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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Mid-term performance evaluations were conducted on two projects funded by USAID/Guatemala’s Economic Growth Office, the Inclusive Market Alliance for Rural Entrepreneurs (IMARE) project, and the TIERRAS/Land Conflict Resolution project, both implemented by Mercy Corps. Together, the two projects represent a portfolio of $4,800,000.

The IMARE cooperative agreement was signed with Mercy Corps in September 2007, and was scheduled to run to September 30, 2010. This original project obligated US$1,131,221 of USAID funding. Six funding and extension-of-date modifications have been implemented over the life of the project, increasing grant funding to a total of $2,600,000. The Modifications have extended the project life from October 2010 to February 2014.

Mercy Corps has implemented the TIERRAS project since 2003, but the most recent cooperative agreement was signed in September 2007, extending the project through September 2013, in the amount of $2,200,000.

Both projects fall under the Mission’s Strategic Objective 2, Economic Freedom: Open, diversified and expanding economies, with IMARE contributing to achievement of Intermediate Result number 2, More Competitive, Market Oriented Private Enterprises, and TIERRAS contributing to Intermediate Result number 1, Laws, Policies and Regulations that Promote Trade and Investment.

The purpose of the mid-term evaluations was to measure the performance-to-date of the two very different projects, analyze any implementation problems, and make recommendations as necessary for needed course corrections.

The intended audiences for these evaluations are USAID/Guatemala—primarily the Economic Growth and Health and Education Offices—and the USAID implementing partner (Mercy Corps).

The evaluation team developed evidence-based findings, and conclusions based on analysis of those findings, in terms of project results and sustainability, institutional capacity-building and gender, under-represented populations and other important categories. These are presented in terms of cross-cutting findings and conclusions, as well as project-specific findings and conclusions. The most salient of these are summarized below:

Project Results and Sustainability
- Both projects appear to be on track to meet or exceed most of the targets specified under their PMPs and work plans. In particular, the IMARE model of working with small landowners to improve their production, agricultural practices and business skills, appears to have strong momentum.
- An impediment has arisen regarding a memorandum of understanding needed by the TIERRAS project which would establish a legal basis for mediated land dispute agreements, deriving from confusion over which court may sign the memorandum.
- Baselines were not developed for IMARE Phase 1, but preliminary indications that the impact of increasing small farmer incomes under Phase 1 may have included positive spillover effects on the provision of services in project communities, but some of the associations supported may not have survived termination of Phase 1 activities.

Institutional Capacity Building
- The IMARE I project relied on large and formal buyers, like WalMart, for sustainability, but the shift in focus to FtF departments under IMARE 2 has de-emphasized that model by also focusing on local and informal markets.
The current TIERRAS model for institution building is the creation and strengthening of the Municipal Agriculture Offices (OMAs) in each municipality. But after the last election, about half of the OMA staff people changed, and training must begin again.

The biggest challenge facing the TIERRAS project is construction of an institutional structure for continuation of the alternative dispute resolution (ADR) process for land conflicts and maintenance of the cadastre.

**Women and Under-Represented Populations**

- The extent of women’s participation in farming activities, producer association management, or both, appears to be limited by cultural norms, literacy and language barriers, especially in the altiplano.
- A decisive plus is that Mercy Corps field staff in both projects tend to speak the language spoken in the community where they are working, and training and ADR sessions are conducted in the language of the community.
- Field staff and mediators for the TIERRAS project include both men and women, and every two months, Mercy Corps holds a training session for women from the municipality, in collaboration with the municipal women’s office, about various aspects of land tenure and land conflict.

The evaluation team also developed concrete recommendations for current activities based on the findings and conclusions that are action-oriented, practical and specific, with defined responsibility for the recommended actions. These are presented in terms of project-specific recommendations, along the most critical of which are the following:

**IMARE Project**

- Mercy Corps should conduct a study of (20) Phase I groups to determine impact
  - Lessons extracted would enrich the understanding of the value chains approach with small producers that in turn could be applied to IMARE II groups
- USAID should link community health and nutrition programs with IMARE II communities
  - Would serve to connect improved food access through IMARE activities with improved food utilization activities of USAID health partner activities
- Mercy Corps should develop new media networks to link IMARE I and IMARE II groups and stakeholders
  - Successes and errors of IMARE I groups could benefit associations in IMARE II
  - Could link producer groups to provide commodity where/when gaps exist
- IMARE producer groups handed off to ANACAFE and Agexport
  - IMARE will end but ANACAFE and AGEXPORT will continue on as successful NGOs in the agricultural value chains arena
  - IMARE groups strength retained with link to ANACAFE or AGEXPORT
- Mercy Corps Should Reflect USAID Gender Assessment Recommendations
- Exchange of Best Practices: ANACAFE/Agexport with Mercy Corps
  - Experiences of IMARE warrant comparison with other actors in rural value chains

**TIERRAS Project**

- The TIERRAS project should consider adding a national-level communication strategy for dissemination of the project model and achievements, to raise the visibility of mediation as an essential tool in resolving land conflicts, particularly in support of the cadastral process.
- The institutional base of the Municipal Offices of Agrarian Affairs (OMAs) is weak and politically vulnerable. Sustainability is an issue. USAID should establish link with its municipal strengthening activities as soon as possible to transfer this experience.
• The advocacy networks of public and private organizations are not sustainable as voluntary organizations without a reliable source of funding. Mercy Corps should provide technical assistance on financial stability, through a consultant who specializes on fundraising for voluntary organizations.

• Mercy Corps should give direct attention to sustainability of two additional essential functions supplied under the project in Alta Verapaz and Quiche that have not been discussed explicitly to date. These functions are (1) the database of the land conflict cases attended by the project, and (2) training of certified agrarian mediators. The disposition and maintenance of the database is a particular concern because it is currently housed at and maintained directly by Mercy Corps.

DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM AND USAID’S RESPONSE

Guatemala has the highest national level of chronic malnutrition (49.8%) in the Western Hemisphere and one of the highest in the world. In addition, more than 50% of the population lives below the poverty line, and Guatemala’s per capita annual income of $2,740 masks extreme inequalities between urban ladino populations and indigenous rural populations. Social and economic inequality is an underlying factor in food and nutritional security in Guatemala because of highly skewed access to productive assets including land and basic public services.

Food insecurity in Guatemala does not result from inadequate national or local food supplies (availability), but instead is caused by the inability of the poor to access food due to inadequate incomes, as well as by uninformed consumption decisions and feeding practices that lead to poor food utilization. USAID’s response to this development problem, therefore, has been to focus its economic growth project support on both income generation and nutritional education for rural small households.

A second development problem in Guatemala is that of land issues and the “agrarian problem.” These are arguably the most longstanding, intractable and fundamental issues in the country, contributing to the internal armed conflict and deterring progress in economic development. Secure and legal land tenure is a critically important resource in agricultural development, providing the base for land stewardship and investment. In an agrarian society, land also is the underlying basis for household (and community) identity, well-being, and inheritance.

While the IMARE project focuses on income generation, poverty reduction and improved nutritional status of smallholder producers, the TIERRAS project seeks collaborative resolution of land conflicts in the departments of Alta Verapaz and Quiché. Both projects also seek to improve local capacity of public and private partners—in the case of IMARE with local producer associations, and in the case of TIERRAS with local advocacy networks and Land Affairs Offices.

The projects evaluated fall under the Mission’s Strategic Objective 2—Economic Freedom: Open, Diversified, Expanding Economies as part of the 2004 – 2011 USAID/Guatemala Country Strategy. In particular, the IMARE project falls under the targeted intermediate result, “More Competitive, Market-Oriented Private Enterprises,” while the TIERRAS project falls under the targeted intermediate result, “Laws, Policies and Regulations that Promote Trade and Investment.”

USAID is also a Feed the Future (FtF) Initiative focus country. The FtF Initiative is a country-led, multi-stakeholder initiative to reduce global hunger and end poverty in over 20 countries around the world, including Guatemala. The world-wide initiative began in 2010, and is expected to continue in Guatemala at least through 2016.

FtF builds on five key principles: 1) support for country-led processes; 2) ensure a comprehensive approach to food security; 3) strategically coordinate assistance among donors and other stakeholders; 4) support a strong role for multilateral institutions; and 5) sustain a robust commitment of financial resources. Although it began before the FtF strategy was in place, the IMARE project falls under the FtF strategy.
USAID/Guatemala is focusing FtF projects on issues of “food security” mostly for rural, indigenous communities in 30 target municipalities in five departments of the Western Highlands (Huehuetenango, Quetzaltenango, Quiché, San Marcos and Totonicapán). Food security is characterized as access, utilization, and availability. Under FtF, food security refers to the whole spectrum of possible interventions, from immediate crises in response to drought or natural calamities to longer-term agricultural productivity and market linkages under the value chain approach.

PURPOSE OF EVALUATION
EVALUATION TYPE AND RATIONALE
Mid-term performance evaluations were conducted on the IMARE project, which is scheduled to end in February 2014, and the TIERRAS project, scheduled for completion in September 2013. The purpose of the evaluations was to measure the performance-to-date of two very different projects implemented by the same partner, Mercy Corps., and make recommendations for any needed course corrections. Section IV, below, lists the key questions that the evaluations addressed.

Also included in this report as annexes are the Scope of Work for the Evaluation, Evaluation Tools that were utilized to assess project performance, and lists of Sources of Information, including persons and organizations met and interviewed.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION TASKS
The mid-term performance evaluations focused on the following tasks:

1) Project effectiveness. Examine the performance to-date of the IMARE project and the TIERRAS Land Conflict Resolution project, both implemented by Mercy Corps.

2) Implementation problems. Analyze any implementation problems, and review institutional capacities of the organizations; this includes assessment of the performance and achievements for each project against its targets—both as listed in the projects’ Performance Monitoring Plans (PMPs) and Work Plans.

The intended audiences for these evaluations are USAID/Guatemala—primarily the Economic Growth and Health and Education Offices—and the USAID implementing partner (Mercy Corps).

RESEARCH DESIGN AND ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY
EVALUATION QUESTIONS
The following questions were addressed during the course of the project evaluations:

Project Results and Sustainability
- Are the projects meeting their targets under their PMPs? Are deliverables on time according to Work Plans? If not what have been the impediments?
- Are the projects addressing poverty reduction and employment generation, and conflict mitigation?
- What are the major constraints facing each project’s objectives?
- What resources will be necessary to continue project achievements after the projects end?

Institutional Capacity Building
- Has the internal management of local producer groups improved due to project efforts?
- Have projects had any effect on local government capacity; has increased organization of farmers (IMARE) or advocacy networks (TIERRAS) led to political strength that makes local governments more accountable to its citizens?

Gender and Under-Represented Populations
- Have women been integrated into farming activities, producer association management, or both?
What have female roles been in conflict resolution in Alta Verapaz and Quiché? Has women’s ownership of land and access to land dispute resolution processes increased?

Did projects reflect the applicable recommendations made by the USAID/Guatemala Gender Assessment (March 2009)? Specifically, did USAID provide resources for implementing partners to incorporate recommendations into work plans; did the implementing partners train their personnel in gender-related issues; did the project make women’s membership and participation in decision-making part of the organizational strengthening for producer groups; did the project include diversity as a criterion for producer group selection; and did the project identify viable women’s producer groups?

EVALUATION ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY
USAID’s Evaluation Policy requires that performance evaluations should be evidence-based. This evaluation is designed to meet that requirement by employing a mixed methods approach to searching for and examining available evidence of changes attributable to the two projects evaluated and to addressing the key evaluation questions. Specifically, the evaluation team’s approach to gathering data and information to assess the two projects includes the following methods.

1) **Document review:** During evaluation launch and as part of final evaluation design, the evaluation team examined project documentation related to the design, objectives and achievements of each of the EG projects. The evaluators assessed: a) the degree to which the project’s objectives and intermediate results are articulated qualitatively and quantitatively; and b) the quality of data collected to measure indicators of progress toward achieving results targets.

2) **Key stakeholders and key informant interviews:** To supplement and support its documentation review, the evaluation team interviewed those individuals closest to the implementation of each project, including implementing partner (IP) managers and staff; USAID Agreement Officer’s Representatives (AORs), counterpart stakeholder partners engaged with the IP’s in project implementation as well as a sample of key market players in the value chains that the projects are strengthening.

3) **Site visits and beneficiary group/individual interviews:** The evaluation team obtained complete lists of project sites and, depending on number of sites and logistical constraints—security, travel time, field staff and beneficiary availability, randomly selected sites for conducting “ground-truthing” field visits to observe project activities among beneficiary populations and to conduct individual and group interviews among beneficiaries and key informants to obtain their observations on impacts on income, employment, nutrition, and gender equity. During visits to project field sites, structured beneficiary and stakeholder interview guides (see Annex B) were used to collect information from field staff, collaborating stakeholders—community leaders, private firms, intermediaries—and small samplings of beneficiaries of both sexes.

4) **Cross-checking and discussion of preliminary findings:** The evaluation team encouraged participation by both USAID and Implementing Partner (IP) staff in field visits and selected interviews. Once the field work was wrapping up, and before deriving conclusions and recommendations, the evaluation team also made presentations of preliminary findings to both technical teams within USAID as well as to IP staff. The objective of the latter exercise was to improve and amplify the evaluation findings and analysis, through discussion, cross-checking of facts and, as necessary, correction of the preliminary findings based on discovery of new, relevant, information.

5) **Limitations of the methodology:** The selection of sites to be visited and persons to be met, which was based on availability, meant that the persons met may not have been representative of all project beneficiaries. For example, if some IMARE project beneficiaries had dropped out of business.
since project inception, or left the communities assisted to find work in other locations, they would not have been represented in the sample visited. If Mercy Corps had conducted baseline beneficiary surveys this kind of bias might have been at least partially corrected for, or at least its scale might have been known through monitoring the number of non-responses from among the original beneficiaries in longitudinal surveys. To correct for these kinds of limitations, the site visit findings were generalized based on their confirmation with USAID and IP staff.

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The following section presents findings and conclusions drawn from the two mid-term project evaluations with cross-cutting implications for USAID programming. In subsequent sections, project-specific findings and conclusions are presented.

**CROSS-CUTTING FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

**Project Results and Sustainability**

Both projects appear to be on track to meet or exceed most of the targets specified under their PMPs and work plans. In particular, the IMARE model of working with small landowners to improve their production, agricultural practices and business skills, appears to have strong momentum.

An impediment has arisen regarding a memorandum of understanding needed by the TIERRAS project that would formalize the link to the Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution and provide a legal basis for mediated land dispute agreements. The Supreme Court has declined to sign the agreement.

Preliminary indications from the IMARE project indicate that the impact of increasing small farmer incomes under Phase 1 may have included positive spillover effects on the provision of services in project communities, but some of the associations supported may not have survived termination of Phase 1 activities.

**Institutional Capacity Building**

The first phase of the IMARE project relied on large and formal buyers, like Wal-Mart, for sustainability, but the shift in focus to FtF departments under IMARE 2 has de-emphasized that model by also focusing on local and informal markets.

The current TIERRAS model for institution building is the creation and strengthening of the Municipal Agriculture Offices (OMAs) in each municipality. But after the last election, about half of the OMA staff people changed, and training must begin again.

The biggest challenge facing the TIERRAS project is construction of an institutional structure for continuation of the alternative dispute resolution (ADR) process for land conflicts and maintenance of the cadastre.\(^1\)

**Gender and Under-Represented Populations**

The extent of women’s participation in farming activities, producer association management, or both, appears to be limited by cultural norms, literacy and language barriers, especially in the Guatemalan Altiplano.

A decisive plus is that Mercy Corps field staff in both projects tend to speak the language spoken in the community where they are working, and training and ADR sessions are conducted in the language of the community.

---

\(^1\) A cadaster, created using a cadastral survey, is a comprehensive, formal register of the real property of the country, including details of ownership, tenure, precise location, and the dimensions of each parcel of land.
Field staff and mediators for the TIERRAS project include both men and women, and every two months, Mercy Corps holds a training session for women from the municipality, in collaboration with the municipal women’s office, about various aspects of land tenure and land conflict.

