



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

USAID/GUATEMALA FINAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS FOR FOUR ECONOMIC GROWTH OFFICE PROJECTS

FINAL REPORT



October 25, 2012

This publication was produced by Amex International and its Subcontractor, DevTech Systems, for the United States Agency for International Development under Contract No. AID-RAN-I-00-09-008/AID-520-TO-12-00001.

USAID/GUATEMALA FINAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS FOR FOUR ECONOMIC GROWTH OFFICE PROJECTS FINAL REPORT

DISCLAIMER:

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 1**
- DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM AND USAID’S RESPONSE 3**
- PURPOSE OF EVALUATION..... 5**
 - Evaluation Type and Rationale5
 - Specific Evaluation Tasks5
 - Intended Audiences6
- RESEARCH DESIGN AND ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY 6**
 - Evaluation Questions.....6
 - Evaluation Assessment Methodology7
- CROSS-CUTTING FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS..... 8**
 - Project Results and Sustainability8
 - Institutional Capacity building9
 - Gender and Under-represented Populations.....9
 - Other Findings10
- COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISES IN COFFEE (ANACAFE) FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS 10**
 - Project Results Framework10
 - Project Results and Sustainability10
 - Institutional Capacity Building14
 - Gender and Under-represented Populations.....16
 - Other Findings17
- ACCESS TO DYNAMIC MARKETS FOR RURAL SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES (AGEXPORT) FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS..... 19**
 - Project Results Framework19
 - Project Results and Sustainability19
 - Institutional Capacity Building23
 - Gender and Under-represented Populations.....25
 - Other Findings26
- FORESTRY ENTERPRISES IN GUATEMALA (RAINFOREST ALLIANCE) FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS 27**
 - Project Results Framework27
 - Project Results and Sustainability28
 - Institutional Capacity Building34
 - Gender and Under-represented Populations.....35
- COMMUNITY TOURISM ALLIANCE (COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL) FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS 36**
 - Project Results Framework36
 - Project Results and Sustainability36
 - Institutional Capacity building41
 - Gender and Under-Represented Populations.....43
 - Other Findings44
- RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTIVITIES 45**

Cross-cutting Recommendations	45
Competitive Enterprises in Coffee (ANACAFE).....	46
Access to Dynamic Markets for Rural Small and Medium Enterprises (AGEXPORT).....	48
Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala (Rainforest Alliance)	50
Community Tourism Alliance (Counterpart International).....	52

ANNEXES

Annex A: Scope-of-Work for the Evaluation

Annex B: Evaluation Tools

Annex C: Sources of Information

Annex D: Statement of Any Unresolved Differences of Opinion

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACOFOP	Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Petén
ADICLA	Asociación Para el Desarrollo Integral del Lago Atitlán
ADIGUA	Asociación Para el Desarrollo Integral de Guatemala
AFISAP	Asociación Forestal Integral San Andrés Petén
AGEXPORT	Asociación Guatemalteca de Exportadores
AGRETOUCHI	Asociación Gremial de Turismo de Chisec
ANACAFE	Asociación Nacional del Café
AOR	Agreement Officer's Representative
ARP	Asociación de Reforestadores del Petén
ASOCAV	Asociación de Carpinteros de Alta Verapaz
BANRURAL	Banco de Desarrollo Rural
BDS	Business Development Services
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CAFTA-DR	Central America-Dominican Republic Free Trade Agreement
CAMTUR	Cámara de Turismo
CAT	Comités de Autogestión de Turismo
CBO	Community-Based Organization (and the Spanish acronym, OBC, Organizaciones de Base Comunitaria)
CDCS	Country Development Cooperation Strategy
CLIP	Consulta Libre Previa e Informada
CoC	Chain of Custody
COCODE	Consejo Comunitario de Desarrollo
CONAP	Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas
CONASAN	Consejo Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria
COTURAP	Consejo de Turismo en Áreas Protegidas
CTA	Community Tourism Association
DOI	Department of Interior
EKKO	The first production center of the Guatemalan Highlands
ENCOVI	Encuesta Nacional de Condiciones de Vida
ENSMI	Encuesta Nacional sobre la Salud Materno-Infantil
FEDECOVERA	Federación de Cooperativas de las Verapaces
FEG	Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala
FENATUCGUA	Federación Nacional de Turismo Comunitario de Guatemala
FFP	Food for Peace
IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture Development (acronym in Spanish is FIDA, Fondo Internacional para el Desarrollo Agrícola)
FORESCOM	Empresa Comunitaria de Servicios del Bosque
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
FtF	Feed the Future Initiative
FUNCAFE	Fundación de la Caficultura para el Desarrollo Rural
FUNDALACHUA	Fundación Ecorregión Lachuá
FUNDESA	Fundación para el Desarrollo de Guatemala
FUNDESPE	Fundación para el Desarrollo de la Pequeña Empresa
GCC	Global Climate Change
GEF	Global Environment Fund
GOG	Government of Guatemala
HCVF	High Conservation Value Forests

HELVETAS	Swiss Association for International Cooperation
IARNA	Instituto de Agricultura, Recursos Naturales y Ambiente (de la Universidad Rafael Landívar)
IDAEH	Instituto de Antropología e Historia
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank (Acronym in Spanish: BID Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo)
IMARE	Inclusive Market Alliance for Rural Entrepreneurs
INAB	Instituto Nacional de Bosques
INCAP	Instituto de Nutrición para Centroamérica y Panamá
INE	Instituto Nacional de Estadística
INGUAT	Instituto Guatemalteco de Turismo
INTECAP	Instituto Técnico de Capacitación y Productividad
IP	Implementing Partner
IR	Intermediate Result
ISO	International Standards Organization
JICA	Japanese International Cooperation Agency
LLR	Lower Level Result
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAGA	Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación
MARN	Ministerio del Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
MBR	Maya Biosphere Reserve
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MFEWS	Mesoamerica Food Security Early Warning System
MICUDE	Ministerio de Cultura y Deportes
MINECO	Ministerio de Economía
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NTCN	National Tourism Conservation Network
NTP	Non-Timber Products
OMA	Oficina Municipal de Agricultura
OMYC	Organización para el Manejo y Conservación Uaxactún
PLANOCC	Plan Estratégico de Seguridad y Alimentaria y Nutricional para Occidente
PMP	Performance Management Plan
PESAN	Programa Estratégico de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional
PNY	Parque Nacional Yaxhá
PYME	Pequeña y Mediana Empresa (SME en inglés)
RA	Rainforest Alliance
RED FASCO	Red Financiera de Asociaciones Comunitarios
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
REDIMIF	Red de Instituciones de Microfinanzas de Guatemala
SAN	Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional
SAVE	Scientific, Academic, Volunteer, Educational
SEGEPLAN	Secretaría de Planificación y Programación de la Presidencia
SESAN	Secretaría de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional
SFM	Sustainability Forest Management
SIGAP	Sistema Guatemalteco de Areas Protegidas
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
SO	Strategic Objective
SOSEP	Secretaría de Obras Sociales de la Esposa del Presidente
SPS	Sanitary and Phyto-sanitary Standards
TBD	Target of Biodiversity

TP	Timber Products
UICN	Unión Internacional para la Conservación de la Naturaleza
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
URL/IARNA	Universidad Rafael Landívar/Instituto de Agricultura, Recursos Naturales y Ambiente
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USG	United States Government
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

End-of-Project performance evaluations were conducted on four projects, funded by USAID/Guatemala's Economic Growth Office, which ended in September 2012. The four projects were the Competitive Enterprises in Coffee project, implemented by the National Coffee Association (ANACAFE) ; the Access to Dynamic Markets for Rural Small and Medium Enterprises project, implemented by the Guatemalan Association of Exporters (AGEXPORT) ; the Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala project, implemented by Rainforest Alliance; and the Guatemala Community Tourism Alliance project, implemented by Counterpart International.

Together, the four projects represented a portfolio of \$29,400,000. They were modified in September 2010 as "bridge mechanisms" with initial transitional funding, until new Mission strategies covering the Feed the Future (FtF) initiative, and the new Country Development and Cooperation Strategy (CDCS), were put into place in 2011 and 2012, respectively. All four projects had some activities redirected to the five FtF priority departments in Guatemala's Western Highlands.

