March 27	Tarija
Ernesto Kanashiro John Elliott	March 28/29	Potosí
Ernesto Kanashiro John Elliott Curt Shaeffer	March 30	Sucre
Curt Shaeffer	April 3/4	Cochabamba
Sandy Del Prado Martin Ede	April 27	La Paz

ANNEX II

DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

P.L. 480, Título II
Evaluación del Programa, Marzo/Abril 1984
Entrevistas a Nivel de Oficina Regional

Entidad: _____ Fecha _____

Localidad: _____

Personas Entrevistadas _____

_____

_____

Entrevistadores: _____

A. Objetivos y Metas

1. Objetivos y metas generales de la entidad regional:

B. Organización

1. Describa la organización (estructura) de la oficina.

2. Cuántos y que programs maneja la oficina?

   a. Programas no relacionados con el Título II:

   b. Título II.

   c. Cómo participa la oficina en la distribución de alimentos para emergencias.

   d. Otras observaciones sobre los programas de la oficina.

C. Personal

1. Personal asignado a la oficina

Nombre	Título	Funciones

2. Qué preparación formal ha recibido el personal en el manejo de alimentos y sobre los reglamentos del Título II?

3. Que actividades del personal están apoyadas con manuales de procedimientos?

4. Recibe el personal suficiente apoyo de servicios de transporte y viáticos para cumplir con su trabajo? Que problemas hay; recomendaciones para mejorar ésto?

5. Cuáles son las áreas de adiestramiento más necesitadas por el personal?

6. En que áreas de trabajo se necesita más personal y porque?

D. Programación

1. Explique el proceso de programación que se usa para áreas de trabajo relacionado con el Título II como también el no relacionado con el mismo. (Es una programación de arriba hacia abajo o de abajo hacia arriba? Se puede estipular el número de beneficiarios por categoría del Título II?)

2. Cómo se podría mejorar el proceso de programación de alimentos?

3. Generalmente se cumplen las metas programadas? Porque?

E. Distribución de Alimentos

1. Cómo llegan los alimentos a esta región?

2. Cómo se distribuyen? (Quién paga los fletes al punto de destino)

3. Cuáles son los medios de transporte que tiene la oficina y para qué los utilizan?

4. Disponen de gasolina y mantenimiento?

5. Inspección del almacén. Está ordenado y limpio?

6. Está al día el inventario de alimentos?

7. Hay seguridad de que los beneficiarios puedan preparar los alimentos correctamente? Cuáles son los pasos específicos que la oficina toma para educar a los beneficiarios en el buen uso de los alimentos?

8. Cómo y con qué frecuencia se realiza la supervisión de los proyectos de alimentos por trabajo? (Ver ejemplos de supervisión).

9. Cuáles son los alimentos <u>más</u> aprovechados por los beneficiarios?

10. Cuáles son los alimentos <u>menos</u> aprovechados?

11. Qué sugerencias se pueden plantear para mejorar los programas de alimentos?

F. <u>Finanzas</u>

1. Tiene suficiente presupuesto para llevar a cabo el programa planeado para la region? Cuáles son los ítems que le faltan?

2. Llegan a tiempo los fondos para sueldos y viáticos? Qué problemas existen?

<u>PREGUNTAS SOBRE OTROS PROGRAMAS</u> (Sí hay)

- Tipo de Programa y cobertura (valor o volúmen de alimentos)

- Objetivos

- Beneficiarios

- (Target group)

- Miembros actuales y edades
- Número

- Cuáles son las condiciones de elegibilidad?

- Cuando se formó el programa?

- Por cuanto tiempo estan los miembros?

- Frecuencia de reuniones y/o actividades

- Con qué frecuencia?

- Descripción del programa
  a) Actividades

  b) Quién lo hace? c) Apoyo de otros programas

  d) Innovaciones

  e) Planes futuros

- Liderazgo

a) Como es elegido

b) Quién es o quiénes son?

c) Que formación tienen?

-Uso de alimentos
a) Como los usan?

b) Adiestramiento - por quién? con que frecuencia?

c) Que alimentos prefieren?

d) Cuales les gustan menos?

-Cómo se hace la recepción

- Solicitud

- Transporte

- Distribución

-Que pasa sí no cumplen con el pedido desde la oficina regional?