**INCLUSIVE MARKET ALLIANCE FOR RURAL ENTREPRENEURS (MERCY CORPS)**

**Project Results Framework**

The first IMARE cooperative agreement (IMARE I) was signed on September 19, 2007, and scheduled to run to September 30, 2010. This original project obligated $1,131,221 of USAID funding. Six funding and extension-of-date modifications have been implemented over the life of the project. The modifications have increased USAID grant funding to a total of US$2,600,000. Modifications have extended the project life under a second phase (IMARE II) from October 1, 2010 to February 28, 2014.

The IMARE project falls under the Mission’s Strategic Objective 2, Economic Freedom: Open, diversified and expanding economies, contributing to achievement of Intermediate Result number 2, More Competitive, Market Oriented Private Enterprises.

Chronic malnutrition is an enormous and challenging public health problem in Guatemala; almost 50% of children less than five years of age are malnourished, higher than any other country in the Americas and higher than many African countries. Additionally, chronic malnutrition among children has a decided ethnic and geographic dimension; malnutrition rates are higher for rural and for indigenous children, at rates of 59% and 66%, respectively.

In 2007 USAID/Guatemala embarked on a rural development model intended to engage small farmers as produce suppliers to supermarkets. In Guatemala, small farmers are traditional suppliers of produce to local markets. Critical for small farmers is overcoming barriers to credit, newer technologies, improved infrastructure, good post-harvest management, market information, and adequate knowledge of global food safety standards. Finding ways to leverage poor small farmer potential offered at least partial solution to Guatemala’s chronic malnutrition and poverty statistics.

USAID’s strategy to address these urgent needs and opportunities was to partner with Mercy Corps through a Cooperative Agreement in a Global Development Alliance with Wal-Mart Foundation and Fundación Agil called the Inclusive Market Alliance for Rural Entrepreneurs (IMARE) project. As originally conceived, it was to be a thirty six-month program in the Departments of Alta Verapaz, Baja Verapaz, Chimaltenango, Sololá and San Marcos in order to create business opportunities and to improve quality of life of 20 producer groups in rural Guatemala, by linking the producers with national supermarket chains.

Mercy Corps had two basic objectives: 1) increase access to more profitable markets on a sustainable basis and 2) increase productivity and quality of life through better farm management, post-harvest and processing techniques. The program targeted 600 families and indirectly to 3,600 members living in the household of the direct beneficiary.

In 2009, USAID adopted a new global strategy called the Feed the Future (FtF) Initiative. Guatemala, because of its high levels of chronic malnutrition, was selected as one of 20 focus countries for the new initiative. The FtF focus of IMARE would be referred to by Mercy Corps personnel as IMARE II or Phase II. Mercy Corps began implementing IMARE II in October 2010, and simultaneously stopped all direct work with the twenty associations in IMARE I. The modified Cooperative Agreement extended IMARE II activities through February 28, 2014.

Wal-Mart Foundation in the United States is a distinct organization from WalMart (Paiz) in Guatemala, which is a supermarket chain that has been a significant buyer from IMARE producer groups. Ultimately, although it participated with financing under IMARE I, Wal-Mart Foundation decided not to extend its support to a GDA participant. Nonetheless, Wal-Mart (Paiz) Guatemala continues to buy produce from
IMARE I producers, as well as IMARE II producers, and in fact, as noted below, has increased its purchases from IMARE I producers following the completion of project activities.

The two tables presented in this section detail the basic achievements of both IMARE Phases I and II, including higher level objectives, targets and achievement toward those targets.

### IMARE I Results Targets and Achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1:</strong> 20 producer groups increase sustained access to more profitable markets.</td>
<td>1. 25% increase in value of sales of specific products. Total = $1,908,543 formal markets $1,323,217 informal markets 2. 15% average increase in net incomes for participants. 3. 50% increase in direct sales to retail markets versus intermediaries 4. No. jobs created</td>
<td>1. = 1.678% increase value of sales over year one; 81% increase over year two. 2. = 59% increase in net income increase for participants. 3. = 51% increase in direct sales to retail markets vs. indirect sales to intermediaries. 4. = 2,434 on and off-farm jobs created (30% were women).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2:</strong> 20 producer groups increase their productivity and quality of life through better farm management, processing and post-harvest techniques</td>
<td>1. 20% increase in yield for existing and new crops 2. 15% improvement in wastage and lot rejection. 3. 15% of household income reinvested in productive enterprises, quality of life and future capacity building, (i.e. education)</td>
<td>1. = 25% increased yield (for existing and new crops). 2. = 1.7% average in wastage and lot rejection (1.6% and 1.8% for yrs. 2 and 3 respectively) 3. 37% of income reinvested in ag. Inputs and 63% of income used in household expenditures food, school, health, clothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direct Beneficiaries**

| Direct Beneficiaries | Farmers participating in training and technical assistance: 127 women, 440 men= 567 |

Source: Mercy Corps documentation

During a field visit to an IMARE I association, ASADIT in San Marcos, the week of September 17-20, 2012, it was possible to both quantify household income increases from IMARE and to gain insights into uses of that income. ASADIT has 24 members. Each member owns and tills an average of 10 cuerdas of land. In 2007, prior to IMARE, these farmers typically cultivated no more than three cuerdas of their land leaving seven cuerdas fallow because they had nowhere to sell excess production. Potato is the main crop. But they also grow broccoli, peas, beans and corn. IMARE introduced them to good agricultural practices and good business practices, and by 2011, each member was cultivating their full 10 cuerdas (one cuerda = 21 meters x 21meters; also = 0.4 hectares). On three cuerdas of land in 2007, the average farmer in this group earned about Q1000 per cuerda.

With improved practices and market access, ASADIT farmers under IMARE were earning Q2,250 in average per cuerda by 2011. Thus, by 2011, from 10 cuerdas, the average ASADIT member was earning a total of Q22,500. Mercy Corps and ASADIT members said these figures were net, after expenses.

When asked in a group discussion how they have been spending this additional income, their ranking was: 1) agriculture inputs; 2) food for the home (cereals, sugar, fruit, Incaparina); 3) education for the children; 4) home repairs/upgrades; 5) household animals; 6) clothing; 7) bus transport costs; 8) buying more land, but percentages spent on each category were not obtained.
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2 Earnings per hectare of production prior to IMARE I = Q13,360; at close of project earnings = Q16,750 or +%25

3 Because participants sold only to informal markets pre-IMARE, there is no way to measure improvement it wastage and rejection. However, the 1.7% average rejection is considered very low by Mercy Corps.
Under IMARE II, Mercy Corps has been expanding the successful IMARE I model with a target to directly benefit 1,000 new rural producers in 40 different producer groups, 30% of which (300) must be women. They have already achieved 116% of the beneficiaries’ target, of which an estimated 40% have been women.

### IMARE II: Results Targets and Achievements to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Three-year Targets (2011-2014)</th>
<th>Target Achievement at mid-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1: 40 producer groups increase farm productivity through better farm management, processing and post-harvest techniques and adopt best agricultural, manufacturing and business practices. (65 groups identified = 163% of target)</td>
<td>1. 25% increase in productivity/crop yield (to be measured at end of project) 2. 25% average increase in net incomes for participants (to be measured at end of project) 3. % producer groups receiving training on sustainable natural resource management practices. 4. 300 hectares of land cultivated using good agricultural practices (GAP) 5. % change in land dedicated to basic grains versus commercial crops. 6. No. individuals receiving short term agricultural training</td>
<td>1. Increased crop productivity/yield will be measured at project end in 2014 2. Average increase in net income to be measured at project end in 2014. 3 =20 producer groups receiving training (50% of target) 4. = 60 hectares (20% of target) applying GAP 5. No data yet available 6 = 1,354 individuals have received short term agricultural training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2: 40 producer groups increase profits through sustained access to more profitable markets, generating jobs and promoting models for development in their community. (65 groups identified = 163% of target)</td>
<td>1. 25% increase in profit per hectare. 2. US$2 million in agricultural sales. 3. No. of jobs created 4. No. new individuals benefitting from USG assistance. 5. No. women trained in business management and assuming positions of leadership.</td>
<td>1. % increase in profit per hectare to be measured at project end in 2012 2. = 55% of target; $1,101,899 3. 1,333 jobs created 4. 1,158 (468 women) new people in rural areas benefitting from USG assistance. 5. 228 women participants in trainings and in leadership positions within producer group board of directors (target = 30%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries</td>
<td>1,000 (30% female)</td>
<td>To date, IMARE II has reached 1158 direct beneficiaries (116% of target) of which 468 = women and 690 = men, (40% are women).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mercy Corps documentation

The geographic focus of IMARE II is the Western Highlands Region (Totonicapan, San Marcos, Huehuetenango, El Quiche and Quetzaltenango). IMARE II also has additional components not included in IMARE I that address food security issues, climate change concerns and incorporating gender equity in every aspect of project planning and implementation.

### Project Results and Sustainability

With respect to objectives and targets, based on the information available, the results achievements appear good for both IMARE I and IMARE II. No baseline study was conducted for IMARE I when it started up in 2007. However, basic numbers are available on the performance of the project from its first crop cycles of April-September 2008 through to July-September 2010. Mercy Corps reports show cumulative quarterly sales totaling US$3,321,760 ($1,908,544 to formal markets such as Wal-Mart and $1,323,217 to informal markets). But, because there is no baseline data of sales realized by the 20 associations made up of 567 members (440 men and 127 women) to measure against, there is no way of knowing definitively if household incomes improved.

Of note, the scope of the evaluation did not call for the collection of primary data, e.g., a survey of household income and expenditure data, nor did it allow for a five-week time frame for field visits that would have been necessary to conduct a census of all 20 IMARE I associations a survey of a sample of

---

4 There are 26 positions of leadership in the six IMARE II associations visited, of which 30% or 8 positions, are held by women. Women hold positions including president, vice president, treasurer, secretary and vocal.
households of each association as well as time to visit a number of IMARE II groups. The evaluation team has had to rely on Mercy Corps reporting data for IMARE I results. Nonetheless, qualitative evidence, below in this section, seems to suggest that there was significant impact.

However, Mercy Corps did extrapolate a number based on several factors over the three-year period. They found the overall increase in the net earnings of the agricultural groups to be 59%, based on crop production improvements, crop diversification, and access to formal retail markets that positively influenced the groups’ earnings. In addition, a 2010 final evaluation carried out by the Corporación Para El Desarrollo, La Innovación y Soluciones Estratégicas, S.A., (AKIANTO) which interviewed 50 members from among 10 associations, found a 78% level of satisfaction among respondents about their increased incomes due to IMARE. The 2010 AKIANTO final evaluation also found member satisfaction of 80% when asked about employment generated by IMARE.

Mercy Corps reports show that 2,434 jobs (718 women and 1,716 men) have been directly generated by IMARE. Further, the AKIANTO evaluation found similar positive achievements with other indicators for both higher level objectives and expected results in each.

IMARE II activities have been underway since June 2011. In that time, Mercy Corps has identified 65 groups to work with in the five-department area. The target was 40 groups. Unlike IMARE I, where groups were formed by Mercy Corps and fell into two classifications—level-2 groups capable of responding to formal market demands right away and consistently, and level 1 groups that would need help reaching formal market standards as most of them come from post-land conflict areas. Almost all IMARE II groups existed before the project arrived but would best be described as level 1 under IMARE I, i.e., small groups needing help to meet formal market standards.

Many groups have formal legal status and date back to 2007 or even earlier in some cases. However, given that IMARE II has been underway only for about a year and a half, some groups have had only one crop cycle since inception of project activities with them, while others have yet to experience their first harvest. Mercy Corps reports that, based on IMARE I experience, data from at least two crop cycles are needed to begin to see patterns of impact with respect to income, poverty reduction and employment opportunities.

Nonetheless, IMARE II groups already producing are off to a good start, suggesting that the project is on track to meet work plan targets. Mercy Corps quarterly reports and other documentation demonstrate strong numbers in terms of meeting higher level objectives of the project. The number of groups incorporated into the project is greater than the target. The momentum and experience of IMARE I would explain the fast start for Phase II. In terms of target sales, IMARE II has already reached 55% of the US$2 million project goal, with sales as of June 2012 totaling US$1,101,898 with 71% of these sales being made to formal markets. Twenty groups were responsible for these sales, producing three crops, peas, French beans and potato.

What this IMARE II production means so far in terms of employment is that 1,333 jobs (grading, sorting and packing product for market—mainly seasonal, but reported as full time equivalent positions) have been created to date (379 jobs for women and 954 for men). Determining how these additional sales and new employment are or will affect group member households remains to be measured in the future. Once two or more crop cycles have been completed, enough data will be available to help determine impact on households in terms of increased incomes and its effect on poverty levels.

Sales and employment numbers suggest that there have been spillover effects from IMARE. The AKIANTO final evaluation asked respondents about this dimension of the project, and 76% said they used increased income to improve the quality of life including making improvements on their homes. During a field visit to an IMARE I association, ASADIT in San Marcos, the week of September 17-20, 2012, it was possible to both quantify household income increases from IMARE and to gain insights into
uses of that income. ASADIT has 24 members. Each member owns and tills an average of 10 cuerdas of land. In 2007, prior to IMARE, these farmers typically cultivated no more than three cuerdas of their land leaving seven cuerdas fallow because they had nowhere to sell excess production. Potato is the main crop. But they also grow broccoli, peas, beans and corn. IMARE introduced them to good agricultural practices and good business practices, and by 2011, each member was cultivating their full 10 cuerdas (one cuerda = 21 meters x 21meters; also = 0.4 hectares). On three cuerdas of land in 2007, With improved practices and market access, ASADIT farmers under IMARE were earning Q2,250 in average per cuerda by 2011. Thus, by 2011, from 10 cuerdas, the average ASADIT member was earning a total of Q22,500. Mercy Corps and ASADIT members said these figures were net, after expenses. When asked in a group discussion how they have been spending this additional income, their ranking was: 1) agriculture inputs; 2) food for the home (cereals, sugar, fruit, Incaparina); 3) education for the children; 4) home repairs/upgrades: 5) household animals; 6) clothing; 7) bus transport costs; 8) buying more land, but percentages spent on each category were not obtained.

**Food Security and Household Nutrition**

IMARE II has a strong household management education component for group members, both men and women, on a range of topics that include food security, health and nutrition. The training sessions, held at least once a month with each group, are highly valued by participants. However, such presentations alone are insufficient for addressing malnutrition. The IMARE training provides only indirect attention to preventing malnutrition. The topic of malnutrition is mentioned but is limited to encouraging pregnant and lactating women and mothers with children under two years to go to their nearest health post for attention.

Mercy Corps’ FY 2012 Yearly Operating Plan describes the work of its food security technician in providing training events on health and nutrition, and carrying out periodic health and nutrition assessments in children under five years of age and of pregnant and nursing mothers. The project description for the IMARE II cooperative agreement makes reference to “additional indicators to respond to the FtF activities being incorporated during the development of the PMP and will be monitored during project implementation.”

Other FtF documentation, such as the Value Chains RFA (RFA-520-11-000003), refers to “the objective of the … Value Chains Project being to improve household access to food by expanding and diversifying rural income and to contribute to improving the nutritional status of families benefitted under the program….and, this will be accomplished by expanding the participation of poor rural households in productive value chains….in coordination with nutrition-related activities aimed at improving food utilization and that are implemented by PL480 Title II Food Security Program and health program partners.”
The powerful association-level training package that Mercy Corps is delivering through IMARE II is introducing pregnant and lactating women, and mothers of infants under two, to concepts about nutrition, hygiene and health. The training also encourages these women to go to their local health post, which is sometimes nearby, but often distant, and then only staffed one or two days a week. While IMARE, even in the remotest of communities, is having a positive impact on increasing household productivity and household income, association women and their infants and young children are not exposed by any IMARE or other project activities to any direct one-on-one interpersonal counseling and home visits that would improve infant and young child feeding practice and maternal health and thereby address malnutrition in a measureable way.