The evaluation team examined the development problems facing small agricultural producers, community forestry concessions, community tourism and handicraft producer groups, the effectiveness of USAID's development hypotheses put forward to address those problems, and the successes achieved or difficulties encountered by implementing partners tasked with carrying out the four projects based on those development hypotheses.

It is noteworthy that, as a result of the changes in strategy stemming from the new FtF and CDCS priorities, USAID's development hypothesis relating to agricultural value chain support had shifted from income generation activities deriving from implementation of the Central America Free Trade Agreement with the United States (and the Dominican Republic) toward food security, including improvement of household nutrition and well-being.

For all the projects evaluated, the evaluations focused on project effectiveness, examined by gathering and analyzing evidence of results and impacts attributable to project interventions, including assessment of the sustainability of those results.

The evaluation team examined the applicability of the development hypothesis put forward 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 (Highlands) region of Guatemala. The evaluation team also addressed aspects of the Mission's multi-year Feed the Future (FtF) strategy, including activities incorporating more vulnerable populations.

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, gender and under-represented populations, and other evaluation parameters. Among the more salient of the findings and conclusions are the following:

- Mellor-type spill-over effects from agricultural value chain support activities, in terms of promoting non-farm employment and income, appeared to be more limited in remote rural communities in part because there a limited number of non-farm goods and services produced locally.
- The shift in focus to FtF departments has added new challenges to the task of achieving economic sustainability for the horticultural and community-based tourism value chains. Working in the more remote areas, without infrastructure and nearby markets, means that desired results are likely to take many more years, and more resources, to achieve.
- Small producers tend to retain their traditional production of corn and beans, utilizing more land than they plant in high-value products to reduce their risk in the event of a cash crop failure. They

are highly dependent on hillside agriculture, and subject to climate change-induced periods of unpredictable drought and excessive rainfall which have eroded the soil and reduced yields.

- The evaluation findings tend to validate scientific studies which have concluded that increased household income and employment derived from small farmer participation in market-oriented value chains do not necessarily translate into better nutrition and living standards.
- Environmental and quality certifications, although they may add value, secure markets and reduce sales volatility, also add to the costs of production, and these costs represent a drain on smallholder income that is not reflected in sales data, and that may be insurmountable for the smallest farmers.
- Adaptation to the effects of climate change also is affecting the costs of production for small farmers in both the coffee and horticultural value chains, a development for smallholder household income that is not reflected in sales data.
- Both ANACAFE and AGEXPORT have excellent institutional sustainability, and have increased their capacity to reach SME beneficiaries, including an emphasis on crop diversification and nutrition.
- Nonetheless, the success of agricultural value chain activities in the FtF departments, in particular, is constrained by inadequate provision by the public sector of needed infrastructure, information, security, access to financing and other inputs that smallholder producer associations cannot address on their own.
- Forestry concessions are a very sustainable institutional basis to build on the remarkable results achieved in forest protection in recent years in Guatemala, by providing local people and entities with more incentives to maintain forests that provide income over the long term.
- The caveat on the forestry concessions is that there remain considerable social pressures to break the model because a rising number of local community residents are not included as concession associates.
- Where there are linkages with national parks or protected areas with an interest in mobilizing community-based forest protection, the sustainability of community-based tourism efforts looks quite strong.
- Expanding community-based tourism to remoter areas, without such institutional linkages, has proven to be a challenge. The Community Tourism Alliance project responded by emphasizing exportable handicrafts products, a strategy that appears to have worked.
- Both ANACAFE and AGEXPORT were slow to respond to the 2009 Gender Assessment recommendations, and the response has been incomplete. The record in the Forestry Enterprises and Community Tourism projects was better, but the institutional sustainability of gender integration still will require reinforcement.
- Women's employment has increased with the introduction of new crops in post-harvest activities like product sorting and grading, and they also are becoming involved in producer association management, but their participation continues to be limited by cultural norms and language barriers.

The evaluation team also developed concrete recommendations for future activities based on its findings and conclusions that are action-oriented, practical and specific, with defined responsibility for the recommended actions. These are presented in terms of cross-cutting recommendations, as well as project-specific recommendations, for future activities. Among the most critical of the recommendations are the following:

- USAID programs designed to support small coffee producers in Guatemala's FtF departments should include support to improve the productivity and environmental sustainability of their traditional food systems (cultivation of corn and beans), in part by linking them into other USAID activities in those departments.

- USAID should review whether a recent waiver allowing grants of seeds and seedlings that are more resistant to the effects of climate change should be utilized to help small producers replace coffee plants that are aged and/or not resistant to infestation and fungus.
- USAID should also direct its implementing partners to develop and share climate change adaptation plans with the communities where they are working.
- In all future value chain support activities, USAID implementing partners should insist that, prior to initiating specific product lines, producer associations should prepare business plans based on a study of the existing market for the product or service the assisted group proposes to supply.
- Given the lack of a direct link between increased income and improved household nutrition, USAID should provide sufficient funding to support health and nutrition interventions in its future programming. Since these types of intervention are not part of the traditional operations of either ANACAFE or AGEXPORT, however, USAID should ensure their partnering with organizations that have the expertise to deliver such services going forward.
- USAID's decision in future projects to segment the geographical areas of activity by ANACAFE and AGEXPORT, and ask them to take on value chain support of products outside their areas of technical expertise, means that complementarities and cooperation between the two institution must be emphasized in all FtF departments.
- In its policy dialogue with high-level GoG officials, USAID should emphasize the complementary role that the public sector must play in the FtF departments, by providing needed infrastructure, information, security, access to financing and other inputs to successful smallholder participation in value chains.
- USAID should provide follow-up and feedback to the implementing partners on their responses to Gender Assessment recommendations to ensure that the recommendations are understood and effective in producing results. For work in the FtF regions, USAID implementing partners should endeavor to field staff with local language capabilities.
- USAID implementing partners working with indigenous communities (particularly FtF activities, with their emphasis on women's empowerment, and health and nutrition) should have staff and budget committed to gender integration, and direct input to strategy and implementation from indigenous gender experts. The latter might be achieved through the inclusion of indigenous gender experts on the staff or as core advisors, or through inclusion of indigenous women's NGOs as partners.

DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM AND USAID'S RESPONSE¹

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 food preparation and consumption decisions and 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 health and nutritional education, for rural small households.

¹ Much of the information in this section is drawn from the Statement of Work for this Task Order (see Annex A).

A second development problem in Guatemala, unsustainable forest management, is largely related to lack of income/employment opportunities for communities settled close to or within protected forest areas, which have historically been subject to rapid deforestation and loss of biodiversity.

USAID's response to this problem has been to help develop environmentally sustainable income alternatives in those communities to encourage forest preservation. The approach takes advantage of the opportunities offered to generate increased income through certified forest management by community-based small and medium enterprises (SMEs). It accompanies this by helping SMEs in the communities to generate income increases from the sale of environmentally sustainable non-timber forest products.

The four projects evaluated in this report are 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, implemented by the National Coffee Association (ANACAFE), the Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala project, implemented by Rainforest Alliance, and the Guatemala Community Tourism Alliance project, implemented by Counterpart International. Taken together, they represented a total portfolio of \$29,400,000.

The projects were designed to implement the Mission's Strategic Objective, Economic Freedom, entitled "Open, Diversified, Expanding Economies," as part of USAID/Guatemala's 2004-2011 Country Strategy. In 2010, USAID and its implementing partners modified their cooperative agreements to focus project interventions on the producer groups made up of the poorest producers in five departments of Guatemala's Western Highlands. The projects were also modified to support implementation of the new Feed the Future (FtF) and Global Climate Change (GCC) Initiatives in Guatemala.

Consistent with USAID's Evaluation Policy, the four end-of-project performance evaluations presented in this report will enable the USAID/Guatemala Economic Growth Office to evaluate whether its projects are achieving their desired results, and will also help inform future project design, implementation and effectiveness.

USAID/Guatemala is both an FtF Initiative focus country as well as a participant in the GCC Initiative. These initiatives share a strong monitoring and evaluation component to track ongoing activities, measure the results, and make corrections as necessary.

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 worldwide initiative began in 2010, and will continue in Guatemala at least through 2016. FtF builds on five key principles: 1) support 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.

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. 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.

Although they began before the FtF strategy was in place, all four projects evaluated in this report were considered to fall under the FtF strategy. All four projects were modified in September 2010 as "bridge mechanisms" with some initial FtF transition funding, until new Mission strategies covering the FtF Initiative, and the new Country Development and Cooperation Strategy (CDCS), were put into place in 2011 and 2012, respectively. As a result, although all four projects began before the FtF strategy was in place, all had some activities redirected to the five FtF priority departments in Guatemala's Western

Highlands.

It is noteworthy that, as a result of the changes in Mission strategy stemming from the new FtF and CDCS priorities, USAID's development hypothesis relating to agricultural value chain support shifted from income generation activities deriving from opportunities related to implementation of the Central America Free Trade Agreement with the United States (and the Dominican Republic) toward food security, including improvement of household nutrition and well-being in FtF-targeted areas.

The evaluation team examined the development problems facing small agricultural producers, community forestry concessions, community tourism and handicraft producer groups, the effectiveness of USAID's development hypotheses put forward to address those problems, and the successes achieved or difficulties encountered by implementing partners tasked with carrying out the four projects based on those development hypotheses.

Current USAID/Guatemala projects for the GCC Initiative 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.

Maintaining the health and productivity of these priority landscapes is an essential part of reducing emissions in Guatemala and Central America. Additionally, USAID will be cooperating with the donor community in assisting Guatemala in the development and implementation of its Low Emission Development Strategy (LEDS). The Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala project and the Community Tourism Alliance project, implemented by Rainforest Alliance and Counterpart International, respectively, fell under GCC guidance.

PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

EVALUATION TYPE AND RATIONALE

End-of-Project performance evaluations were conducted on each of the four economic growth projects, all of which ended in September 2012. The purpose of the evaluations was to measure and assess the effectiveness of the four projects at both strategic and project levels to validate or improve USAID's approach and to learn from results achieved for future project programming.

The next section, Research Design and Assessment Methodology, lists the key questions that the evaluations addressed. Also included in this report as annexes are the Scope-of-Work for the Evaluation (Annex A); the Evaluation Tools that were utilized to assess project performance (Annex B); and the Sources of Information to which the evaluation team referred (Annex C).

SPECIFIC EVALUATION TASKS

The evaluations focused on project effectiveness, examined by gathering and analyzing evidence of results and impact attributable to project interventions, including assessment of the sustainability of those results. In particular, the evaluation team was tasked with the following:

Project Effectiveness

Assess project effectiveness and high-level results of the projects in terms of:

- introducing small agricultural producers, community forestry concessions and community-based tourism and handicrafts producer groups to value-added activities, linking them to larger markets;
- increasing incomes and improving household food consumption decisions to combat food insecurity;
- increasing agricultural sector growth to increase economic activities of the rural non-farm sectors of nearby communities; and
- increasing the effectiveness of the local groups with which the projects worked.

Mellor Hypothesis

Test the applicability of the development hypothesis put forth in the “Mellor Model” of agricultural growth as a strong driver of poverty reduction and job creation, as it applies in the Altiplano (Highlands) region of Guatemala, both through increases in income from agricultural production and through ‘spillover effects’ on small-scale rural non-farm activities.

Implementation Problems

Analyze any implementation problems encountered in the context of the projects’ results frameworks, and how the implementing partners dealt with them.

Feed the Future (FtF) Strategy

Address the Mission’s multi-year FtF strategy, including activities incorporating more vulnerable populations. These activities include lower-end value chain producers, women, and USAID/Food for Peace (FFP) beneficiaries, 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 the National Coffee Foundation FUNCAFE (rural development).

INTENDED AUDIENCES

The intended audiences for this compendium of end-of-project performance evaluations are USAID/Guatemala—primarily its Economic Growth and Health and Education Offices; the USAID implementing partners whose projects were evaluated; and Government of Guatemala (GoG) entities—including the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food; the Secretariat for Food Security and Nutrition; the Ministry of Economy’s National Competitiveness Program; and the National Council of Protected Areas. The evaluations will also be provided for informational purposes to USAID/Washington—including the Bureau of Food Security, the Bureau of Policy Planning and Learning, and Economic Growth, the Education and the Environment 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.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The following questions were addressed during the course of the project evaluations:

Project Results and Sustainability

- Have the 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 the projects awarded to ANACAFE and AGEXPORT, and the subawards with FUNCAFE and INCAP? If there was an effect, how is that effect explained?
- Did the projects promote sustainable activities; what support will be needed for the producer associations assisted 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 the improvements likely to be lost if USAID support is 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 Under-Represented 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 with purchasing decisions or changes in household decisions concerning family planning?
- Did the 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 both performance and impact evaluations should be evidence-based. This evaluation was designed to meet that requirement by employing a mixed methods approach to searching for and examining available evidence of results attributable to the four projects being evaluated. Specifically, the evaluation team’s included 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; b) the quality of data collected to measure indicators of progress toward achieving results targets; and c) the degree to which implementing partners followed USAID guidance for measuring and reporting key performance indicators, especially for achieving higher order objectives of increased income and employment and, since 2010, reduced poverty and malnutrition. Lack of implementing partner (IP) baseline and longitudinal beneficiary surveys, along with evaluation team resource and time constraints, limited the evaluation to review of implementing partners’ compliance with indicator measurement and reporting; the scope of work for the evaluation did not allow for collection of any primary data.
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 IP managers and staff; USAID Agreement Officer Representatives (AORs), counterpart stakeholder partners engaged with the IPs in project implementation as well as a purposeful sample of key value chain players available to the evaluators during the field work. During visits to project field sites, structured interview guides (see Annex B) were used to collect information from collaborating stakeholders—community leaders, private firms, intermediaries, etc., of both sexes. Each evaluator tabulated responses from the interview forms to identify response patterns that would suggest uniformity in question findings, inconsistencies that would indicate diverse experiences, or potential response biases that warranted further investigation. Further key informant responses were “triangulated” with responses from direct beneficiaries to similar interview questions to verify the information provided.
3. **Site visits and beneficiary group/individual interviews:** The evaluation team obtained complete lists of project sites—communities and producer associations benefitting directly from project interventions—and, depending on number of sites and logistical constraints (security, travel time, field staff and beneficiary availability) randomly selected communities, producer associations and their members for conducting “ground-truthing” field visits and individual and group interviews

among beneficiaries to obtain their observations about changes in their income, employment, nutritional levels, wellbeing and gender equity deriving from project interventions. (The contacts made and sites visited are listed in Annex C to this report.) During visits to project field sites, structured interview guides (see Annex B) were used to collect information from small groups of beneficiary household representativeness and producers of both sexes, selected based on their availability at the time the evaluators were in the field and their experience with the project. In most cases interview groups ranged in size from 10 to 40 participants, drawn from households adjacent to a particular community center or producer group facility at the time of the evaluator's arrival at the project site.

4. **Cross-checking and discussion of preliminary findings:** The evaluation team encouraged participation by both USAID and IP staff in field visits and selected interviews. 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 based on availability meant that the persons met may not have been representative of all project beneficiaries. For example, if some 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 any of the projects had conducted baseline beneficiary surveys this potential 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.

CROSS-CUTTING FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

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

PROJECT RESULTS AND SUSTAINABILITY

Some of the value chain activities have been quite successful, particularly in coffee and horticultural products, tourism services in accessible areas and high-end handicrafts, as well as higher value certified wood products and some non-timber forest products from protected areas; and there is qualitative evidence of replication and scaling up of successful value chain production.

Other value-chain activities—involving community-based tourism in remoter areas, and some of the newer non-timber forest products—are still struggling to find their footing, in part because in some cases they seem to be supply-driven. Supply-driven assistance becomes more of a risk when other objectives begin to replace increased smallholder income as the primary goal of support to the value chain.

Spill-over effects from agricultural value chain support activities, in terms of promoting non-farm rural employment and income, appear to be more limited in remote communities in part because a limited number of non-farm goods and services are produced locally.