Constraints and Opportunities
IMARE II beneficiaries face serious limitations on three fronts. First, the land holdings are very small. The average land holding for both IMARE I and IMARE II beneficiaries is 10 cuerdas, or less than half of a hectare. This creates a limit on possibilities for the farmer’s children. Given that current beneficiaries have as many as seven children, any inheritance of land is likely to be too small for any viability beyond the current family. Second, many of the small holdings are on steep inclines and hillsides. Severe weather incidents such as tropical storms with heavy torrential rains pose a serious erosion risk to these areas. The good agricultural practices training includes minimum and contour tilling practices to protect against basic erosion, but severe weather events could easily overwhelm even the best of applied practices. Third, many associations and their members are a long distance from good local markets and even farther from formal markets. Currently, data are not being captured on these limits that would provide insights into viability for small scale value chains activity.

For producer associations that have achieved a satisfactory level of operational independence through the IMARE project, such as the four IMARE I groups that have turned in good production and sale numbers, even after Mercy Corps withdrew its direct project support (see following section), future links to support networks may prove vital to their survival. Direct and even indirect support from Mercy Corps while the IMARE project remains active is a source for technical updates on crop management and business practices, but when the project ends, these groups will find themselves entirely on their own.

Participants across the board have responded extremely positively about the usefulness and value of the training. Training on good agricultural practices, on good business practices and on good manufacturing practices has been well received. The training on gender and on home economics issues is viewed equally as positive. The common theme seems to be that these clients have had so little formal socialization in their lives that to receive some now is to open doors on a world they did not know existed.

In addition to Mercy Corps’ IMARE training, participatory exchanges have also taken place. On July 18, 2012, a one-day gender conference was organized and hosted by Vital Voices in Quetzaltenango. There were 200 women were invited to participate in the event from different communities across the Western Highlands region, including 20 from IMARE II groups. There were three topics presented and
each woman could choose two, one for the morning session and one for the afternoon session. The topics included: (1) how to prepare a business budget, (2) how to use the computer/internet to find businesses online, and (3) how to create an email address and use it in business.

One woman from Cholá (Uspantán, Quiché) who attended from IMARE was enthusiastic about the experience. She participated in budget development and using the Internet to find businesses topics. Apart from the unique experience the topics offered her, she was equally as impressed with the opportunity to interact with other women from similar economic backgrounds from communities all across the region in a setting where the environment was about enhancing and improving their skill sets.

Sharing experiences and impressions with kindred spirits is empowering and fulfilling for participants. To sustain these linkages beyond IMARE would be to enhance and promote what IMARE has participated in starting. One of the realities of IMARE is that the training, capacity building, technical updating and the exchange of innovative ideas that take place as part of the project will end when the project ends.

**Institutional Capacity Building**

The prospects for sustainability beyond project life are good based on IMARE I experience. IMARE II has yet to complete one agriculture cycle in some of its associations and only one in others, offering up too few data to analyze and to indicate where they might be going. However, some IMARE I numbers suggest that prospects are positive. While Mercy Corps was making the shift to FtF departments, it stopped reporting on IMARE I group activity beginning in October 2010, but data were produced. Those data now show that in the 20 months from October 2010 to May 2012, four IMARE I groups sold a total of $1,710,035 of produce, compared to $990,952 worth of produce sold by the same four groups from April 2008 to September 2010. This would appear to be strong evidence that the activities under IMARE I have been effective, and are being built on following termination of project activities. Data are not available from the other 16 IMARE I groups.

The IMARE I experience suggests that IMARE II associations will enjoy measureable increases in household income. At the time of this evaluation, IMARE II has yet to complete one agriculture cycle in some of its associations and has only completed one in others, offering up too few data to analyze regarding impact. However, site visits showed that the training imparted by Mercy Corps to associations on good agricultural practices, good marketing practices and good business practices, are powerful. What members report is that they are learning concepts they never knew existed, especially those related to markets and business management. Also, training in good agricultural practices is very well received, especially when it comes to innovative technologies and crop diversification. Those already applying the concepts are seeing changes, and are likely to retain any new practices adopted on the experience of some of well-performing IMARE I groups.

Mercy Corps experience in IMARE I and now in IMARE II suggests that for newly formed groups about four years are needed for that association to reach a level of sustainability whereby it can maintain production volumes and standards for continued sales to formal markets such as Wal-Mart and PLANESA-Costco. For groups that were already functioning when they became involved in IMARE, the time frame is reduced to three years. However, other factors come into play including the group’s level of interest in developing and then consolidating a relationship with formal markets, and their business aptitude which, post-IMARE, enables them to seek out help on their own for new markets. The three to four years required to get a group to the transition point where they are able and willing to seek out new markets on their own is key.

There is no uniform classification for associations involved in IMARE. Some are weak and others have been around for several years and are strong. Training by Mercy Corps, as well as the experience gained
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5 From a Mercy Corps report on four post-IMARE I groups, Comité de Productores Los Altos Sololá, Comité Vista Hermosa Sololá, Esfuerzo Agrícola, Las Canoas.
by association clients in dealing with markets has strengthened associations visited on the field site tour. One association formed its own revolving seed fund by asking each of its ten members to contribute Q1000. Training on budget making and management seems to be effective. Some associations are using skills gained to prepare forward planning exercises to identify where they want to be in several years from now. IMARE training in the community is highly valued, especially by the women. Because of few education opportunities in their lives, the women don’t know what they don’t know and when they are exposed to development concepts, they soak them up like a sponge and are eager for more.

**IMARE and Local Government Capacity**

IMARE, through Mercy Corps, has built a strong department-level alliance with Government of Guatemala (GOG) as well as private sector entities. Active linkages have been established with the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAGA) and the Ministry of Economy (MINECO) both at the department level, municipalities, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (FIDA), the Organization for Agricultural and Microenterprise Development (ADAM), among others. Private entities that include Horti-Fruti, Grupo CEIS, MANCUERNA, Asociación ECO, SHARE, Plamar-MAGA, participate as product buyers, and providers of technical assistance for training, for credit support, and for other inputs. The alliance network appears to function as a team.

The alliance model developed by Mercy Corps through IMARE is impressive, and holds promise for GOG activities going forward. The model was on display as part of discussions to take place at the Second Western Regional Congress on Food Security and Nutrition, in Quetzaltenango, October 18-19, 2012, and specifically as it relates to meetings challenges to achieving food security and nutrition goals in Guatemala’s Western Highlands region. The strength of this alliance goes beyond the formative role that Mercy Corps has played. Nurtured correctly, the alliance could provide a good model of leverage for local and departmental level agencies and organizations to better achieve objectives of mutual interest.

The GoG’s Pacto Hambre Cero (Zero Hunger Pact) as well as other work carried out by the Secretaria de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutrición (SESAN), has led MAGA to restart its agricultural extension service after suspending it 15 years ago. The re-started service will have a three-person team in all municipalities (an agronomist, an assistant agronomist, and a home economist). The evaluation team understands that a budget has been assured for four years for this effort, getting underway currently in western departments. MAGA has asked Mercy Corps to provide training to its first cadre of extension teams in the IMARE project area.

The department-level alliance appears to be especially effective in working with 30 additional groups coming on line with IMARE II in the Palajujnoj valley of Quetzaltenango. All the agencies and institutions in the alliance will be providing complementary support to the 30 groups that are considered weak, but have been in existence for some years in most cases. Mercy Corps is orchestrating the main work and providing the guidance on training and expected results, but MAGA will provide some agricultural practices training along with Mercy Corps, FIDA will provide support for greenhouse construction and management, irrigation, and collection and packing of product. ADAM is expected to provide inputs relating to seedling production and distribution, and the Ministry of Economy, via international cooperation from the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA), will work with the groups to strengthen their internal management capability. As IMARE closes out, the inter-institutional alliance crafted by Mercy Corps has the potential for continued cooperation in the FtF area, and beyond as a means to bring pressure to bear on national level institutions to continue the work of improving the quality of life for small farmers and for reducing the incidence of chronic malnutrition.

**Gender and Under-Represented Populations**

Information on IMARE I shows that of 3,755 group members trained in Good Agricultural Practices, Good Business Practices and Good Manufacturing Practices, 704, or 19% of the total receiving training, were women. In terms of employment generated during IMARE I, Mercy Corps reports that 2,434 jobs
were created, of which about 30% were filled by women. One of the IMARE I associations visited (ASADIT), were employing women in the classification and bagging of potatoes for market. These were new jobs created by the project and are fairly steady throughout the year.

IMARE II work in this area is off to a strong start. Data show that of 65 groups brought into the IMARE II project, membership totals 1,158, with 468 being women and the remaining 690 being men. While the basic numbers say little about the meaningful participation of women in activities, Mercy Corps has a strong technical team that includes a gender specialist to impart training on the topic.

In the field, at association level, Mercy Corps is carrying out capacity building training and it is having an impact on association make up, not only in membership, but in leadership positions. In six IMARE II associations visited, a total of 26 positions of leadership were counted. Of these, eight positions (30% of the total) were held by women. When “promotora” positions are counted, five more women are involved in some kind of leadership role in their associations. One of the six IMARE II groups is a women’s organization whose individual members are growing produce for market. Only a little more than a year into IMARE II implementation, 228 women have received training through the project that includes management topics, and some of these women are active as members of their respective association governing boards. In IMARE II, agricultural training on technical topics has reached 674 women to date.

Data from IMARE I, e.g., the AKIANTO final evaluation report, suggest that households have experienced increased incomes, but no direct evidence is available or was observed during site visits that there was any change on purchasing decisions made by women, or other household decisions as a result. Also, gender equity as a specific target was not part of IMARE I.

It is a little early into IMARE II to determine if there is any impact in this regard, and too few IMARE I groups were visited to be able observe effects in that part of the project. However, interviews and discussions that did take place are hopeful with respect to achieving progress in this area in IMARE II associations. Families are aware of the uneven participation of men and women in productive roles, and certainly in reproductive roles, and are aware now because of Mercy Corps’ training given by its gender specialist. The exposure to and training on matters relating to gender equity is important and having an impact in IMARE II associations.

**Effects on Poverty or Malnutrition in Target Communities**

IMARE II associations have had little time to produce visible or measureable data. Nonetheless, the training activities presented by Mercy Corps, are having an early and important impact, especially on women. The training sessions, which are held at least once a month with each association (with their full membership both men and women), are highly valued. The women comment openly about the importance of these sessions on all the topics included, but especially those related to home economics, hygiene in the home, and food security issues. However, the training comes up short for women who are pregnant and lactating, and those with children under two years of age. When it comes to the basic message of malnutrition, women are instructed to go to the local health post. The basic information imparted in the training sessions is not complemented with one-on-one counseling that would address infant and under two feeding practices and maternal diet important to the first 1,000 days.

**Gender Assessment Recommendations**

The 2009 USAID gender assessment was yet to be completed when IMARE I was started, but was in place for the beginning of IMARE II. However, Mercy Corps informed the evaluation team that they have not studied the USAID report deeply enough to respond to all its recommendations in a formal way.

Indirectly, Mercy Corps has been responding, but recognizes that more needs to be done. The most relevant part of the USAID gender assessment for IMARE is the economic growth section. That section underscores the need for projects and programs to emphasize monitoring policy and institutional
reform efforts by gender; that to make value chains more efficient, gender needs to be taken into
account in planning and implementation; and that results be measured not solely in economic terms but
expanded to include gender related dynamics.

Based on those criteria, Mercy Corps has been applying the recommendations of the 2009 assessment.
Their Yearly Operating Plans for IMARE II specifically address an approach to include gender and to
empower women. Moreover, Mercy Corps activities for IMARE II gender activities are part of a
comprehensive strategy intended to link components that help both men and women improve their
skills. These include:

- The training activities that specifically address gender across all aspects of IMARE;
- Exchange visits with men and women of other associations;
- Participation of association members (both men and women) in regional seminars and meetings;
- Meetings of women and women leaders; and
- Opportunities to build self-esteem for women.

In sum, Mercy Corps has been implementing a gender strategy, but it is not linked formally to the 2009
Gender Assessment.

TIERRAS/LAND CONFLICT RESOLUTION (MERCY CORPS)
Project Results Framework
Mercy Corps has implemented the TIERRAS/Land Conflict Resolution project since 2003, but the most
recent cooperative agreement was signed in September 2007, extending the project through September
2013, in the amount of $2,200,000. The project falls under the Mission’s Strategic Objective 2,
Economic Freedom: Open, diversified and expanding economies, TIERRAS contributing to Intermediate
Result number 2, Laws, Policies and Regulations that Promote Trade and Investment.

Mercy Corps implements the project in close collaboration with its partner NGO in Alta Verapaz,
Associated Jurists for Legal Development (JADE), which provides the actual mediation services. In the
current project extension, the Mercy Corps team is operating in eight municipalities targeted for
current or imminent implementation of the GOG property cadaster, four in Alta Verapaz and four in
Quiché. In Quiché, mediation services are provided by the partner NGO the Association for Integrated
Multi-Sector Development (ADIM). A third local NGO partner, Association for Integral Rural
Development (ADRI) has joined the project under the 2010 extension to manage the public education
campaign. In addition, Mercy Corps identifies two government entities as partners, the regional offices
of the Secretariat of Agricultural Affairs (SAA) and the Land Fund (Fondo de Tierras).

The technical strength of ADR methodology of the TIERRAS project has been demonstrated over the
last nine years by the number of land conflicts resolved (281 as of September 2010), number of
indigenous families benefitted (25,346) and continued demand for services as well as by various internal
and external evaluations. For this reason, the scope of work of this mid-term evaluation is focused
principally on the specific objectives of the most recent September 30, 2010 to September 30, 2013
extension of the 2007 cooperative agreement, the three objectives, expected results, and indicators for
which are shown in the table below.
### TIERRAS Project Results Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Expected Results</th>
<th>Indicators/Targets</th>
<th>Results to Date (June 30, 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase the use of ADR processes by affected parties to reconcile differences over land issues, focusing primarily on 8 municipalities that are undergoing the RIC processes.</td>
<td>- Population of 4 municipalities of Alta Verapaz and 4 of Quiché aware of benefits of cadaster, ADR, and economic opportunities. - 100 land disputes resolved - 3 NGO and 2 GOG partners have knowledge and skills to continue ADR services.</td>
<td>- 3414 persons (2916 men; 458 women)</td>
<td>3414 persons (2916 men; 458 women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promote adoption of policies and actions that address the root causes of land conflicts.</td>
<td>- 2 land use policies promoted by department networks at national level - CM TIERRAS, Network of Quiché connected with 3 other networks in region to advance policy change. - 2 policies promoted by networks integrate gender considerations.</td>
<td>- 2 policy issues identified. Workshops and seminars by the advocacy networks. One workshop focused on gender integration. Validation of the topics with community leaders. Initial meeting of CM Tierras and Quiche Network with Peten Network to review approach to policy issues</td>
<td>2 policy issues identified. Workshops and seminars by the advocacy networks. One workshop focused on gender integration. Validation of the topics with community leaders. Initial meeting of CM Tierras and Quiche Network with Peten Network to review approach to policy issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enhance cooperation between municipal authorities and local community members, private sector interests, and local NGOs on land issues in Quiché and Alta Verapaz.</td>
<td>- Agreements reached on two contentious land issues as a result of collaborative processes in Quiche and Alta Verapaz. - 8 municipal land affairs offices are coordinating land information and ADR services - 8 MOUs in place with the Justice System and with municipalities</td>
<td>- # persons trained in conflict mitigation and resolution (Target: 40 community, municipal, and private sector leaders) - # persons served by the municipal agrarian affairs offices (Target: 8000) # MOUs signed among the NGOs, the local government, and the Justice System (Target: 8)</td>
<td>(reported indicator of 1707 persons “sensitized” does not match indicator in PMP) 713 persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Results and Sustainability**

Performance to date is measured by the indicators reported quarterly for each objective and result area. According to the most recent quarterly report (July 15, 2012, for Third Quarter FY2012, April through June), all indicators are on track and in conformance with the annual work plans and targets with the exception of the number of land conflicts resolved (Objective 1.2), the number of people receiving services in the Municipal Offices of Agrarian Affairs (Objective 3.2), and the signed Memoranda of Understanding among JADE and ADIM, the municipalities, and the Justice System for provision of ADR services (Objective 3.3).

The baseline values, indicators, and targets are tools for monitoring the progress of the project and to identify possible issues and/or needed revisions in implementation plans to achieve the intended project results. In the case of this evaluation (given the nine-year history of the project), the discrepancies between planned targets and results to date of interest are those tied to the new features of the program introduced in the current three-year extension.

The lag in the number of conflicts resolved is explained by three factors. Project implementation started late because of delays in signing sub-grant agreements, and when it did start the two organizations that
provide mediation services were understaffed. More importantly, the forceful removal of residents from properties (desalojos) in the two departments contributed to an atmosphere of confrontation rather than negotiation, complicating the task of “selling” the mediated non-violent approach in the region. In March 2011, 14 violent forceful displacements took place in the municipality of Panzos in Alta Verapaz. Only 14 of a targeted 40 conflicts were resolved during the first year, although the initial processes of investigation began on 59 additional cases. Through information and education activities in local communities, as well as an intensified program of training and certification for mediators, by the end of the third quarter of the second year, 54 cases had been resolved, and the implementers anticipate that the target of 100 cases will be achieved by the end of the project.

The other two indicators that are not on-track, the number of people served by the Municipal Agrarian Affairs Offices (OMAs) and the formal agreements of JADE, ADIM, and the municipal authorities with the Justice System, deserve more attention. Both are indicators of progress in building a sustainable municipal-level capacity to provide ADR services for land conflicts and to maintain the cadastral system being developed by the RIC. The OMA is the “one-stop shop” being created by the TIERRAS project in each of the eight target municipalities to provide ADR services and to provide communities and individuals with information and assistance to access local services related to agrarian issues. The low number of individuals receiving assistance, relative to targets, reflects both delays in establishing these offices and subsequent problems (discussed in the next section) in the institutionalization process.

According to the project implementers, the absence of formal coordination with the Justice System does not affect the current operations of the project since JADE and ADIM have an on-going working relationship with the Justice System Office of Alternative Conflict Resolution (RAC) but it does have implications for the institutionalization process (also discussed in the next section).

A second topic in assessing the progress to date is to examine the four new features of the TIERRAS Project under the 2010 extension.

1) **Focus of the mediation services in areas of cadastral-affected municipalities.**

The justification for this selection is two-fold. The RIC is being implemented first in the areas most affected by debilitating land conflicts as a step toward regularizing the land tenure system. The cadastral process will uncover latent conflicts and bring urgency to the resolution of existing conflicts. Therefore these municipalities also are a priority for the alternative land conflict resolution services provided by the TIERRAS project. Second, after the cadastral mapping process is complete, the municipality will be responsible for maintaining the cadastral information registry for that municipality. By concentrating services in these municipalities the TIERRAS project will support the establishment of the necessary municipal-level organizational structure to manage the cadaster and emerging conflicts into the future.

The TIERRAS information campaigns about the cadaster process and its benefits, types of land tenure, and indigenous community and individual rights are intended to reduce the resistance to the cadastral process while it is underway and to contribute to its maintenance (Objective 1.1). The project is on-track in implementation of this campaign among community leaders, local organizations, and the general population. All information, materials and activities are being designed to be culturally and gender sensitive and are transmitted in the local indigenous language. One mechanism in this process is the

---

6 The project is approximately one-quarter behind the initial targets for cases resolved. A case is considered to be resolved when both parties to the conflict sign the agreement that sets out the obligations and rights of the two sides in the conflict. While the resolution is not legally enforceable, Mercy Corps has a formal follow-up process for each resolution, at three, six, nine, and twelve months after the signing. Since 2010, only one agreement (between a brother and sister) has collapsed after signing. Resolution is not equivalent to closing a case. Some cases are dropped (closed) if the circumstances change so that non-judicial negotiation is not possible or one of the two parties withdraws from the process or decides to take the case to the courts. Others are closed because the parties reach an agreement during the course of the technical investigation without entering formal negotiations.

7 Materials are being designed and tested at this time. The evaluator was not able to provide an independent verification of cultural and gender sensitivity, or to assess the content of the campaign.
“people-to-people” exchange between groups of community leaders who have resolved conflicts through the ADR process and those who have pending conflicts. The evaluator observed a meeting of approximately 125 women representing the COCODES in Tucuru, Alta Verapaz who actively participated in a training session (approximately three hours) on types of land tenure and the cadastral process. The session was co-hosted by the Municipal Office of Women’s Affairs, the regional office of the RIC, and the TIERRAS Project. The presentation and discussion were in Q’eqchi’.

ADRI, the NGO partner responsible for the mass promotional and information campaign is currently finalizing and field-testing various media and techniques (e.g., radio spots, mobile units, information booths in the market, t-shirts, information pamphlets, etc.) An important next step will be the implementation of a monitoring instrument for the campaign to assess its impact and effectiveness by the project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) unit.8

2) **Enhancement of the role of the municipal authorities in coordinating land issues through technical and material support of municipal Land Affairs Offices.**

The rationale for the establishment of the OMAs is to establish an institutional structure for coordinating land issues during and after the cadastral process. As noted above two of the indicators for monitoring this set of activities suggest potential problems in achieving this result (Objective 3). This is discussed further in the next section under Institutional Capacity Building and Sustainability.

Two additional observations may be important to sustainability. First, the OMAs have been established in all eight of the project municipalities through formal agreements with the municipal councils whereby the municipality provides the office space and pays the staff person for the office. The TIERRAS project has provided the office equipment, operational guidelines, and training for the personnel in mediation, land and agrarian issues, and the institutional framework. The eight offices were established before the most recent elections. After the elections, five of the eight original staff changed, so that the training process must begin again.

The second observation is based on field visits to two OMAs, and is presented as suggestive and tentative. The OMA visited in a municipality where the RIC had not yet begun did not demonstrate the same clear definition of task or have the same level of request for services as the OMA in the municipality where the RIC is underway. The critical functions of the office seem to be linked to the implementation of the RIC so that timing of the establishment of the office may be important to sustainability.

3) **Use of a collaborative planning process in two pilot cases to demonstrate the effectiveness of collaboration as a tool in conflict prevention.**

The evaluator had no contact with the two pilot cases or validation of the collaborative planning process reported in the project annual and quarterly reports.9 According to the most recent quarterly reports one of the two cases (in Quiché) has been resolved successfully. The dispute in Alta Verapaz, involving a conflict related to hydroelectric development was still in process as of June 2012. The technical board involved in the collaborative process for each case includes the Comisión Presidencial de Derechos Humanos, Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos, Secretaria de Asuntos Agrarios, Asociación Juristas Asociados para el Desarrollo Legal y La Coordinadora Nacional Indígena y Campesina. The pilot cases are important not only to demonstrate the validity of the collaborative process to prevent conflict but also to document and explain this process to multiple audiences and decision-makers, and to

---

8 As an anecdotal observation, men were seen wearing the t-shirts on market day in Tucuru. They are probably appreciated as new items of clothing and do give visibility to the RIC, although their message of support, in Spanish, may be most effective with the more urban Spanish-speaking population.

9 This is a gap in the evaluation and deserves follow-up. According to the most recent quarterly report the documentation of the Quiché case is being done now and will be posted when it is complete. More time in the field would allow for an independent assessment of extent and reception of the collaborative planning process.
disseminate information about the process and the lessons learned in the case study. The plan for dissemination includes the local community and municipal stakeholders and departmental and national decision-makers. In addition the studies will be posted on the Mercy Corps RedTierras website.

4) Integration of gender equity concepts in each of the project initiatives emphasizing policies that address women’s access to land.

The evaluation of attention to gender issues in the project is discussed below under the heading “Gender and Under-represented Populations.” In short, both in program planning and implementation, the project evidences broad-based integration of gender considerations. Mercy Corps sought and was awarded a parallel two-year grant from USAID/Washington for Empowering Women’s Leadership in Conflict Resolution (EMA), which was implemented in four additional municipalities in Alta Verapaz. A third topic identified in the scope of work for evaluation of progress to date is the quality of data reported in the PMP and indicators, and the monitoring and evaluation system.

The monitoring and evaluation system for the project houses a detailed record of each step in the conflict resolution process and follow-up for each case, which includes historical and contextual information and scanned documentation of the technical investigations and all agreements as well as reports on all negotiation sessions and demographic, social, and economic data on the parties to the conflict. The folder for each case also houses maps, photographs, and a narrative description of the process. Documentation of activities and progress of each case under negotiation according to the ten-step agreement process is reported monthly by ADIM and JADE directly into the system. All person-level indicators are disaggregated by sex. Data quality is monitored by the M&E director via the system and through weekly visits in the field.

A baseline was established for all indicators through a random sample survey completed by the Mercy Corps monitoring and evaluation unit in the eight municipalities in early 2011 (precise date is unknown but the report was completed in June 2011), to be used to measure change in indicators at the conclusion of the project. The baseline survey measured level of information about the cadaster and alternative non-violent methods for dispute resolution in the general population, and among community and municipal leaders. People surveyed included representatives of local organizations in the municipalities and representatives of the level II Community Development Councils (COCODES) stratified by micro-regions in the municipalities. Baseline values also were established for organizational capacity of partner organizations and institutions, and knowledge about the ADR methodology for land conflict resolution. The organizational and institutional capacity indicators for Mercy Corps partner organizations, the departmental advocacy networks, and local governmental and municipal entities vary widely. Both JADE and CM-TIERRAS in Alta Verapaz have been a part of the TIERRAS project since its inception, while ADIM and Red Quiché began to work with Mercy Corps under the current cooperative agreement. Finally, in addition, the project (through CM-TIERRAS in Alta Verapaz and ADIM in Quiché), in coordination with the SAA, maintains an up-to-date database of the number and types of agrarian conflicts in each municipality. The baseline value for the conflict resolution indicator came from this database. The baseline methodology and definitions are clearly documented in detail providing a solid framework for a valid and reliable re-test at the end of the project. Project documents indicate that Mercy Corps plans that the final evaluation should be a participatory evaluation with explicit feedback to community leaders and targeted municipalities.

The majority of the indicators in the Performance Management Plan are output indicators of the number of people trained and reached through information campaigns, the number of OMAs established, number of MOUs signed, and others. As indicated in the PMP, the effectiveness of the information campaigns and capacity building is to be measured at both the midterm and the end of the project through a survey for comparison to baseline values, as well as through continuous field testing and monitoring. The indicator to measure achievement of the project purpose is change in the number of
violent incidents related to land conflicts. This variable is not within the manageable interest of the Mercy Corps project and is unlikely to be achieved. The level of conflict in the region has accelerated in recent years because of emerging land use demands including mining, sugar cane, African palm, and generation of hydroelectricity that conflict with the traditional coffee plantations and the needs of the resident indigenous communities. Further, the implementation of the cadastral surveys and mapping brings to light additional latent conflicts. The indicator should be violent incidents avoided, which cannot be measured directly.

Finally, the ongoing follow-up and monitoring of the conflict resolution agreements and of the effectiveness of the information campaigns are essential components of project implementation and of the project M&E system to measure results and sustainability. Field visits are made to each conflict site at three-month intervals for a year after the agreement is signed to monitor compliance, and to take additional action if needed. On the other hand, the M&E system and the PMP provide no information on the sustainability of the municipal-level institutional component of the project, which is intended to provide for continuing ADR service delivery after the project ends.10

**Institutional Capacity Building**

The underlying focus of the three-year extension of the TIERRAS project is to provide for the sustainable transfer and expansion of the capacity for non-violent resolution of agrarian issues and land conflicts to local organizations and institutions. Three aspects of the project objectives are important in this context.

**Strengthening Institutional Capacity at the Municipal Level:** First, a clear objective of the three-year extension is to strengthen the institutional capacity of the municipality to manage the cadastral information system and provide services related to agrarian and land tenure issues, including ADR. The eight Municipal Offices of Agrarian Affairs (OMAs) have been established by the project as the base for this function.

The project has signed a series of memoranda of understanding with national and municipal institutions to strengthen inter-institutional coordination in the short-term. These agreements are between Mercy Corps and the RIC, the SAA, the Land Fund (Fondo de Tierras), and each of the eight municipalities. The request from Mercy Corps for a signed memorandum of understanding with the Justice System for collaboration with the RAC, through the Centro de Mediación de Conflictos Agrarios in Cobán, was formally denied on legal terms, in a letter from the Presidency of the Justice System to Mercy Corps (August 2012).11 The MOUs are a relatively new instrument used by the TIERRAS project under the current cooperative agreement to strengthen collaboration among institutions in the rural areas rather than only at the departmental and national levels.

Under the terms of these agreements, the project is providing coordination services and smoothing relationships among the entities (especially between the national government entities and the municipalities), providing training to the local staff of these agencies, developing diagnostics (e.g., the elaboration of the Plan de Participación Indígena for the RIC), and developing materials for information campaigns. The project works particularly closely with the regional offices of the RIC.12 For example, in La Tinta, Alta Verapaz, the TIERRAS and RIC teams have a joint annual operational plan and hold monthly coordination meetings. The RIC and the TIERRAS project also participate in the monthly

---

10 In fairness, it is probably not realistic to require a measure of institutional sustainability because it is a long-term process beyond the scope of the three-year project.

11 Without a formal tie to the Justice System, the mediated agreements of the TIERRAS project are not legally binding. According to the project team this is not a significant constraint, first because the agreements are reached in the spirit of good-faith negotiation and not legal “threats”, and second, because lack of compliance has not been an issue to date.

12 In a meeting with the RIC team in La Tinta, the evaluation team was told that the RIC has no funding for the “social aspects” of cadaster implementation but only for the technical aspects. TIERRAS supports the RIC in this part of the task—to quote, it “humanizes” the RIC. (group interview, La Tinta, September 10, 2012)
meetings of the Land Committee (Comisión de Tierras) of the Municipal Development Council (COMUDE), which also includes representatives of the Land Fund, RIC, OMA, and SAA, as applicable. The project has provided workshops for this and other COMUDE Land Committees on topics like the agrarian conflicts, types of tenure, and indigenous rights. These findings about institutional capacity building raise several concerns about sustainability and long-term viability after the TIERRAS project ends.

- The political vulnerability of the OMAs: The OMAs are offices of the municipality, created by Mercy Corps but funded and staffed by the municipality. Mercy Corps, with the two departmental advocacy networks (CM TIERRAS and Red Quiché) has included the development of the legal mandate for the OMAs as one of two national policy issues to be pursued during the extension (outcome pending), and has prepared Operational Guidelines for the OMA and an Operational Handbook for the staff. However, as suggested by the turnover in OMA staff after the election and the subsequent necessity to re-visit the topic with the new municipal governments and train the new staff, the OMA appears to be a relatively fragile entity vulnerable to changes in local political priorities and municipal budgets. Resources for training staff are a particular concern as well as the maintenance of linkages with the network of other organizations involved with agrarian issues at the local level, particularly after the RIC has been completed.

- The lack of sufficient and stable funding for ADR implementation: The USAID/Guatemala Land Conflict Assessment (2005) lauds the strength of the Mercy Corps conflict resolution model and project, noting the importance of adequate funding and personnel to carry out the necessary technical investigations, the on-site visits and discussions, and the negotiation process to use the ADR process successfully.