The shift in focus to FtF departments—the five poorest Western Highlands departments of San Marcos, Huehuetenango, Quiche, Quetzaltenango and Totonicapán—has added new challenges to the task of achieving economic sustainability for the horticultural and community-based tourism value chains. Working in the more remote areas, with limited infrastructure and few nearby markets, means that

desired results will probably take many more years, and more resources, to achieve. This trade-off between working with the extremely poor and effective use of project resources is a critical dimension of FtF Initiative implementation in Guatemala's Western Highlands.

Small producers tend to retain their traditional production scheme, basically rotation of corn and beans, utilizing more land than they plant in high-value products, to reduce the risk to their families of a cash crop failure. The system is managed as hillside agriculture, subject to climate change-induced periods of unpredictable drought and excessive rainfall, which have eroded the soil and reduced yields, exposing smallholder families to increased food insecurity due reduced availability of basic grains.

The evaluation findings tend to validate recent scientific studies and survey findings which suggest that increased incomes and employment from improved small farmer competitiveness in value chains do not necessarily translate into better nutrition and living standards for smallholder households.²

Environmental and quality certifications, although they tend to add value, secure markets and reduce sales volatility, also add to the costs of production, and these costs have an impact on smallholder household disposable income that is not reflected in sales data.

It is also true that adaptation to the effects of climate change is affecting the costs of production for small farmers in both the coffee and horticultural value chains, a development for smallholder household income that is not reflected in sales data.

INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING

Both ANACAFE and AGEXPORT have excellent institutional sustainability, and have increased their capacity to reach SME beneficiaries, including an emphasis on crop diversification and nutrition.

Nonetheless, the success of agricultural value chain activities in the FtF departments is constrained by inadequate provision by the public sector of needed infrastructure (e.g., paved highways and rural roads, irrigation systems), information (e.g., about climate changes and technologies to address their impacts), access to financing and other inputs to a successful value chain that smallholder producer associations are not able to address on their own.

Forestry concessions are a very sustainable institutional basis to build on results achieved in forest protection in Guatemala, by providing local people and entities with more incentives to maintain forests that provide income over the long term.

The caveat on the forestry concessions is that there remain considerable social pressures to break the model, because a rising number of local community residents are not included as concession associates.

Where there are linkages with national parks or protected areas with an interest in mobilizing community-based forest protection, the sustainability of community-based tourism efforts looks quite strong. But expanding community-based tourism to remoter areas, without such institutional linkages, has proven to be a challenge. The Community Tourism Alliance project responded by emphasizing exportable handicrafts products, a strategy that appears to have worked.

GENDER AND UNDER-REPRESENTED POPULATIONS

Both ANACAFE and AGEXPORT were slow to respond to the 2009 Gender Assessment recommendations, and their response has been incomplete. The response was stronger in the Forestry Enterprises and Community Tourism projects, in both form and intent, and there is evidence of the effectiveness of the attention to gender concerns in the results of these projects. The institutional sustainability of gender integration still will require reinforcement.

² Studies conducted by the Nutrition Institute for Central America and Panama (INCAP) and statistical findings from Guatemalan National Statistical Institute (INE), the National Household Living Conditions (ENCOVI) survey on household expenditures and cost of living, and the National Maternal and Child Health Survey (ENSMI) survey of maternal and child health and nutrition are cited in Annex C.

Although in some cases women’s employment has increased with the introduction of new crops in post-harvest activities like product sorting and grading, and women are becoming involved in producer association management, women’s participation continues to be limited by cultural norms, traditional gender roles and language barriers.

Project results in terms of women’s participation in decision-making vary by region and by activity. In the coffee cooperatives, decision-making still tends to be the preserve of men. In the forestry concessions, women have benefitted economically and have assumed active roles in management.

OTHER FINDINGS

Security issues stemming from narcotrafficking are a major issue, contributing to plunging tourism visits, cancellation of forestry concessions and highjacking of trucks carrying coffee produce.

The quality of Implementing Partner Performance Monitoring Plans (PMPs) suffers at times from lack of baseline and indicator definition, as for example in respect to sales levels of certified timber products prior to project initiation, and sales of environmentally certified agricultural products.

COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISES IN COFFEE (ANACAFE) FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

The Competitive Enterprises in Coffee project contributed to USAID’s 2004-2011 CDCS Strategic Objective 2, Economic Freedom: Open, Diversified, Expanding Economies, through achieving Intermediate Result 2.1, More competitive market-oriented (small and medium) private enterprises, by increasing the competitiveness of producers and producer groups in quality coffee value chains.³ Performance indicators measuring the impact of project contributions at the SO-2 level included:

- 1) cumulative value of sales of quality coffee, and in particular, environmentally certified coffee; and
- 2) number of full-time-equivalent jobs generated directly by the SME producers in quality coffee value chains.

Measures of project performance at the IR-2 results level included the number of quality coffee producer associations strengthened and the number of producer households and household members benefitting from USG assistance, disaggregated by sex. The table below summarizes the targets and results achieved as measured by key SO and IR performance indicators during the life of the project.

Competitive Enterprises in Coffee (ANACAFE)		
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULTS ACHIEVED	TARGETS
SALES (in US\$ millions)	US\$ 70.7	US\$44.5
NUMBER OF JOBS GENERATED	21,853	2,496
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	4,991	NA
NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS	24,955	NA
NUMBER OF SMEs BENEFITTED	78	75

PROJECT RESULTS AND SUSTAINABILITY

The evaluation team’s review of available USAID and ANACAFE project records—including the original cooperative agreement and modifications, performance monitoring plans (PMPs) and targets and quarterly and annual reports—indicates that the project met or exceeded its results targets for sales of quality coffee and generation of on-farm employment opportunities. Project records also indicate that intermediate results targets—in terms of participant training, association formation and legalization and

³ In 2010 USAID added the additional high level SO-2 outcomes of reduced poverty and malnutrition, to which the quality coffee project results were to contribute. These results outcomes were to be defined and measured in the national context, using secondary data sources including official Government of Guatemala (GOG) national household expenditure (ENCOVI) and maternal/child health and nutritional (ENSMI) surveys.

facilitating market alliances with buyers—were met in most cases, the exceptions being among those Western Highlands region producer groups included as project beneficiaries, which required longer periods of time than the two years anticipated for their formation, legalization, environmental certification and preparation to administer their operations. These latter producer groups are also located in more remote areas which lack access to paved roads and other infrastructure and public services key to becoming competitive value chain participants.

With regard to achievement of higher level objectives and results attributable to the project the evaluation team observed the following:

Changes in Income and Employment Opportunities

Document reviews, project staff interviews and discussions with producer groups substantiate that ANACAFE correctly recorded and reported the increases in employment and sales value of small and medium enterprise (SME) coffee association members, following the Mission’s PMP results indicator measurement guidance. By these measures ANACAFE achieved or exceeded the targets set in their project’s cooperative agreement and amendments. The evaluation team notes, however, that because the implementing partner did not collect and report data on changes in coffee prices, production costs or wages paid to workers, there is no evidence indicating whether or not increased sales and employment levels succeeded in raising the disposable income of beneficiaries, and hence in improving their living standards and reducing poverty.

The only qualitative evidence that evaluators found to support the claim that improved living standards resulted from sales of higher quality coffee was in respondents’ claims that the income generated had reduced somewhat their need to migrate to the coast to larger coffee plantations during harvest season—or out of the country—to supplement their household incomes.

Certification—e.g., organic, good agricultural practices or other quality certification—of quality coffee does appear to be a promising tool for putting a floor on declining incomes in the short-term, when prices fall, because of previously contracted prices. (There does not seem to be a short-term price ceiling, because the consumer market for certified coffees is limited and very price sensitive when prices rise.) And, even with non-certified coffees, which is still what most smallholders continue to produce, ANACAFE has been careful to maintain the concept of “Healthy Cups” (that the quality of the coffee coincides with the type of coffee grown at that altitude). This concept has had an effect on price premiums and stability similar to certification.

Although it is difficult to calculate the returns from project interventions in terms of attributable impact, preliminary analysis indicates that in terms of employment generation, the project produced excellent returns to USAID’s investment.⁴ One likely reason is that ANACAFE and its regular programs for small coffee growers are permanent activities, carried out with or without external international donor programs. The project’s interventions have provided additional leverage by allowing ANACAFE to extend its programs to small coffee producer units that had not been able to benefit from the institution’s support previously in terms of growth and further development. This is the case in respect to improvements in capacity and skills of the beneficiaries, mainly at the association level, areas in which cooperatives have gained the most from project support.