- The government agencies that have a mandate to provide ADR services for land conflicts (the SAA and the RAC) are underfunded and vulnerable to changing political priorities. The RAC Center for Land Conflict Mediation in Cobán serves the entire country and has a staff of two. The SAA, which was created under the Peace Accords, is an arm of the Presidency. It is not included in the national budget and its level of resources varies according to the priorities of the President. For example, the SAA budget was reduced dramatically under President Colom, compared to previous administrations, but the current president has expressed support for it. The visit to the SAA regional office in La Tinta confirmed the tight budget since it had no vehicles, the land surveyor position had not been filled, and only one of two mediator positions was filled. (The mediator who was present had held the position for only three months and had no formal training for mediation.)

- The inability to construct a formal relationship between the municipality (OMA) and the Justice System raises a question about the framework of support, follow-up, and legitimacy for resolution.

Note that without the quarterly reports for FY 2011, I am unable to cite specific data on these workshops. This information is drawn from key informant interviews with project staff.

Guatemala does not have a tradition of qualified civil service. Turnover of staff after elections occurs at all levels of government.

One option is that the Mercy Corps partner NGOs and advocacy networks will have the technical capacity to provide this training and support the mediation functions of the OMA. The continuous training and certification of mediators with JADE and ADIM under the current project is intended to create the capacity for them to carry on the ADR land conflict resolution independently.

According to the RIC agreement, the SAA should have an office in each RIC area to deal with land conflicts. The SAA is to receive the land conflict or agrarian issue, review and classify it, and channel it to the appropriate organization for resolution. At present, the OMA receives cases that are appropriate for ADR, land title issues are transferred to the Land Fund, and more complex conflicts may be transferred to the court system. According to project staff, the system does not in fact function this way at present. The OMA and the TIERRAS project often receive direct requests for ADR assistance through less formal word-of-mouth channels.
agreements mediated by the OMA, in the absence of the TIERRAS project and the RIC. Again, the proposed Rural Development Law may address this issue.

**Strengthening the Operational Capacity of Partner Organizations:** Second, the project seeks to strengthen the technical and operational capacity of the NGO partner organizations (JADE and ADIM) so that they can provide the ADR services for land conflicts independently. Training and mentoring in conflict mediation has been a core activity of Mercy Corps since 2003. The local NGO partners, JADE and ADIM, manage the cases and conduct the mediation processes. The measure of the result of this training is the number of conflicts resolved (as noted above), and the comparison of pre- and post-measures of knowledge of ADR and agrarian conflicts, to be done as part of the end-of-project evaluation.\(^{17}\)

Three activities for strengthening mediation capacity were reported during the first year of the extension. First, a meeting was convened of representatives of the Mercy Corps partners (JADE, ADIM, ADRI, SAA, and the Land Fund) and municipal land commissions to exchange information about the mediation process for land conflicts, so that all the relevant entities operate with the same set of expectations. Second, a short-course (*diplomado*) was designed and facilitated by the Fundación Propaz\(^{18}\) for training and certifying mediators. The 96-hour course, “Mediación de Conflictos Agrarios con Enfoque de Género—Una Alternativa para la Paz” was completed by 27 persons (12 men and 15 women), who were then certified by Propaz as mediadores agrarios.\(^{19}\) Third, Mercy Corps contracted a consultant from Vantage Partners, an expert in alternative dispute resolution, to work with the Mercy Corps team to refine and systematize the model for land conflict resolution and incorporate gender considerations. The 20 hours of training were attended by 23 people (19 men and 4 women).

In the second year, a “mediation clinic” was attended by 40 people (24 men, 16 women), including the mediators trained during year 1 as well as representation from other NGOs and government organizations, to reinforce the mediation training through presentation of new mediation techniques, and discussion of methods used in difficult situations. In addition, according to project documentation but not independently verified, new mediators are mentored by accompanying experienced mediators. The series of activities including initial training and certification, mentoring, and continuing education through mediation clinics has evolved through the nine years of the program and is a strong model. An additional point, gleaned through conversations in the field visits, is that there is shortage of trained agrarian mediators and of experienced people to work at the local level on agrarian issues. Mercy Corps training of mediators is filling an important gap in this area.

Organizational strengthening with the Mercy Corps NGO partners, especially JADE and ADIM, has been an on-going process since the initiation of the program, but it is not directly addressed under the current project extension. It is occurring to the extent that the organizations work closely as a team with an integrated project staff structure.

One concern raised by review of the information on technical capacity-building, without a direct evaluation of the content or effectiveness of the training, is the gap that will be created in workforce training when the Mercy Corps project ends. At present there is no mechanism, either through an NGO or a training entity, to provide this training in a systematic and continuous manner. Further, both the training and the ADR process have a cost. JADE and ADIM will not be able to continue to provide these services to the target indigenous population without a funding or payment-for-services

---

\(^{17}\) No information was provided on the number of cases closed without resolution during the course of the extension or the reasons for discontinuing them, although this analysis could be done using the project database and would provide another indirect measure of mediation effectiveness.

\(^{18}\) Fundacion Propaz is a national NGO, formed by the Organization of American States during the peace project, which conducts training and certification of mediators as one of its core functions.

\(^{19}\) This included 2 each from JADE, ADIM, and ADRI, 8 from FUNDEMI for the EMA project, 6 from Mercy Corps, and 7 from the OMA project.
mechanism. In fact, ADR services are specified as a government function to be performed by the RAC and the SAA. They are currently being provided by NGOs by default.

**Building Mechanisms and Capacity for Land Conflict Prevention:** The third aspect of strengthening institutional capacity in the project extension concerns the local and regional capacity for conflict prevention through policy definition and advocacy. The departmental social action networks, CM Tierras (Coordinadora Multi-sectoral de Tierra), established in 2004 and Red Quiché (La Red de Atención a la Conflictividad de Quiché), which started in 2009, are voluntary associations composed of government, non-governmental, and campesino organizations, educational institutions, and interested individuals who are committed to minimizing agrarian conflict. Mercy Corps has supported the establishment of these networks, has worked with them in formalizing their structure, and, until recently, has provided funding for activities. The networks research and define policy issues and convene seminars and other events to educate themselves and the public about the issues and to advocate for policy change.

Under the current project, Mercy Corps continues to assist the two organizations in strengthening their operations through development of operational plans and budgets. In addition, in accordance with the project objectives, the two networks have worked together to define two main policy agenda items to carry to the national level—the legal designation of the OMAs and legal outline for formalizing tenure regulations in the municipal ejido lands in Quiché. As of the third quarter of this year, the regulations had been drafted and were under discussion and review within the networks. A third policy topic that has been pursued by both networks, at least in terms of educating the member organizations is attention to gender considerations in agrarian issues and conflicts, and policies to increase women's access to land. Finally, the project calls for expansion of the network to a regional level by linking these two organizations with the Mesas del Sur de Petén to increase the potential national impact of the advocacy efforts. Initial in-person meetings among the three organizations have occurred. No further information was obtained about this regional organization. In addition, the three networks have been linked virtually through the on-line network, Red Tierras.

Several concerns are highlighted based on the review of project documentation and presentations and discussions with network representatives.

- Each association has a core of committed members (CM Tierras reports 16 active organizations at this time) who meet regularly (as much as weekly, when necessary) and implement educational events and training that are well received and attended. Both associations have invested considerable effort in defining their purpose and operational plans. The principal concern voiced in discussion with the members is funding. Neither association has a structure or plan to raise money for their activities (from member organizations or events, for example), and until now have functioned exclusively through grants.
- The Red Tierras platform is attractive, accessible, and populated mostly by videos and blogs of experiences in Guatemala and Colombia. Because access to most of the specific items on the website is password controlled no further assessment of the content or program utility is possible at this time. The website is maintained by Mercy Corps for its programs rather than to meet specific USAID objectives.

**Gender and Under-Represented Populations**

The scope of work for the evaluation calls for an examination of attention to gender considerations in the project on two levels: the implementer’s actions to respond to the USAID Gender Assessment

---

20 The networks also have received institutional support and funding from other donors, especially the German Government.

21 Municipal ejidos are communal lands of varying size, used in the past as forest reserves, or community agricultural or grazing lands. Today they are sometimes used by individual households but cannot be owned. (See Universidad de San Carlos, Tesis de Maestria, Facultad de Ingenieria, 2010, “Gestion Municipal a la Regularizacion de Tierras en el Area Urbana del Municipio de Santa Maria Nebaj, Department of Quiche. Humberto Rivera Santiago.)
recommendations; and, the effect of project activities on women’s roles in conflict resolution and access to land. On these topics, the TIERRAS project provides examples of good practices that are reflected in project results.

In responding to USAID’s requirements for attention to gender issues in project implementation, Mercy Corps defined its mandate as the integration of gender into all aspects of the program. Examples of this integration have been cited throughout the report. In addition, in September 2010, Mercy Corps submitted a proposal to the USAID/Washington (former) Office of Women in Development, and was awarded a grant for the two-year Empowering Women’s Leadership in Conflict Resolution (EMA) project (January 2011-December 2012), as a parallel activity to the TIERRAS project. EMA is implemented in four other municipalities of Alta Verapaz by Mercy Corps and its partner organization, Fundación para el Desarrollo y Educación de la Mujer Indígena (FUNDEMI-Talita kumi). The three objectives of the project are:

1) Indigenous women negotiate and mediate peaceful resolution of agrarian conflicts.
2) Agrarian policy making processes include greater participation of indigenous women leaders.
3) Best practices in increasing indigenous women’s leadership in agrarian conflict resolution adopted.

The EMA project is important for this evaluation because it has been a vehicle for investigation and articulation of the gender and indigenous women’s issues associated with agrarian policy and conflict resolution, and as a part of its work plan, has worked with the TIERRAS team to integrate these issues into the TIERRAS ADR methodology and policy agenda. Mercy Corps designed the project and applied for the funding to strengthen integration of gender issues into the land conflict resolution processes and agrarian issues. As a gender equity mechanism, the specific EMA project results are interlinked with the ongoing capacity of the TIERRAS activities to promote gender equality. EMA has trained and certified eight indigenous women as agrarian mediators (through the TIERRAS short-course in 2011, discussed above), and by the end of the project, these mediators will have resolved 20 agrarian conflicts.

EMA has prepared workshops and seminars for CM Tierras and the Red Quiché about gender and agrarian conflict, and participated in the preparation of materials for the information campaign to support the RIC. In collaboration with the Mercy Corps home office, EMA has presented project-specific gender training, on several occasions, for the TIERRAS technical staff. During the current project extension, the ADR methodology for land conflict resolution was re-worked to include a gender focus, and EMA has collaborated with CM Tierras and Red Quiché to build a gender focus into the two policy issues (legal and operational definition of the OMAs and plan for tenure regularization in the municipal ejidos) identified for the advocacy networks. EMA and FUNDEMI have actively participated in the educational and promotional campaigns to expand the participation of women and particularly indigenous women. For example, they used direct outreach to the COCODES to ensure that the delegations of community leaders participating in the people-to-people exchanges between communities that have and have not resolved land conflicts through mediation include women leaders as well as men. Mercy Corps also has collaborated actively with the Municipal Offices for Women (OMM), and as a result of the EMA project, the Defensoria de la Mujer Indígena (DEMI) also has taken part in TIERRAS workshops and seminars. These successful direct efforts to ensure that women and especially indigenous women are included in all activities are particularly noteworthy in this case because the arena of agrarian issues and land tenure historically has been a preeminently male domain. The integration of gender issues and the importance given to women’s role in agrarian and land conflict issues is highlighted in all TIERRAS publications and project documentation, including the virtual network www.redtierras.org.

The effect of this attention to gender in project implementation on gender equality and women’s land rights in Alta Verapaz and Quichéé is more difficult to measure and has not been contemplated as a part

---

22 USAID EMA grant agreement, APS-OAA-10-000005, 2010.
of the monitoring and evaluation plan of the project. The fact that women were present in nearly equal numbers as men in the community meetings attended by the evaluator during the field visits, and that they spoke and voiced opinions was surprising and may be an indirect and anecdotal reflection of this effect. In the training session in Tucuru for women representatives from the COCODES in the municipality that covered the topics of land tenure rights and the RIC (described above), the interest displayed and the questions asked were not those of passive observers.

Finally, in reference to the question posed by the evaluation scope of work about attention not only to gender but also to under-represented populations (i.e., indigenous groups), the explicit focus of the TIERRAS project from its inception has been not only to provide a mechanism for peaceful conflict resolution and to prevent violence in agrarian issues, but also to deliver services that are accessible to rural indigenous communities. These communities do not have the resources (financial, informational) or the power and contacts to regularize and protect their access and rights to land through traditional channels. The TIERRAS project brings the ADR services to the rural areas, and provides these communities with the technical legal and field research and documentation, and the platform to negotiate as equals.

This principle also underlies the institutionalization process in the current project extension with the focus on municipal-level services and networks and the creation of the OMAs as easily accessible service and information centers. It also is reflected in the support the project has given to the regional offices of the RIC in the preparation of the Plan for Participation of Indigenous Populations (PPI), and in the public education campaign to information about the 2007 UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (of which Guatemala is a signatory). In the community meetings attended by the evaluator, the community leaders clearly articulated the importance of the TIERRAS work in terms of providing them with information, technical support, and a forum for negotiation among equals that they did not have before.

**Summary Findings and Conclusions**
During the last nine years of the project, Mercy Corps has identified a core rural development problem in Guatemala and has developed a model and mechanism to respond to this problem that is effective in resolving land conflicts without violence, and makes conflict resolution accessible to the under-represented, poor indigenous communities. The evaluation raises concerns about potential barriers and shortcomings in the institutionalization and sustainability of these services.

In providing the ADR services in rural land conflicts, Mercy Corps and its partner NGOs are to some extent providing services that are nominally included in the mandate of government institutions. This situation, in which the chronic underfunding of state institutions leaves gaps in essential public functions and non-governmental and private sector organizations step in to meet these needs, is not unusual in Guatemala. It does, however, complicate the task of defining an exit strategy for the project which involves the return of these functions to the public sector without leaving a big hole.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CURRENT ACTIVITIES**

**INCLUSIVE MARKET ALLIANCE FOR RURAL ENTREPRENEURS (MERCY CORPS)**
From the findings and conclusions of the IMARE project evaluation emerge several actionable recommendations for USAID/Guatemala and Mercy Corps that merit consideration as the project goes forward:

---

23 In the two meetings with a community in Alta Verapaz that has completed the mediation process and one in Quiché, where the mediation is still in process, women were hesitant to speak, in part because of language barriers. When the mediators addressed them directly, they responded in terms that demonstrated their knowledge and involvement in the community discussions about the conflict.
1) Conduct a study of Phase I groups to determine impact.

Many of the associations in IMARE I appear to have achieved a level of sustained success. This observation comes from the reports of at least four of the IMARE I groups continuing to provide formal markets like Wal-Mart with quality produce without any direct involvement of Mercy Corps, or the other IMARE I partners at the production and association management level. IMARE I worked with 20 groups, grouped into two levels. About two-thirds were level-two and ready to produce and sell to formal markets almost immediately, though some needed management and production help to be able to reach formal market standards, and about a third were made up of post land-conflict groups facing more challenges than level-two groups. The common thread across these two levels of associations was the fact that they were all organized under IMARE, i.e., no group had a prior history as a formal association. A fuller understanding of what has become of all 20 groups could shed light on the impact of IMARE I, both in terms of institution building, and on their productive and management capacities. Lessons might be extracted that would enrich the understanding of the value chains approach with small producers that could in turn be applied to IMARE II groups.

2) Link USAID community health and nutrition programs with IMARE II communities.

Mercy Corps’ FY 2012 Yearly Operating Plan describes the work of its food security technician in providing training events on health and nutrition, and carrying out periodic health and nutrition assessments in children under five years of age and of pregnant and nursing mothers. The project description for the IMARE II cooperative agreement makes reference to “additional indicators to respond to the FtF activities being incorporated during the development of the PMP and will be monitored during project implementation.” Other FtF documentation such as the Value Chains RFA (RFA-520-11-000003) refers to “the objective of the proposed Value Chains Project being to **improve household access to food** by expanding and diversifying rural income and to contribute to improving the nutritional status of families benefitted under the program….and, this will be accomplished by expanding the participation of poor rural households in productive value chains….in coordination with nutrition-related activities aimed at **improving food utilization** and that are implemented by P.L. 480 Title II Food Security Program and health program partners.” The powerful association-level training package that Mercy Corps is delivering through IMARE II is introducing pregnant and lactating women and mothers of infants under two, to concepts about nutrition, hygiene and health. The training also encourages these women to go to their local health post, which is sometimes nearby, but often distant, and then only staffed one or two days a week. Given that IMARE, even in the remotest of communities, is having a positive impact on increasing household productivity, and by extension, household income—even when their new production is sold in informal markers—association women and their infants would greatly benefit from a social and behavior change communication component with one-on-one interpersonal counseling and home visits to directly improve infant and young child feeding practice and maternal health. Real and measurable impact on malnutrition could be achieved if a USAID health and nutrition project were located in communities where IMARE was working. If USAID Nutri Salud contract municipalities include any IMARE II communities, a concerted effort should be made to ensure that those IMARE communities receive direct benefits from Nutri Salud and that the project’s presence be coordinated with Mercy Corps. The complementary effects of the two interventions could have real and sustained impact on achieving the ultimate goal of FtF which is to reduce chronic malnutrition.

3) Incorporate a Forward Transition component into IMARE II.

The IMARE value chains program centers on small farmers who own and cultivate an average of ten cuerdas (about 0.44 hectares of land). However, despite the small size of the plots, the application of innovative crops complemented by Mercy Corps’ training in good agricultural practices and good business practices is yielding positive results in virtually all the associations they are working in. From what was observed, virtually all participating households are experiencing some increase in household income, and thereby, an improvement in their quality of life. Improvements are as small as being able to
purchase meat more than once a month as a result of the new income, or experiencing increases in income by as much as several hundred percent, enabling the household to invest in more agricultural inputs, additional food for the home, afford school costs, make home improvements, among other new expenditures. But the reality is that these improvements are likely to be limited to the current household. Most association members are made up of younger families, with small and young children numbering from three to seven. Given the small land holding, and the tendency and tradition to bequeath land to children, the average current IMARE direct beneficiary will eventually have his land divided up through his children’s inheritance such that the family will not be able to effectively earn a living from agriculture in a few short years from now. At best, an inheriting child will have a few square meters of land to grow some milpa as an expression of tradition, but any viable agriculture beyond the current family will be out of the question. This scenario creates a need for each household to have and to develop a forward vision for their household so that the transition out of agriculture for the children is accommodated in a productive and positive way. Adopted as an additional component of the current household management training imparted by Mercy Corps, this would include topics and workshops directed at helping and guiding households to develop a forward transition vision that they work on continually over time.

4) **Develop a network(s) via internet that link(s) all Phase I and Phase II groups.**

Direct and even indirect support from Mercy Corps while the IMARE project remains active is a source for technical updates on crop management and business practices, but when the project ends, these groups will find themselves entirely on their own. This may not be serious problem for groups that reach a high level of self-reliance and confidence, but having a network or larger institution to turn to as times and markets change may prove helpful for many groups who graduate from the IMARE project going forward. Similarly, the success, and even the trials, of IMARE I groups could benefit associations in IMARE II, were there a network linking them in some way. Experiences of successful IMARE I groups could serve as incentives and examples for IMARE II groups. A network could also provide a market support mechanism for product supply when occasional shortfalls in quantity of a product occur in one group, alerting other groups in the network that might have product available to make up the difference to complete a shipment for market. At a general level, successes of some IMARE I associations, and the positive start to IMARE II groups, have yielded a large number of experienced growers and association members. Cross fertilization of ideas and experiences could enhance and enrich the path forward for other groups, and also reinforce all the groups by way of their mutual interests. Mercy Corps has discussed the concept of forming a network or networks among IMARE associations, but has yet to put the idea into practice. A mechanism and an organizing principal needs to be identified for one or more such networks. Computer based networks hold promise and should be pursued.24

5) **USAID should consider a distance learning effort as a follow up to IMARE.**

It has been noted just how powerful the Mercy Corps home management training sessions have been, especially among the women. Women are finding the home economics, health and hygiene messages, and the field production and association management and business/marketing training to be excellent and empowering for them. Those who have had opportunities to participate in training conferences with women from around the region have found them be especially empowering and informative. Men have also commented that the training is important and even life altering when discussing the innovative technologies they have experienced such as the macro tunnels for tomato production, or learning to classify vegetable production for formal markets. One dimension that both good business practices and good agricultural practices share is the evolution of ideas, technologies, and approaches to doing things. As FtF evolves and matures and as projects such as IMARE come to an end, associations will lose easy and familiar access to ways to update their knowledge on innovations currently provided by the project.

24 There are an estimated 19 million cell phones in Guatemala. The ubiquity of computers is not far behind, especially given advances and price breaks occurring with tablet computers.
Maintaining the flow of updated information to associations would be an obvious way to sustain impact and to protect USAID investment in IMARE. A distance learning module that would begin in the final year of IMARE and continue indefinitely thereafter, with messages designed around supporting the technical and innovative information beamed to F2F areas by radio and computer/podcast would be one way to replace people driving to the communities to present training sessions or sending them to participatory conferences. Once people learn to learn, gaining new information is always welcome.

6) **IMARE Producers HANDLED OFF to ANACAFE and AGEXPORT.**

Mercy Corps through IMARE and in cooperation with other agencies and ministries of the GOG as well as private sector entities has been effective in creating some fairly strong producer associations in IMARE I. Similar outcomes can be expected with IMARE II groups. Some and maybe all IMARE II producer groups will reach a level of good business and good agricultural practices acumen that they are able to transition to a modest level of independence and perhaps even reach a point where they can search out new markets on their own. But even if some or more than a few, achieve a good degree of self-confidence and independence, staying linked to the industry and to changes in the flow of information about markets will ensure their sustainability. As has been observed, IMARE has served to not only train up producer groups, but also as the conduit and source of new information on markets and technology as conditions have changed. Once IMARE is gone from the picture, successful groups run the risk of losing some of their edge if they are unable to keep abreast of events and changes in the market. ANACAFE and AGEXPORT will continue on as successful non-governmental organizations in the agricultural value chains arena. Therefore, IMARE groups able to continue meeting formal market standards on their own should be incorporated into ANACAFE or AGEXPORT market networks at the end of the project.

7) **Mercy Corps Needs to Reflect USAID Gender Assessment Recommendations.**

While Mercy Corps has been assertive in including gender concerns in the planning and implementation of IMARE II, including the development of a strategy, it has yet to respond in a formal way to the USAID Gender Assessment (March 2009). USAID should ensure that a copy of the assessment has been shared with Mercy Corps, and that the next annual work plan reflect the assessment’s recommendations.

8) **Exchange of Best Practices.**

The experiences of both IMARE I and IMARE II warrant comparison with other actors in rural value chains such as ANACAFE and AGEXPORT. Creating an opportunity for Mercy Corps to exchange experiences with ANACAFE and AGEXPORT to compare and contrast successes, how they overcame challenges, and to explore future relationships for successful IMARE associations that graduate from IMARE might be useful to consider.

TIERRAS / LAND CONFLICT RESOLUTION (MERCY CORPS)

From the findings and conclusions of the TIERRAS project evaluation several actionable recommendations for USAID/Guatemala and Mercy Corps merit consideration as the project goes forward:

1) **Mercy Corps should improve outreach and information dissemination activities.**

One characteristic of the Mercy Corps project that came to light during the course of the evaluation is that people in Guatemala City do not really know much about the project or what it does. The work and the results are not very visible at the national level or within the development community, and this isolation limits the effectiveness of the project in terms of its overall goal to contribute to peace in Quiché and Alta Verapaz. While the program is small relative to the scope of the agrarian land issues in Guatemala it is a strong model for non-violent conflict resolution with proven effectiveness. Mercy Corps might consider developing a strategy for a promotional or information campaign to increase the knowledge about and support for the model at the national level.
2) **Mercy Corps should improve targeted communications.**

Along this same line, one of the results of the current project is the use of a collaborative planning and negotiation process to resolve conflicts in two cases that have implications for big issues in rural land use in the region such as the development of mining or hydroelectricity. One of these two cases has been completed and the documentation process is underway. The utility of these cases beyond the immediate conflict resolution depends on getting the word out—watching the way in which the steps in the process develop to arrive at a final agreement in a situation that could easily have become violent. Again, the recommendation calls for a communication strategy that takes it out of its immediate arena.

3) **USAID should give priority to making the OMAs institutionally sustainable.**

The evaluation highlights a series of concerns about the sustainability of the OMAs as the mechanism to transfer and continue the TIERRAS project functions in the municipalities, particularly after the RIC is completed—even on a transitional basis pending a new Rural Development Law. USAID/Guatemala has many years of experience in the area of municipal strengthening and decentralization that might provide insights or lessons to confront these concerns. The recommendation is that USAID consider establishing a forum for exchange and discussion between these two sectors.

4) **Mercy Corps should advise on fundraising options for key institutions.**

The advocacy network(s) of public and private organizations are not sustainable as voluntary organizations without a reliable source of funding. Mercy Corps should consider providing technical assistance, perhaps through specialized external consultants, on fundraising options for CM Tierras and Red Quiché.

5) **USAID should insist that a plan is in place for the disposition and effective maintenance of the Mercy Corps database of conflict cases.**

The Mercy Corps database to track conflict cases is an essential record of the process of negotiation in each case, the agreement reached, and the obligations of the two parties. It is also the only record of these cases since the TIERRAS operations have no formal link to the court system or to the SAA. A plan should be in place for the disposition and maintenance of this system when the project ends.

6) **Mercy Corps should develop a legacy plan for Alternative Dispute Resolution training and certification.**

Consideration should be given to a plan for formalizing the current important role that the project has assumed in training and certifying agrarian mediators. ADR services for land conflicts cannot be expanded or maintained in the absence of trained personnel.
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SECTION C - STATEMENT OF WORK

C.1 BACKGROUND

Consistent with the new Evaluation Policy, the end-of-project and mid-term performance evaluations will enable USAID/Guatemala Economic Growth Office to evaluate whether projects are achieving the desired results, and will help inform future project design, implementation, and effectiveness. These projects fall under two broad categories, the Feed the Future Initiative and the Global Climate Change Initiative. USAID/Guatemala is both a Feed the Future Initiative focus country as well as participant in the Global Climate Change initiative. These initiatives share a strong monitoring and evaluation component to track ongoing activities, measure the results, and make corrections as necessary.

The Feed the Future Initiative (FTF) is a country-led, multi-stakeholder initiative to reduce global hunger and end poverty in over 20 countries around the world, including Guatemala. The world-wide initiative began in 2010, and will continue in Guatemala at least through 2016. Although they began before the FTF strategy was in place, all projects to be evaluated under this task order fall under the FTF strategy, except TIERRAS Land Conflict Resolution. USAID/Guatemala is focusing FTF projects on issues of “food security” for vulnerable populations, which most often include rural, indigenous communities. Food security is characterized as access, utilization, and availability. Food insecurity in Guatemala does not result from inadequate national or local food supplies (availability), but instead is caused by the inability of the poor to access food due to inadequate incomes, as well as by uninformed consumption decisions and feeding practices that lead to poor food utilization. FTF projects, therefore, focus on income generation and nutritional education for rural small households.

Current USAID/Guatemala projects for the Global Climate Change Initiative (GCC) include using sustainable landscapes funding to continue the Mission’s long-term commitment to market-driven conservation and sustainable forestry management in the Maya Biosphere Reserve and other important forested landscapes in the country. The Maya Biosphere Reserve and similar protected areas serve as important areas for carbon sequestration. The Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala project and the Community Tourism Alliance project, implemented by Rainforest Alliance and Counterpart International, fall under GCC guidance.

C.2 SCOPE OF WORK

This Task Order requires the contractor to evaluate the effectiveness of USAID/Guatemala Economic Growth Office projects at the strategic and individual project levels to validate or improve USAID’s approach and to learn from results. Performance evaluations of these projects will look at the high-level results as they relate to each project’s objectives (See in Attachment J.1). This portfolio consists of agricultural and environmental value chain projects supporting Strategic Objective 2 “Open, Diversified, and Expanding Economies” under the USAID/Guatemala strategy. The end-of-project and mid-term evaluations will also inform new project implementation under the new five-year Country Development and Cooperation Strategy (CDCS). The success of these project components will heavily influence upcoming FTF and

2 For more information, see http://www.feedthefuture.gov
3 Annex B of USAID/Guatemala FTF Multi-year strategy
4 The CDCS for Guatemala is pending approval as of February 2012.
GCC strategy implementation. As such, USAID/Guatemala needs to thoroughly understand their achievements.

### Project Information – End-of-Project Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects To Be Evaluated</th>
<th>Access to Dynamic Markets for Rural Small and Medium Enterprises</th>
<th>Competitive Enterprises in Coffee</th>
<th>Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala</th>
<th>Community Tourism Alliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement #</td>
<td>$20-A-00-06-00099-00</td>
<td>$20-A-00-06-00099-00</td>
<td>$20-A-00-06-00099-00</td>
<td>$20-A-00-06-000992-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$7,700,000</td>
<td>$6,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Organization</td>
<td>AGEXPORT</td>
<td>ANACAFE</td>
<td>Rainforest Alliance</td>
<td>Counterpart International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement Officer’s Representative</td>
<td>Glenda de Paiz</td>
<td>Glenda de Paiz</td>
<td>Maria Teresa Robles</td>
<td>Maria Teresa Robles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Information – Mid-term Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects To Be Evaluated</th>
<th>Inclusive Market Alliance for Rural Entrepreneurs</th>
<th>TIERRAS / Land Conflict Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement #</td>
<td>$20-A-00-07-00216-00</td>
<td>$20-A-00-07-00225-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Dates</td>
<td>September 2007 – February 2014</td>
<td>September 2007 – September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Organization</td>
<td>Mercy Corp / WallMart</td>
<td>Mercy Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement Officer’s Technical Representative</td>
<td>Glenda de Paiz</td>
<td>Maria Teresa Robles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Contractor shall conduct a performance evaluation of six USAID/Guatemala Economic Growth Office's projects in achieving their stated objectives. The Contractor shall prepare end-of-project performance evaluations for four rural value chain projects which will end September 30, 2012: the Access to Dynamic Markets for Rural Small and Medium Enterprises project implemented by the Guatemalan Association of Exporters (AGEXPORT), the Competitive Enterprises in Coffee project with the National Coffee Association (ANACAFE), the Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala project with Rainforest Alliance, and the Guatemala Community Tourism Alliance with Counterpart International. The Contractor will also prepare mid-term performance evaluations of two ongoing projects: the Inclusive Market Alliance for Rural Entrepreneurs (IMARE) project, a public-private partnership between USAID, and Mercy Corps/Wal-Mart for horticultural value chains; and TIERRAS Land Conflict Resolution project implemented by Mercy Corps in the departments of Alta Verapaz and Quiche.

The six performance evaluations shall be split into two final reports, although the much of the expertise needed for evaluation will cut across the projects. The first report is an end-of-project performance evaluation of the four rural value chain projects ending in September of 2012, and the second is a mid-term performance evaluation of two very different projects implemented by the same partner, Mercy Corps. The needs of these two activities are different because of the projects’ implementation phases, so they are discussed separately below.

THE END-OF-PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS SHALL:

(a) Examine the effectiveness and high-level results of projects implemented by AGEXPORT, ANACAFE, Rainforest Alliance, and Counterpart International as defined in their respective cooperative agreements, which will be provided upon award of this evaluation Task Order. The Contractor shall assess achievements for each project. If objectives have not been met—due to either over- or under-achievement—findings, conclusions and recommendations in these areas should be addressed in the final report. An acceptable report should meet the following requirements as per the USAID Evaluation policy:

- Evaluation findings should be presented as analyzed facts, evidence and data and not based on anecdotes, hearsay or the compilation of people’s opinions.