As distinct from employment generation, however, the gross sales indicator is a very weak indicator of smallholder household income, as it is not capable of reflecting the sensitivity of the coffee operation to changes in production costs. When coffee prices are good, the indicator is valid. But during the past year, as prices have tended to weaken, and with climate change impacts and increased input costs affecting costs of production, this indicator has failed adequately to measure what is occurring in terms of the disposable incomes of smallholder coffee producers.

⁴ The project produced more jobs per USAID project dollar expended than any of the other three projects evaluated.

Lack of access to formal credit lines limits the commercial viability of the coffee production cooperatives and their members. Important restrictions are observed in the aging of coffee trees, transport and the skills and capital of beneficiaries, which persist in spite of the progress made. The restrictions that limit the growth potential of small producers include lack of direct access to formal credit with the commercial banking system or through savings and credit cooperatives. In spite of being formally and legally constituted, a good portion of the coffee production cooperatives limit their credit to just receiving advances for production supplies in each crop cycle from the Federations of Cooperatives. It would seem that credit is not part of the culture of the cooperatives, even though during interviews, some of the cooperative members informed the evaluation team that they had received personal credits either from the banking system or the cooperative movement.

Changes in Poverty and Food Security

Health and nutrition show signs of improvement, with project support, particularly among the 175 beneficiary coffee producer households participating in the three FUNCAFE pilot Food and Nutrition

FUNCAFE: Linking Food Security to Coffee Value Chain Competitiveness

FUNCAFE's food security and nutrition interventions include kitchen gardens for more nutritious local vegetable cultivation, along with water filters and more fuel efficient stoves aimed at reducing intestinal and respiratory infections. Project support targeted women and children among 175 participating families in three pilot communities in the Western Highlands department of San Marcos. Responses to questions about these interventions ranged from "Now we don't have to travel so far and pay so much to buy better food for our children," to "With the stoves and water filters we also don't spend so much money on fuel wood and medicines." FUNCAFE interventions saved these households money, allowing them to spend more on other household needs—clothing and school supplies and house improvements were the most frequently mentioned. The more efficient stoves also used less fuel wood and put less pressure on the region's dwindling forests.

Security (SAN) pilot communities in San Marcos department. Still, overall, earning more money does not necessarily mean the money will be spent more responsibly, that is, on more nutritious food or better hygiene.

Recently completed INCAP household behavior surveys indicate that improved nutrition does not necessarily result from greater incomes or employment among agricultural producers organized into associations and competing more effectively in production chains.⁵

In 2010 USAID responded to these INCAP findings by linking a food security component to ANACAFE's quality coffee value chain competitive

activities and tasking ANACAFE's social development arm, FUNCAFE, with implementing this component. The evaluation found that outcome of this initial food security and nutrition (SAN, by its Spanish acronym) to be promising but mixed.

Under its sub-contract agreement with ANACAFE, FUNCAFE has launched a major effort to educate women in ANACAFE's rural project site areas (including women beneficiaries among both coffee producers and household members) about nutrition and hygiene, in order to reduce malnutrition and improve household welfare.

Beginning in late 2011, as part of its pilot SAN activities in three communities in San Marcos, FUNCAFE provided many of the 175 participating households with 50 gallon plastic water barrels and tubing to provide drip irrigation to 100 square meter vegetable plots. FUNCAFE also provided vegetable seed and guidance on how to plant, cultivate and harvest the vegetables and as well as information on how to prepare them for their families' consumption. The beneficiaries of the drip irrigation systems, seeds and technical guidance provided the land and prepared the garden areas using appropriate hillside terracing and other soil conservation measures.

⁵ See citation in Annex C. Although this study was focused on rural populations linked to a commercial value chain project with vegetable gardens, it suggests that similar results would be obtained in the case of the small coffee producers.

Despite a positive start, the evaluators observed shortcomings in FUNCAFE's technical oversight over the installation and operation of pilot vegetable gardens that tended to diminish their effectiveness in improving household nutrition in a sustainable manner.

The evaluators visited with the beneficiary families and inspected the vegetable gardens and drip irrigation systems of several of them. Deficiencies were found in the way the drip irrigation systems were designed and installed:

- First, the drip irrigation systems for the home gardens were designed for monoculture crop cultivation that provides gravity-fed water for the entire cultivated area of a single crop from the 10 to 12 lines of parallel drip tubing lines that radiate out from one feeder pipe connected to the water barrel, controlled with a single shut-off valve. For home gardens which include a variety of vegetables, however, the drip lines should each have a valve so as to regulate water flow only to those plants needing water. As a result, the barrels wasted irrigation water requiring refilling much more frequently than otherwise necessary, an added chore left largely to women household members.
- Second, the barrels were supplied and installed without lids. Beneficiaries did what they could to cover the barrels and prevent the collection of debris by using plastic sheet or corrugated metal pieces used for roofing, but complained that winds blew these away. Without properly installed lids, the systems will quickly clog up and be useless at critical water delivery times.
- Third, barrels were often installed with no easy access to a supply of tap or hose water to refill them. As a result, at critical times when water must be delivered to vegetable plants via the drip irrigation system, women must hand carry water to fill the barrels, as often as every three days when barrels are in continuous use and serving the entire vegetable garden area.

These deficiencies tended to reduce the effectiveness of the drip irrigation and vegetable garden systems and to place added burdens on women beneficiaries.

Spillover Impact on Local Non-Farm Rural Economies

Spillover effects from the successes of beneficiary producer associations appear to be limited in the more remote rural communities because there are limited non-farm goods and services produced locally. Information from beneficiary respondent interviews during field visits to project sites in the Verapaces and San Marcos suggests that the bad condition of highways and access roads reduced the exchange of goods and services with the neighboring towns only to market days. Transport costs and limited local demand restrict the extent to which local SMEs offering non-farm goods and services can grow and prosper. The FtF rural communities tend to be more remote than other communities in Guatemala, limiting the spillover impacts of agricultural value chains on nonfarm rural income and employment.

Sustainability of Activities beyond Project Life

USAID/Guatemala's decision to select a strong, financially solvent national NGO, ANACAFE, as the project's implementer, appears to have enhanced the sustainability of project activities and results. A fee levied on all Guatemalan coffee producers (1% of export value) provides ANACAFE with a financial base to offer agricultural, reproductive health and nutritional training to small coffee producers—and in many cases, other interested producers—and their families.

As a local NGO, ANACAFE has been able to obtain grants from a range of donors—including the UN International Fund for Agricultural Development, as well as bilateral support from the Danish, Swedish, Spanish and Italian governments, in addition to USAID—to sustain and expand its work with small coffee producers and members of rural communities where coffee is grown.

FUNCAFE also has a solid reputation as a responsible and responsive social development organization among independent sources of funding in addition to those of USAID; it has received other donor support for its social outreach programs, which is a promising sign for its capacity to do so as needed in the future. FUNCAFE can also count on ANACAFE regional offices for logistical support to extend its outreach to target small coffee producer communities. Finally, FUNCAFE has basic core budget support allocated to it directly by ANACAFE to run its basic programs and to provide counterpart funding for other donor assisted activities that its board of directors views as appropriate for carrying out its mandate.

ANACAFE records show that nearly all project beneficiary producer associations continue to be members of the Association. However, challenges confront the long-term viability of some of these groups. In particular, ANACAFE's assessment of the coffee sector is that many older coffee plants must be replaced; and many of these plants are located on the farms of the SME producer associations participating in the project (see box). There is no systematic national replacement strategy that takes into account the particular needs and constraints of small coffee producers, who often cannot afford to lose income for the periods that newly planted coffee trees during the 3-5 year period required to reach full production.

Aging of the Coffee Plantations of Guatemala

Practically 60% of the coffee plantations of Guatemala need to be renewed country wide, due to aging. This represents a serious challenge that will require financing to confront, because in addition to the cost of replacing the plants, the coffee producers must wait a minimum of 3 years before the new plants begin to yield. Despite some differences among regions, the majority of the plantations are over 15 years old. The problem is most severe in the departments of Huehuetenango y Quiche, in the Feed the Future geographical area.