- Findings should be specific, concise and supported by strong quantitative or qualitative evidence.

- Recommendations need to be supported by a specific set of findings.

- Recommendations should be action-oriented, practical and specific, with defined responsibility for the action.

The key approaches to be evaluated are: introducing small agricultural producers, community forestry concessions and handicraft producer groups to value added activities and linking them to larger markets; increasing incomes and improving household food consumption decisions to combat food insecurity; and increasing agricultural sector growth to increase economic activities of the non-farm sectors of the same communities—causing a spillover effect of USAID projects. The projects also seek to increase effectiveness of the local groups with which they work. In the cases of the Access to Dynamic Markets for Rural Small and Medium Enterprises and the Competitive Enterprises in Coffee projects, the awards attempt to improve the project
management capacity of AGEXPORT and ANACAFE and improve the nutritional outcomes for beneficiaries. The Contractor will address the organizational capacity of these groups to carry out this work, including adequate staffing, equipment, and internal processes and procedures. The Contractor shall refer to the projects' Work Plans and results frameworks for specifics.

(b) Test the development hypothesis put forth in the "Mellor Model" of agricultural growth as a strong driver of poverty reduction and job creation both through agricultural production and supporting small-scale rural non-farm activities in the Altiplano region of Guatemala5;

(c) Examine effectiveness by comparing each project's actual achievements with its respective work plan and results framework targets and goals. Where findings suggest that projects have been ineffective at reaching their objectives, the contractor will seek to: a) determine explanations as to why and whether the cause is in design or in implementation, and b) make design and implementation recommendations for consideration in future Mission programming.

And

(d) As Guatemala is an FIF Focus country, the evaluation must also address the objectives of the Mission's FIF Multi-year Strategy. The end-of-project performance evaluations, therefore, will also address the activities incorporating more vulnerable populations. These activities include lower-end value chain producers, women, AGEXPORT's sub-awards with the Institute of Nutrition for Central America and Panama—INCAP (nutrition) and Vital Voices (gender inclusion) and ANACAFE's relationship to Funcafe (rural development).

The following evaluation questions are illustrative. If the Contractor sees fit, the Contractor is encouraged to revise and refine the questions to best suit the goals of these evaluations.

Project Results and Sustainability:
• Have projects met high-level objectives in the areas of income generation, poverty reduction, and improved employment opportunities?
• What are the perceived effects on household malnutrition of IMPRE and the sub-awards with Funcafe and INCAP? If there is an effect, how is that effect explained?
• Are the projects promoting sustainable activities; what support will be needed for the associations to continue providing benefits to their members?

Institutional capacity building:
• By using local organizations as the prime implementing partners in the cases of AGEXPORT and ANACAFE, have the capacities of those partners to identify and cultivate small producer groups improved? Has their organizational planning and implementation of funds improved? Are improvements likely to be lost if USAID support were no longer available?
• Has the internal management of small agricultural and handicraft producer groups, tourism-related service providers and community forestry concessions improved due to project efforts?

Gender and Underrepresented Populations:

- Have women been integrated into farming activities, producer association management, or both? If so, have these interventions affected poverty or the prevalence of hunger and malnutrition in those communities?
- Assuming women's participation in producer associations, what effects are seen at the household-level—i.e., greater involvement in purchasing decisions or changes in household decisions concerning family planning?
- Did projects reflect the applicable recommendations made by the USAID/Guatemala Gender Assessment (March 2009)? Specifically, did USAID provide resources for implementing partners to incorporate recommendations into work plans; did the implementing partners train their personnel in gender-related issues; did the project make women's membership and participation in decision-making part of the organizational strengthening for producer groups; did the project include diversity as a criterion for producer group selection; and did the project identify viable women's producer groups?

The intended audiences for the end-of-project performance evaluations will be USAID/Guatemala—primarily the Economic Growth and Health and Education offices; those USAID implementing partners to be evaluated under this Task Order; and Government of Guatemala (GoG) entities—such as the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food (MAGA in Spanish); Secretariat for Food Security and Nutrition (SESAN in Spanish); the GoG Ministry of Economy's National Competitiveness Program (PRONACOM in Spanish); and the National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP in Spanish). The evaluations will also be provided for informational purposes to USAID/Washington—including the Bureau of Food Security, the Policy Planning and Learning office, and Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade Bureau's Natural Resources Management office; and international donor partners—specifically those with interest in value chain work such as DANIDA, the European Commission, the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank.

While the end-of-project and mid-term evaluations will be shared and discussed with the illustrative groups mentioned in this section, USAID/Guatemala also requires the contractor to prepare and give a formal presentation of the findings from the four end-of-project evaluations. This presentation would be to open to the general public and the press in Guatemala City following completion of the final report and completion/close out of the projects themselves. The presentation will be an opportunity to discuss USAID's work in Guatemala, demonstrate USAID's commitment to transparency, and foster public debate on development projects working in food security, value chains, and land dispute resolution. The Contractor is also encouraged to suggest audio/visual materials to complement the final report and presentation.

THE MID-TERM PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS SHALL:

(a) Examine the performance to-date of the IMARE project implemented by Marcy Corps/Wal-Mart and the TIERRAS Land Conflict Resolution project also implemented by Marcy Corps. While the IMARE project focuses on income generation, poverty reduction and improved nutritional status of beneficiaries, TIERRAS seeks collaborative resolution of land conflicts in the departments of Alta Verapaz and Quiche. Both projects also seek to improve local capacity of public and private partners—in the case of IMARE with local producer associations, and in the case of TIERRAS with local advocacy networks and Land Affairs Offices.
The Contractor shall assess the performance and achievements for each project against targets—both as listed in the projects’ Performance Monitoring Plans (PMPs) and Work Plans. While this exercise is not an audit of data quality, the PMPs and Work Plans should be used as a reference to identify areas that need to be investigated by the evaluation team. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are expected for both project performance of activities in Work Plans as well as other activities on which the projects could be working. For example, if the project in question is devoting a significant portion of its time to activity X under the Work Plan, is the project meeting the objectives agreed to under activity X. And separately, would the projects be more effective if it addressed other issues through activity Y—which is not part of the current work plan. An acceptable report should meet the following requirements as per the USAID Evaluation policy:

- Evaluation findings should be presented as analyzed facts, evidence and data and not based on anecdotes, hearsay or the compilation of people’s opinions.
- Findings should be specific, concise and supported by strong quantitative or qualitative evidence.
- Recommendations need to be supported by a specific set of findings.
- Recommendations should be action-oriented, practical and specific, with defined responsibility for the action.

(b) Analyze any implementation problems, and review institutional capacities of the organizations.

The following evaluation questions are illustrative. If the Contractor sees fit, the Contractor is encouraged to revise and the questions to best suit the goals of these evaluations.

**Project Results and Sustainability:**
- Are projects meeting targets under PMPs? Are deliverables on time according to Work Plans? If not what have been the impediments?
- Are projects addressing poverty reduction and employment generation, and conflict mitigation?
- What are the major constraints facing the project objectives?
- What resources will be necessary to continue project achievements after the projects end?

**Institutional capacity building:**
- Has the internal management of local producer groups improved due to project efforts?
- Have projects had any effect on local government capacity: has increased organization of farmers (IMARE) or advocacy networks (TIERRAS) led to political strength that makes local governments more accountable to its citizens?

**Gender and Underrepresented Populations:**
- Have women been integrated into farming activities, producer association management, or both?
• What have female roles been in conflict resolution in Alta Verapaz and Quiche? Has women’s ownership of land and access to land dispute resolution processes increased?
• Did projects reflect the applicable recommendations made by the USAID/Guatemala Gender Assessment (March 2009)? Specifically, did USAID provide resources for implementing partners to incorporate recommendations into work plans; did the implementing partners train their personnel in gender-related issues; did the project make women’s membership and participation in decision-making part of the organizational strengthening for producer groups; did the project include diversity as a criterion for producer group selection; and did the project identify viable women’s producer groups?

The intended audiences for the mid-term performance evaluations will be USAID/Guatemala—primarily the Economic Growth and Health and Education offices—and those USAID implementing partners to be evaluated under this task order.

C.3 EVALUATION METHODS

The Contractor must conduct evaluations using methods that generate valid and reliable evidence corresponding to the evaluation questions being asked. Both quantitative and qualitative methods should be employed when applicable. Evaluation methods should use sex-disaggregated data and incorporate attention to gender relations in areas such as the participation of women in leadership roles in producer associations and in community development councils or as conflict mediators. Methodological strengths and limitations will be communicated explicitly in the evaluation reports.

The Contractor will use similar analytical methods to conduct the mid-term and final evaluations, which will be outlined in the final work plan. The mid-term evaluations will place greater emphasis on findings, conclusions, and recommendations at the level of the project itself, while the final evaluations will focus more on findings, conclusions, and recommendations for high-level project results and future projects design.

Data sources should include, but are not limited to, field visits, in-person interviews, direct observations, as well as relevant USAID, GoG, and private sector reports and documents (for example, any articles published by Guatemalan Universities such as Instituto Agricultura, Recursos Naturales y Ambiente, Guatemalan think tanks such as La Asociacion de Investigacion y Estudios Sociales and Centro de Investigaciones Economicas Nacionales, or institutions such as International Food Policy Research Institute.

Evaluation methods should include but are not limited to the following:

1. Documents and secondary data sources: The Contractor will review the relevant literature related to economic growth in Guatemala, and will arrive in Guatemala versed in the FIF and GCC Initiatives and their supporting literature, including the Mollor Model of poverty reduction in the Altiplano, the Guatemala Country Strategic Plan, and the Feed the Future Multi-year Strategy. The literature review will also include the guidelines for monitoring and evaluating FIF programs, USAID’s new Gender Policy, and an understanding of the centrally managed global database in the USAID Bureau for Food Security—which is used to support USAID field mission M&E programs in tracking and reporting progress toward FIF targets. The entire team will review the Mission Gender Assessment and the Team benefits from having the Assessment’s author, Virginia Lambert, as a Team member. Most importantly, the Team will systematically
review project documents provided by USAID/Guatemala for each project, including quarterly and annual reports, work plans, and performance indicator data.

2. Individual and focus group interviews with beneficiaries and other stakeholders: The Contractor will interview the USAID Agreement and Contracting Officer’s Representatives (AOR & COR), Project COP and staff members, other donors (particularly those with agricultural or value chain projects), private sector buyers, key USG officials, and local community development councils. In addition, the Team will conduct structured individual and focus group interviews with a sample of individual Program beneficiaries and other stakeholders. Table 1 below provides an illustrative list of beneficiaries and stakeholders to be interviewed for each project. It is essential that the team interview both women and men in beneficiary and stakeholder groups to ensure that perspectives from both sexes are integrated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Other Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Dynamic Markets for Rural Small and Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>● Small male- and female-headed producer households and workers, particularly in high value crops</td>
<td>● Private firms and market intermediaries with interest in quality high value produce for domestic and export sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Enterprises in Coffee</td>
<td>● Small rural producers of specialty coffee or other commodities (typically families)</td>
<td>● Local and regional producer and marketing organizations and local community based organizations (CBOs) supporting improved household consumption/nutrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala</td>
<td>● Small and medium-scale forestry concessionaires</td>
<td>● CBOs particularly in the areas with potential for introducing sustainable income-generating forestry practices—product harvesting, nature tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest and Nature Alliance</td>
<td>● Mayan Biosphere Reserve (MBR) communities</td>
<td>● Local tourism boards in Peten, Alta Verapaz, Solola, and Quetzaltenango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Market Alliance for Rural Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>● Small farmers and farmer marketing organizations with high value specialty produce</td>
<td>● Urban supermarket chains and other agribusinesses that process and market high value, locally produced food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial Land Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>● Displaced persons/households with pending land use/ownership claims or disputes to be resolved</td>
<td>● ISS Office of Agrarian Affairs (SAA) NGOS and CBOs in El Quiché and Alta Verapaz, COCODES and Municipal planning offices, Mediation centers supported by SAA and municipalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because time is limited for analysis of respondent information collected in the field, the Contractor will design basic, easy-to-administer interview guides that elicit information that can be scored/indexed. These will largely be based on qualitative scores (e.g., “Do you agree with the statement that...” 1) not at all 2) somewhat 3) fully). Interview guides will also include open-ended questions designed to capture respondents’ unprompted perceptions of the programs.
3. Field Visits to project sites: The Contractor will focus its field visits mainly in the Western Highlands with trips to El Quiche and Alta Verapaz. The Contractor will conduct its site visits largely to interview beneficiaries and stakeholders in their program setting (as outlined above in number 2), but also to observe sites where projects are underway, and to collect additional documentation and information as feasible. This is an opportunity to systematically corroborate, or dispute, initial findings.

During site visits, the Contractor will collect data using a structured field visit guide to assure uniformity of coverage across sites. The guide will outline the specific changes that need to be verified, people to meet with, and tasks or activities to be observed. In developing a site visit plan to collect the data listed above in numbers 2 and 3, the Contractor will consult with USAID and the program implementers on our methodology for selecting sites to visit. Since time for field site visits is limited, the Contractor will follow the steps below to determine the sample frame from the population project sites:

- Exclude from its sampling those sites where programs or program components have not yet had sufficient time to produce demonstrable results/outcomes.
- From the remaining possible sites to visit, select a stratified sample of suitable size to visit for each of the programs that assures a balance of female-to-male participants (as a proportion of the total beneficiaries), keeping in mind timeline and travel logistics.
- Review the list in consultation with USAID to ensure representation from all relevant project/components that should be observed. If some components are not represented, the Contractor will make substitutions as needed.

4. Review quantitative data as available and applicable: Where available and applicable, the Contractor will review national or regional data through sources such as the National Agricultural Survey (ENA in Spanish) and the National Survey on Infant and Maternal Health (ENSNI in Spanish), and USAID’s recent Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index\(^6\) may be applicable to evaluations. These data would be used not to attribute project effects, but to provide context for the data collected. For example, data on child stunting from the ENSNI could aid in understanding nutrition levels in communities where the programs/projects are functioning.


END OF SECTION C
Annex B: Evaluation Tools
Participantes: Equipo evaluador TIERRAS y Equipo técnico Mercy Corps.