Source: ANACAFE

A critical question is whether the banking system might be relied on to help bridge this gap. It is true that ANACAFE has used project funds to help some producer associations become formal entities, gaining "personería jurídica" status, which in Guatemala is a prerequisite to obtaining formal sector financing and entering into sales contracts. Formalizing their legal status has assisted beneficiary organizations to become more sustainable and viable organizations, and it is also a clear benchmark on the organizational scale toward sustainability. Nonetheless, access to formal sector financing remains an unsurmounted barrier for most of them.

INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING

Changes in the Capacity of ANACAFE and FUNCAFE to Identify and Cultivate Small Producer Groups, Including Organizational Planning and Management of Funds

ANACAFE and FUNCAFE now have a broader experience base in the particular requirements of small producers and their families, both for improving the quality of the coffee they produce as well as in diversifying their production of other nutritious crops for home use and for sale to generate added income. This is particularly evident in the social worker extension information on reproductive health, diet and nutrition that ANACAFE and FUNCAFE have generated, with both USAID and other donor support.

But the evaluation team did not find much evidence that either ANACAFE or FUNCAFE had internalized this experience by hiring and retaining project field technicians within its own staff. Most of these field staff found themselves without employment at project end and confessed to evaluators that they were uncertain about whether they would continue to work on similar FUNCAFE social development activities under new USAID activities, or would be hired from other funding.

According to field observations, it is evident that ANACAFE is a solid technical assistance provider for the coffee producers. But it is also clear that ANACAFE's field technicians are not trained to assist the families of the producers in improving the nutritional or health aspects of their households.

Consequently, coordinating their efforts with FUNCAFÉ technicians—and perhaps with other social development NGOs, as well—will be fundamental, if future technical assistance to the beneficiary families of the coffee producers is going to be implemented according to a more holistic approach, including include social and nutrition issues.

The pilot SAN projects carried out in three communities of San Marcos provided insights into FUNCAFÉ's capacity to administer these types of food security and nutrition activities in target FtF areas of the Guatemalan Western Highlands. The evaluation team visited all three communities and spoke with a number of the 175 families that had received potable water filters, fuel efficient stoves and drip irrigation equipment for small 100 square meter vegetable garden plots. The evaluators also visited the homes and garden plots of members to examine their installation and operation.

The evaluators found enthusiastic reception among beneficiaries for all of these health and nutrition interventions. Women confirmed FUNCAFÉ reports that the stoves and water purifiers not only improved their health but also saved them money—from the purchase of less wood to the purchase of less medication for healthier children—which meant income savings that could be used to meet other household expenditure needs.

Women respondents had more mixed experiences with the vegetable gardens, however, for reasons cited above about the deficiencies in design and installation of the drip irrigation systems needed to provide water for year-round vegetable cultivation. These design and installation flaws are correctable with proper training and oversight by FUNCAFÉ field extension staff. But FUNCAFÉ oversight of technical field staff—and of suppliers from whom drip irrigation systems are procured—is required, to ensure that the full nutritional potential of home vegetable gardens is achieved.

Impact of Project on the Internal Management Capacity of Small Coffee Producer Groups

Although one of the beneficiary-group selection criteria is that they be capable of being formalized into legally recognized production or marketing entities, for some producer groups this is a complicated process, as they start with little understanding of the process and find it takes longer than they had planned. Nonetheless, they insist that their value chain participation is a strong incentive because of the legal, technical and administrative strengthening support that ANCAFE provides them as participants and the increased sales values of higher quality product that they have experienced during their formalization process.

In terms of the production process improvements supported by the project, ANACAFE's holistic approach (including husking, fermenting and drying) proved to be very good. This process has allowed the producer associations and cooperatives to improve their members' incomes, since they had the capacity to store green coffee, process and sell the resulting product to the coffee federations or directly to exporters. There are strong incentives for the producers to improve the quality and increase the production of green coffee and to do so collectively through their stronger member-based organizations. Nonetheless, the field visits indicated that, derived from this growth, the current capacity of the storage-processing facilities (drying areas and mainly availability of water) will soon limit further production increases.

Project-supported rural coffee producer associations and groups require on-going guidance for both the technical operations of their members as well as the management—administrative, financial, etc.—of their operations as associations. Fortunately, that is the type of guidance that ANACAFE is prepared to and capable of offering its members on a sustainable basis. At the same time, the centralized role of Federación de Cooperativas de Las Verapaces (FEDECOVERA) and Federación de Cooperativs de Café de Guatemala (FEDECOCAGUA) in keeping financial records of the individual coffee associations has produced a dependency and discouraged expansion of their capacity to become more self-reliant in their operations. Interviews with ANACAFE and FUNCAFÉ project administrators indicate the interest of

those federations in continuing to work with these producer groups following termination of USAID funding as part of their own strategy to expand their membership base and operations.

The relationship between the Federation of Cooperatives and the individual cooperatives is solid and functional, and there is a strong relationship between and among these organizations. Strategic planning at the cooperative level is based on medium and long term plans. The Federations respond to their own plans, and they maintain a good control on these processes. But after visiting some federated cooperatives, it is evident that the strategic planning process in practice at the federation level is not present among cooperatives. Because of their high degree of dependency on the federations, the coffee cooperatives have no demonstrated development strategy or vision. Such dependency is not unusual in early development stages but it also eventually constrains the capacity of producer groups to exercise more decision making and control over their operations in order to continue to advance their competitiveness.

GENDER AND UNDER-REPRESENTED POPULATIONS

Results of Efforts to Integrate Women into Farming Activities, Producer Association Management

The participation of women is limited, at least in the Board of Directors of producers' associations that were visited. Their participation is mentioned as a support to the family and there are cases in which widows act as leaders of their homes. Women do participate in local Community Development Councils (COCODES). Participation of women in the boards of cooperatives and/or new associations seems to take place in those organizations that have also undergone training in greater gender awareness directed toward men. It is important to mention that when activities are incorporated in SAN with ANACAFE/FUNCAFE, women's participation becomes more active. This finding emerged from interviews with producer association members and project staff during field site visits, which revealed that women have found employment in specialized coffee sector activities, including in laboratory operations and as coffee tree nursery grafters and propagators. Any scaling up of coffee value chain competitiveness activities offers promise for additional employment for women as well as men.

Changes in Poverty from Project Interventions

There is little evidence available to substantiate one way or another whether women's poverty levels have fallen because of increased coffee sales attributable to project activities. Poor coffee prices and bad growing conditions have left producers and their families with limited additional net (and disposable) income for producers and their households.

The evaluation was, however, able to assess improvements in quality-of-life for three San Marcos FUNCAFE SAN communities visited. In those communities, interviews with representatives of participating households indicated that they and their family members have experienced diet and health improvements derived from the kitchen gardens, potable water and improved cook stoves introduced by the project, even if there have been initial shortcomings in the introduction and operation of these systems.

Diversity of Project Participants

The ANACAFE/FUNCAFE influence zones include areas where the majority of the population is indigenous, in the Verapaces and the Western Highlands. In both cases we can see that the supported producer and/or cooperative groups include, without any type of exclusion, the indigenous population. The only exclusion that could be observed was the participation of women in decision making and economic empowerment. The limited Spanish language capabilities, both in terms of speech and literacy, of many women within these communities constrains their capacity to participate more actively in producer group leadership and decision-making.

Adoption of 2009 USAID/Guatemala Gender Assessment Recommendations

In response to the Gender Assessment recommendations, in November 2011 ANACAFE used USAID funding to engage a consultant to conduct a gender assessment of its operations, make recommendations for integrating gender into its operations, development manuals and prepare and conduct workshops for ANACAFE staff on integrating gender into the Association's programs. Among the consultant's findings were that:

- Gender issues were recognized in the ANACAFE culture but were not well understood and not in any way integrated into the Association's operations or programs.
- Other than for its training programs, ANACAFE has no indicators to track participation by sex or the relative gender impact of its activities.
- The ANACAFE Organizational Strengthening Unit is the most appropriate entity to take responsibility for ensuring that gender tools are integrated into Association programs, and used.⁶
- However, this work was only started and completed during the last year of project implementation and only reached a small share of ANACAFE and FUNCAFE staff, mostly in the field.

The evaluator's review of project documents including the gender assessment training manuals and workshop agendas as well as responses to interviews with headquarters staff revealed that ANACAFE and FUNCAFE staff were not well informed about this gender work.

OTHER FINDINGS

Unanticipated Outcomes

The introduction of measures for adapting to the effects of climate change was found to be appropriate but insufficient. The absence of environmentally sound water management (e.g., waste water treatment and recycling) practices in wet mills has been an important limitation. Rain harvesting has required better and bigger infrastructure to cope with the droughts deriving from climate change. Plagues and diseases related to higher humidity and temperatures remain of high concern, because they will require significant investments by producers to be overcome.

Coffee "roya," a fungus deriving from extreme humidity that because of climate change is now appearing at altitude levels never before subject to the plague, is damaging both the size and the quality of smallholder coffee harvests (see box). Its control requires either the application of fungicides, increasing production costs while simultaneously threatening organic certification. The alternative is to replace the coffee plants with more resistant varieties, a significantly more costly investment in seeds and seedlings that also requires bridge financing for several years until the new plants start producing.

Regarding climate change and adaptation to its effects, many of the practices that were seen by the evaluation team concur with the technical package recommended by technical extensionists (compost using worms, harvesting of rain, optimal use of water, minimum tillage practices, etc.). However, they have no structured answers regarding traditional crops and integral management of small water watersheds, although they were aware of the problems.

Small coffee producers retain their traditional production scheme, which includes rotation of corn and beans (traditional Mayan milpa cultivation system), in most cases allocating more land to this than to the area they plant with coffee. It is likely that they prioritize the more starvation risk-averse practice of cultivating basic grains for home consumption before expanding the share of their land dedicated to cultivating coffee for sale to the markets. In other words, they attempt to avoid the risk of a cash crop failure, which would lead to reduced income and food insecurity. According to the field visits, the

⁶ Eugenia Centeno de Celada, Eugenia. Diagnóstico situacional de las Condiciones de Género, del Proyecto Competitividad y Fortalecimiento Empresarial Western Highlands, ANCAFE/USAID, Guatemala, 2011.

Climate Change and the Coffee “Roya” Fungus

The Global Climate Change phenomenon introduces much instability to climate conditions. The seasons are irregular and unpredictable. The rains can be erratic and extend over unknown periods of time—and the same happens with droughts. These conditions encourage the spread of disease vectors in places and during months where they were unheard of before. Temperatures rise, and provide the conditions for the infection process to increase. Other factors that affect the development of coffee roya, such as the altitude, plantation management, storage and plant varieties get mixed up with the aforementioned situations. Under unfavorable conditions, severe epidemics can occur, and this tends to explain some recent occurrences in certain coffee regions of Guatemala. Small farmers are reporting that their costs of coffee production are increasing because of climate change, requiring them to make investments to adapt or lose markets. In particular, the coffee “roya” fungus has become a major concern, devastating producers at higher altitudes who had never before been subject to the problem. A case study carried out in Acatenango and Yepocapa by ANACAFE demonstrated a severe drop in levels of coffee production during the harvests of years 2011/12 and 2012/13, caused by the coffee roya. The drops in production were between 40% and 50%, for the Acatenango zone, and 30% and 40% for the Yepocapa zone.

Source: ANACAFE

smallholder system is managed as hillside agriculture. Periods of alternating drought and excessive rainfall have eroded the soil, while poverty pressures are causing smallholders to cultivate on ever steeper inclines.

The already restricted capacity to retain humidity is reduced further, given that many do not follow good soil conservation practices and adequate use of organic matter. The culmination is reduced yields, which expose smallholder families to increased vulnerability regarding food security due to reduced availability of basic grains. Good coffee prices, for a period within the project’s life, have generated good returns from the coffee investments. However, because of the recent fall in prices, some cooperatives that bought grain coffee at good prices from their producer members were forced to sell for lower prices. As a result some of the FEDECOVERA cooperatives discontinued their operations as federation members.

Luckily, their producer members had sold their grain coffee at good prices and were able to escape without losses.

Difference between Design Assumptions and External Uncontrollable Events during Project Implementation

Climate extremes, such as tropical storms, freezes, droughts, floods and hail, have impacted negatively on flowering, production and yields of coffee plantings and have facilitated the unanticipated spread of some coffee diseases. Climate change is a growing threat to small holders, and adaptation to climate extremes—since they are unpredictable according to all previous experience—has become part of the challenges coffee producers face, adversely affecting their competitiveness.

Quality of Project Monitoring and Reporting

In most but not all cases implementing partners are correctly measuring and reporting indicators of progress toward achieving project targets. One shortcoming is the procedure for measuring and reporting the value of sales of environmentally certified coffee, as distinguished from the value of total coffee sales, which does not appear to have been practiced consistently over time and among producer groups. Further, gross sales revenue is a poor measure of household income, poverty reduction and well-being in the absence of information to track the impacts of changing production costs in terms of net revenues. Similarly, employment generation figures without wage or task remuneration information provide little understanding of whether workers’ employment on their own or nearby small coffee farms compares with the opportunity cost of working as migrant workers on larger coffee plantation or as remittance workers outside the country, two practices particularly dominant in the Wester Highlands region of Guatemala today.

ACCESS TO DYNAMIC MARKETS FOR RURAL SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES (AGEXPORT) FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

The Access to Dynamic Markets for Rural SME's (Dynamic Markets) project contributed to USAID's 2004-2011 CDCS Strategic Objective 2: Economic Freedom, Open, Diversified, Expanding Economies, through achieving Intermediate Result 2.1, More competitive, market-oriented (small and medium) private enterprises, by increasing the competitiveness of producers and producer associations in horticultural value chains.

Performance indicators measuring the impact of project contributions at the SO-2 level included:

- 1) the cumulative value of sales of horticulture crops, particularly environmentally certified goods, and
- 2) the number of full-time-equivalent jobs generated directly by more competitive SME producers in quality coffee value chains.

Measures of project performance at the IR-2 results level include the number of horticultural producer associations strengthened and the number of producer households and household members benefitting from USG assistance, disaggregated by sex.⁷ The table below summarizes the targets and results achieved as measured by key SO and IR performance indicators during the life of the Dynamic Markets project.

Access to Dynamic Markets for Rural SME's (AGEXPORT)		
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULTS ACHIEVED	TARGETS
SALES (In US\$ Millions)	US\$ 36.3	US\$34.0
NUMBER OF JOBS GENERATED	28,114	18,500
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	4,812	NA
NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS	24,060	NA
NUMBER OF SMEs BENEFITED	70	70

PROJECT RESULTS AND SUSTAINABILITY

The evaluation team's review of available USAID and AGEXPORT Dynamic Markets project records—including the original cooperative agreement and modifications, performance monitoring plans (PMPs) and targets and quarterly and annual reports—indicates that the project met or exceeded its results targets for sales of horticultural commodities and generation of on-farm employment opportunities. Project records also indicate that intermediate results targets—in terms of participant training, association formation and legalization and facilitating market alliances with buyers—were met in most cases, the exceptions being among those Western Highlands region producer groups included as project beneficiaries in the two years of project implementation which required longer periods of time than anticipated for their formation, legalization, environmental certification and preparation to administer their operations. These latter producer groups are also located in more remote areas which lack access to paved roads and other infrastructure and public services key to becoming competitive value chain participants.

⁷ In 2010 additional USAID added additional higher level SO-2 outcomes of reduced poverty and malnutrition to which the quality coffee project results were to contribute. These results outcomes were to be defined and measured in the national context using secondary data sources including official Government of Guatemala (GOG) national household expenditure (ENCOVI) and maternal/child health and nutritional (ENSMI) surveys.

With regard to achievement of higher level objectives and results attributable to the project the evaluation observed the following:

Changes in Income, Employment Opportunities and Poverty

Measures of progress toward achievement of income targets may be misleading, because the income measure used, “Cumulative sales of goods under environmental certification . . .,” is not well defined, and also because information provided by beneficiary producers is incorrectly calculated in PMP reports.

AGEXPORT quarterly and annual reports indicate that producer groups achieved or exceeded their average US\$50,000 sales targets when measured in terms of gross sales. In two observed cases, for example, 2011 season sales were reported at US\$320,000 and US\$115,000, respectively, well above the target. However, these sales statistics appear to be misleading indicators for measuring income gains for two reasons.