### Lunes, 10 de septiembre de 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horario</th>
<th>Lugar</th>
<th>Actividad</th>
<th>Observaciones y responsables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>San Julian</td>
<td>Punto de reunión</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>Tactic</td>
<td>Almuerzo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30 - 15:30</td>
<td>Tactic la Tinta</td>
<td>Desplazamiento al municipio de la Tinta, Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Miguel Balán, Gerente de Proyecto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 - 16:30</td>
<td>Oficina RIC</td>
<td>Presentación del proceso de coordinación con el RIC y MC</td>
<td>Miguel Balán, Gerente de Proyecto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 - 17:30</td>
<td>Municipalidad</td>
<td>Reunión con autoridades municipales del municipio de la Tinta, A.V.</td>
<td>Miguel Balán y Edgar Putul, Proyecto RCTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30 - 18:00</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Desplazamiento y descanso en el municipio de la Tinta, AV.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Martes, 11 de septiembre de 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horario</th>
<th>Lugar</th>
<th>Actividad</th>
<th>Observaciones y responsables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 - 9:30</td>
<td>Oficina de la SAA</td>
<td>Presentación del proceso de coordinación con la SAA y MC y socios</td>
<td>Miguel Balán y Edgar Putul, Proyecto RCTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 13:00</td>
<td>Cooperativa MOCCA</td>
<td>Presentación del conflicto resuelto en coordinación con el resto de cooperativas</td>
<td>Miguel Balán y Gerson Coy, Proyecto RCTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 – 14:00</td>
<td>La Tinta</td>
<td>Almuerzo</td>
<td>Miguel Balán, Gerente de Proyecto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 16:00</td>
<td>La Tinta-Cobán</td>
<td>Desplazamiento al municipio de Cobán, Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Todos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horario</td>
<td>Lugar</td>
<td>Actividad</td>
<td>Observaciones y responsables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 17:30</td>
<td>Oficina de Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Reunión con miembros de la CMTIERRAS</td>
<td>Miguel Balán y Edgar Putul, Proyecto RCTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30 – 18:00</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Desplazamiento y descanso en el Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miércoles, 12 de septiembre de 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horario</th>
<th>Lugar</th>
<th>Actividad</th>
<th>Observaciones y responsables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 - 10:30</td>
<td>Cobán- Uspantan</td>
<td>Desplazamiento al municipio de Chicamán, EL QUICHE</td>
<td>Miguel Balán y Edgar Putul, Proyecto RCTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 12:30</td>
<td>Chicaman La Campana</td>
<td>Caso en Proceso de resolución</td>
<td>Carlos Aquino. Gerente de Programa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 12:50</td>
<td>Oficina Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Presentación de la situación de conflictividad agraria de Alta Verapaz y El Quiche</td>
<td>Carlos Aquino/Gerente de Programa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:50-13:10</td>
<td>Oficina Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Presentación de las acciones desarrolladas en los proyectos de Tierras, apoyados por USAID</td>
<td>Jose Aquino/Especialista de monitoreo y evaluación.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:20-14:50</td>
<td>Traslado Uspantan Chicaman</td>
<td>Traslado</td>
<td>Jose Aquino/Helmer Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:50-1530</td>
<td>Oficina Municipal Agraria de Chicaman</td>
<td>Visita a OMA Chicaman/presentación de funciona y servicios que presta, proceso de fortalecimiento.</td>
<td>Zoila Perez/Técnico de OMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 -17:30</td>
<td>Traslado de Chicaman a Coban</td>
<td>Traslado</td>
<td>Jose Aquino/Carlos Aquino.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nota: Virginia Lambert, estará participando en todas las actividades programadas, el Dr Scott Tomas se incorporara el día miércoles a partir de medio día.
KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE

(RESPONDENTS FAMILIAR WITH THE PROJECT)

Talking points:

Interviewer: ______________________________ Date: ______________

PART 1: RESPONDENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Title/Function/Sex:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>Contact Info:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation (past/present)to the Project:</td>
<td>Period Project Involvement:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 2: PROJECT PERFORMANCE

- **What have been the principle achievements** of the project that you have seen or experienced?

  **Outcomes**: What evidence have you seen of improvements in: incomes, employment, gender participation, food security, child nutrition, production or sales attributable to the project?

- **Outputs**: What evidence can you provide that the project has improved the capacity of participating organizations to carry out activities after project support ends – administrative efficiency, coordination and communications (transparency); engagement with GOG? With private sector? Local communities? Success at obtaining new revenues from member beneficiaries or donors or private sector?

1. **For Project results and objectives** - Where has the project (or its partners) fallen short of your expectations about what it was expected to achieve? Where has the project (or its partners) exceeded expectations of what you expected it would accomplish?

2. **Sustainability**

   - What evidence do you see that the project has improved the long-term sustainability of participating local tourism organizations or marketing, production, services enterprises?
• What evidence is there that the capacity of participating organizations has improved enough to carry out their activities after project support ends – administrative efficiency, coordination and communications (transparency); engagement with GOG? With private sector? With community organizations? Obtaining operating revenues from member beneficiaries or donors other than USAID or the USG.

• What will happen to activities/organizations now that the project is ending?

• What would be an ideal follow on project and how would it be different?

3. **Institutional Capacity Building**

• Where applicable, what evidence is there of improved organizational capacity among participating local groups and institutions that can be attributable to project activities?

• What beneficiary groups have moved from informal to more formal (legal) status and more systematic operations during their project involvement?

---

**PART 3: RESPONDENT EVALUATION**

Respondent assessment: Cooperative and helpful = y/n/so-so; Informed and knowledgeable = y/n/so-so

Continuation space for added questions relevant to the respondent population
PROJECT PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEW GUIDE

Note: These questions may be administered either individually or in focus groups to project beneficiary participants – producers, service providers, heads of households, men and women.

________________________________________________________________________

Interviewer: ____________________________ Date: _________________

PART 1: RESPONDENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Sex: M ____ F ____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association:</td>
<td>How long Involvement in Project:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 2: RESPONDENT’S EXPERIENCE WITH THE PROJECT

1. How has involvement in the project changed your life?

2. What evidence can you present?
   a. Income
   b. Employment
   c. Participation of family members
   d. Food security
   e. More production
   f. More sales & produce
   g. Other: __________________________________________________

3. Has your household income increased?
   a. How much? ______________
   b. Is this due to the project? _____ Yes ____ No

4. Do you have more access to markets to your produce? _____ Yes _____ No
   a. Is this due to the project? _____ Yes _____ No
5. Has the project helped your management capability?

6. Is your organization strong? _____ Yes _____ No
   a. Can it function without project support and technical assistance? ___ Yes ___ No

7. Gender: Does your wife participate in the project? _____ Yes _____ No
Annex C: Sources of Information
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Project / Activity</th>
<th>Fecha (date)</th>
<th>TYPE OF ORG.</th>
<th>Organization (name)</th>
<th>Position within the organization</th>
<th>Depto.</th>
<th>Municipio</th>
<th>Notes &amp; comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alberto Brito</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>ADIM</td>
<td>12-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>ADIM</td>
<td>Mediar in the organization</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Miguel?</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>ADIM</td>
<td>12-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>ADIM</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Otto Cuellar</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>ADIM</td>
<td>12-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>ADIM</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ruby Avalos</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>ADRI</td>
<td>11-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>CM Tierras</td>
<td>representative INAB</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Coban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alan Baldez</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>CM Tierras</td>
<td>11-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>CM Tierras</td>
<td>representative Pastoral Social</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Coban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Monica Cuy</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>CM Tierras</td>
<td>11-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>CM Tierras</td>
<td>representative Pastoral Social</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Coban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Benito?</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>community La Campana</td>
<td>community leader</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Chicaman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Herson Coy</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>JADE</td>
<td>10-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>JADE</td>
<td>Medic in the organization</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Coban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Carlos Aquino</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>10-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Gerente, Programa Desarrollo Rural</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Coban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cesar Xoy</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>11-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Field technician</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Tucurú</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Edgar Putul</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>10-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Coordinador tecnico agrario</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Coban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Helmer Pa</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>12-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Coordinador tecnico agrario</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jose Aquino</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>10-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Especialista, Monitoreo y Evaluacion, Proyecto TIERRAS</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Coban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Miguel Arnoldo Balan Teni</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>10-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Gerente de Proyecto TIERRAS</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Coban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Peter Loach</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>03-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yojana Cantana</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>10-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Promotora Social</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>Coban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sara Murray</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>09-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>gender specialist/EMA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Zoila Perez</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>OMA - Chicaman</td>
<td>12-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>OMA - Chicaman</td>
<td>tecnico de OMA</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Chicaman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pedro Hermenegildo</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>OMA - La Tinta</td>
<td>10-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>OMA - La Tinta</td>
<td>tecnico de OMA</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>La Tinta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Miriam Danuda</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>RIC - Polochic</td>
<td>10-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>RIC - Polochic</td>
<td>Area Social</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>La Tinta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Wilfrido Barrios C</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>RIC - Polochic</td>
<td>10-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>RIC - Polochic</td>
<td>Sub director regional</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>La Tinta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Oscar Och</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>SAA - La Tinta</td>
<td>11-sep</td>
<td>Tierras</td>
<td>SAA - La Tinta</td>
<td>Mediar/Concilidor</td>
<td>Alta Verapaz</td>
<td>La Tinta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Ict / Act</td>
<td>Fecha (date)</td>
<td>Tipo de org.</td>
<td>Organization (Name)</td>
<td>Position within the organization</td>
<td>Depto.</td>
<td>Municipio</td>
<td>Notes &amp; Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Felipa Vicente Baten</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>“ADICS” San Jose Sigüílía</td>
<td>Tesorera</td>
<td>Tottonican</td>
<td>Momostenango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Francisco V.</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>“ADICS” San Jose Sigüílía</td>
<td>Vice Presidente</td>
<td>Tottonican</td>
<td>Momostenango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Isabel Baten Ajtun</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>“ADICS” San Jose Sigüílía</td>
<td>Promotora SAN</td>
<td>Tottonican</td>
<td>Momostenango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Juan Baten Vicente</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>“ADICS” San Jose Sigüílía</td>
<td>Secretario</td>
<td>Tottonican</td>
<td>Momostenango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Juan Walberto Vicente Torres</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>“ADICS” San Jose Sigüílía</td>
<td>Sub-Tesorero</td>
<td>Tottonican</td>
<td>Momostenango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lucas Baten Ajtun</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>“ADICS” San Jose Sigüílía</td>
<td>Coordinador</td>
<td>Tottonican</td>
<td>Momostenango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lucio Juan Baten Vicente</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>“ADICS” San Jose Sigüílía</td>
<td>Presidente y Representante Legal</td>
<td>Tottonican</td>
<td>Momostenango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maria Baten Vicente</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>“ADICS” San Jose Sigüílía</td>
<td>Promotora</td>
<td>Tottonican</td>
<td>Momostenango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Marta Victoria Baten Vicente</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>“ADICS” San Jose Sigüílía</td>
<td>Promotora SAN</td>
<td>Tottonican</td>
<td>Momostenango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Odilia Lucrecia Baten Ramirez</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>“ADICS” San Jose Sigüílía</td>
<td>Promotora</td>
<td>Tottonican</td>
<td>Momostenango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Olivia Baten Ramos</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>“ADICS” San Jose Sigüílía</td>
<td>Promotora</td>
<td>Tottonican</td>
<td>Momostenango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Guillermo Cifuentes</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>ADAM</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Delma Gomez</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>ASADIT</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Tejutla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>José Gomez</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>ASADIT</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Tejutla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Leydi Gomez</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>ASADIT</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Tejutla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Luis Gomez</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>ASADIT</td>
<td>Tesorero</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Tejutla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rosalina Muñoz</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>ASADIT</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Tejutla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rubelcy Gomez</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>ASADIT</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Tejutla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rudy Ramirez</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>ASADIT</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Tejutla</td>
<td>Exitosa asociación de papa de IMARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Veronica Marroquin</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>ASADIT</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Tejutla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Willy Gomez</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>ASADIT</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Tejutla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pedro Sales</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>ASOFRACHI</td>
<td>Secretario</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## EVALUATION OF USAID PROJECTS / ECONOMIC GROWTH PROJECTS EVALUATION

### CUADRO DE INFORMANTES CLAVE / KEY INFORMANTS REGISTER

Prepared by John Chudy
Date visited: 17 to 20 Sept, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Act / Activity</th>
<th>Fecha (date)</th>
<th>TYPE OF ORG. Organization (Name)</th>
<th>Position within the organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Antonio Chipel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td>Cholá</td>
<td>Presidente</td>
<td>Quiché</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Balthazar Chipel Lux</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td>Cholá</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiché</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Balthazar Chipel Yat</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td>Cholá</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiché</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Dora Azucena Moreno</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td>Cholá</td>
<td>Tesorera</td>
<td>Quiché</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Juan Us Mejia</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td>Cholá</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiché</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Julia Chipel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td>Cholá</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>Quiché</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Magdalena Luz Pu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td>Cholá</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>Quiché</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Victoria Chipel Lux</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td>Cholá</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>Quiché</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pamela de Leon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>FAO/PC Organization</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mynor Gómez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>FIDA Coordinador Comercialización</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Joaquin Toma</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>Fonda Sistemas Pro Agrícola</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>Concepción Chiquichego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Berta Zacarías</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>Futuros del Mañana</td>
<td>Promotora</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Delma Elizabeth Gomez Ramirez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>Futuros del Mañana</td>
<td>Vice Presidenta</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Elizabeth Dolores Garcia</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>Futuros del Mañana</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Eluvia Ramirez Escobar</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>Futuros del Mañana</td>
<td>Presidenta</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Leydi Gomez Muñoz</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>Futuros del Mañana</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Onalia González Méndez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>Futuros del Mañana</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Rosalina Muñoz</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>Futuros del Mañana</td>
<td>Secretaria</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Veronica Marroquin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td>Futuros del Mañana</td>
<td>Vocal</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Isidro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Tomonori Uchikawa</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Experto JICA</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Aracely Martinez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td>La Cruz Chicaman</td>
<td>Socia</td>
<td>Quiché</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Francisco Martinez Lopez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td>La Cruz Chicaman</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiché</td>
<td>Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Act / Ac.</td>
<td>Fecha (date)</td>
<td>Tipo de Org.</td>
<td>Organization (Name)</td>
<td>Position within the organization</td>
<td>Notes &amp; Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Herlindo Gonzalez Soto</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Cruz Chicaman</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiche Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Maynor Hernandez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Cruz Chicaman</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiche Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Miguel Angel Garcia</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Cruz Chicaman</td>
<td>Encargado</td>
<td>Quiche Uspantan En busca de apoyo para sistema de riego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Roberto Gamarro M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Cruz Chicaman</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiche Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Rosalina Alvarado de Gamarro</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>19-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Cruz Chicaman</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiche Uspantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Agustin Barrios L.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Aurrom Perez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Benildo Laporra</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Tesorero</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Donaldo Castañon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Presidente</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Elru Amos Galvez J</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Presidente</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Jeronimo Rodriguez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Julio Rodriguez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Maximo Pérez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Pedro Gomez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ruperto Velasquez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Sergio Perez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Vice Presidente</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Wilfredo Laporra</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Pradera</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>San Marcos Ixchiguán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Rafael Villatoro O.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAGA</td>
<td>Supervisor Deptamental</td>
<td>Quetgo Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Carlos Aquino</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Gerente Desarrollo Rural</td>
<td>Quetgo Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Delfina Garcia Reyes</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Especialista Genero</td>
<td>Quetgo Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Edgar Bethancourth</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Coordinator Monitoring and</td>
<td>Quetgo Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Elmer Santos Gonzales</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Tecnico de Campo</td>
<td>Quetgo Sacapulas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Inés Tujab Lopez</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Especialista SAN</td>
<td>Quetgo Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Act / Act</td>
<td>Tipo de Or.</td>
<td>Organization (Name)</td>
<td>Position within the organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes &amp; Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Israel Cifuentes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reunion de entrada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Jesus Montyo</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Tecnico de Campo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Osmar Ardiano</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Tecnico de Campo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Pedro Gomez</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Tecnico Agricola</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ronald Balz</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Climate change specialist</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Selvin Maldonado</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Tecnico Agricola</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Peter Loach</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>05-oct</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Director de Pais</td>
<td>Guatemala City</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Marco Segura G.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>MINECO</td>
<td>Delegado Regional</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Zacarias Aguilar</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Municipalidad de</td>
<td>Extensionista</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
<td>Quetgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concepcion Ch.</td>
<td>Concepcion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Alejandro DeLeon Lopez</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Pichiquil</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Aguacatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Antonio Mendoza Marquin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Pichiquil</td>
<td>Tesorero</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Aguacatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Catarina Mendoza Mejia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Pichiquil</td>
<td>Vocal I</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Aguacatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Francisco Raymundo Mendoza</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Pichiquil</td>
<td>Presidente</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Aguacatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Gaspar Mendoza Solis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Pichiquil</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Aguacatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Marcelino Castro Ailon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Pichiquil</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Aguacatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Marta García Mendoza</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Pichiquil</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Aguacatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Miguel Vicente Paan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Pichiquil</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Aguacatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Samuel Castro Ailon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Pichiquil</td>
<td>Secretario</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Aguacatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Vctor Raymundo Cruz</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Pichiquil</td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Aguacatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Ana Saluella Exguile</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17-sep</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Sesan, S.M.</td>
<td>Delegada Departmental</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex D: Statement of Any Unresolved Differences of Opinion

There were no unresolved differences of opinion concerning this evaluation report.