First, under the SO 2 “More competitive Market-Oriented Private Enterprises,” to which the Dynamic Markets project contributes, the higher-level performance indicator for income to be measured is “Cumulative value (in USD) of sales of goods under “environmental certification,” as a result of USAID programs.” But the definition of “environmentally certified,” which could cover a number of concepts, from organic certification to good agricultural practices, is not specified.

The evaluators found that AGEXPORT helped participating producer groups to improve their agricultural performance in order to obtain good agricultural practices (GAP) certifications for many—but not all—of their members. The more advanced producer groups visited—the Association of MAM Agricultural Producers (ASOMAM) in San Bartolo, Huehuetenango and the Association for Integrated Agricultural Development (ADADI) in San Lorenzo, San Marcos—have documented proof with certificates to demonstrate their compliance with GLOBALGAP standards of cultivation.

But sales data reported by producer groups to AGEXPORT and consolidated by AGEXPORT in reports to USAID represent total sales without reference to whether the commodities were produced and sold by “environmentally certified” producer groups or not, or if so, what kind of environmental certification was entailed. The evaluators found no sales data that were disaggregated to distinguish between certified and non-certified produce.

Second, increased (gross) sales value can tend to misrepresent the project’s impact on beneficiary families’ net or disposable income, because no account is taken of production costs. Thus there is no way of knowing whether beneficiaries indeed have more disposable income available to improve their quality of life.

When evaluators discussed product sales with groups of producers and asked them on what they spent their added income—in an effort to ascertain possible spill-over effects into the local

Certification: The “New Normal” for Horticulture Value Chain Competitiveness

The green bean Association of Mam Agricultural Producers (ASOMAM) proudly displays its product quality and environmental certifications on the wall of its small office at its facility on the edge of the city of San Sabastian in the Western Highlands department of Huehuetenango. The office is part of a half acre complex of buildings that include a receiving and packing room for post-harvest product sorting and selection, a cold storage room for holding produce till delivery to buyers, and well marked areas for storage and handling of agro-chemicals used in production. The certifications are from international organizations including GlobalGAP that certifies that good agricultural practices were followed in the course of cultivation and post harvest handling. These certifications enable ASOMAM the products of ASOMAM’s current 524 members to reach markets as far away as Europe and Japan at premium and more stable prices. Also, AGEXPORT help in setting up their own sorting and backing operations has meant reduced rejections and a stronger, more balanced partnership with buyer-exporters, which now have confidence in the quality of ASOMAM deliveries to their shipping facilities outside Guatemala City. “We won’t go back to the way we sold our produce before, by the side of the road at whatever price middlemen truckers paid us,” ASOMAM representatives stressed. “We know how to be more competitive now and the certifications help. We plan to grow our Association with even more members and certified produce now that we have the facilities and the experience.”

non-farm economy—the response most frequently was, “What additional income?” To explain their response, participating producers indicated that rising input and transport costs had left them with very little income after they had been paid by buyers. This was true particularly for newly assisted producer groups which had not yet mastered quality control and therefore experienced rejections of a significant share of the product they shipped to buyers.

Producers did report that project assistance in obtaining environmental or quality standards and certifications helped to increase value added and protect them against price fluctuations. Still, producers complained that there was little income left over if they experienced rejections by buyers for inferior product, particularly if they had first to pay down any advances made in cash or in kind by buyers for seed or agrochemical inputs used in production. Nonetheless, the lesson that it was necessary to exercise quality control to obtain higher prices was internalized; producer associations with their own sorting and classification facilities (such as San Barolo cooperative in San Sebastian, Huehuetenango) reported improving income margins from reduced rejections for their green beans and snow peas.

Such positive experiences have by no means been uniform for all the producer groups assisted. One producer association visited reported loss of membership—from 140 members down to 104 members—in part because the plot sizes of several members were too small to be commercially viable, but also because they were able to sell their product to only one buyer, which was suspected of manipulating prices by applying overly strict quality requirements for delivered product. The AGEXPORT field agent had responded well, by arranging a second buyer contract with the producer group to introduce a little more market competition for their produce.

Product certification works to protect producers against price declines at time of sale as well as to secure higher premium prices for product. The Dynamic Markets project focus has been on the production of “environmentally certified” product sales with particular focus on adoption of “good agriculture practices” (GAP) proof for that certification. AGEXPORT has helped producer groups obtain GlobalGAP certification and with it a differentiation of their output as superior to products lacking that labeling. The goal of “environmental certification”—putting aside the particular certification process, GlobalGAP or otherwise—is to give participating producers a competitive edge. High-value horticultural crop producers interviewed by the evaluators could cite fewer examples of where certification increased the prices they obtained for their products than from situations where certifications helped put a floor on prices when markets were in decline.

In response to questions regarding their interest and motivation to participate in horticultural value chains, beneficiaries tended to respond that they would prefer to increase their crop production, sales and incomes sufficiently so that they did not need to leave their communities and families to migrate to jobs elsewhere.

Changes in Food Security

The evaluation team learned from discussions with small producers that they tend to allocate to high-value horticultural export crops only a small share of the land that they allocate to their main subsistence crops, corn and beans; the average ratio was about 6 to 1 among the respondents interviewed. In addition, producers reported looking to their own or communal forested land to harvest fuel wood or construction lumber. This diversification of sources of food, fuel and cash crops may not maximize revenue but producers interviewed claimed it was necessary to manage the risk of food shortages that might be more likely—in their minds—to occur in the event a cash crop failure were to leave them with no income at all to buy food or fuel.

The relationship between rising incomes and declining malnutrition among project beneficiary households appears weak. Earning more money does not necessarily mean the money will be spent more responsibly. Available evidence examined by the evaluation team suggested that increasing incomes is not sufficient to ensure reduction of chronic malnutrition. AGEXPORT’s sub-grantee,

INCAP, has conducted household behavioral studies which suggest that the objective of improved nutrition does not necessarily result from greater incomes or employment among agricultural producers organized into associations and competing more effectively in production chains.

Spillover of Increased Incomes and Employment on Non-Farm Rural Economies

The evaluation finds little evidence from field visits of any significant and distinguishable impact on generation of non-farm employment from the purchase of local goods and services, an outcome posited by the Mellor model of agriculture-led rural development. The most reasonable explanation is that several important conditions for the Mellor model to work did not exist in the communities where the project was operating. Among the most important of these conditions is proximity to paved roads and other infrastructure, and a population density sufficient to foster rural non-farm economic activities.⁸ Analysis of producer responses to questions about their spending practices suggests why spillover effects may be low among project participants in the Western Highlands FtF departments, at least in the early stages of project implementation in the region:

- First, farmers produce very low net incomes at an early stage in their high-value horticulture production and when some disposable income is available it is first used to pay off debts or buy more land. There is no clear evidence that money received by creditors or by land sellers is circulated in the local rural non-farm economy.
- Second, in the more remote areas where the project attempted to improve competitiveness of producer groups in horticultural value chains, the population is much more dispersed. Those producers who indicated that they generated some disposable net income, said they purchased few goods and services at local markets, preferring to travel further to larger urban centers, often buying goods and services imported from outside the region—e.g., clothing and shoes for children, pre-paid cell phone services, medications and school supplies. This tracks with the recognition in the Mellor model that “leakages” outside local rural economies exist and as a result diminish the income multiplier and job creating spill-over effect of added rural incomes.
- Also worthy of noting here is that the Mellor employment generation model is based on a study of the Guatemalan Western Highlands region that includes not only the five Feed the Future departments but also the departments of Chimaltenango, Sololá and Sacatepéquez; these last three horticulture crop intensive departments have much greater concentrations of rural non-farm populations and much more developed road and irrigation infrastructure than the departments and municipalities where the Dynamic Markets project has been working in the last two years and where the Feed the Future Initiative will focus going forward.

Sustainability of Horticultural Value Chain Activities beyond Project Life

Despite the challenges facing small high-value horticultural crop producers in their efforts to improve their value-chain competitiveness, the following evidence suggests that the project has generated promising momentum toward improved competitiveness, and with it rising incomes, greater employment opportunities and potential for reduced poverty and malnutrition.

First, producer group legalization, product certification and improved skills development are now powerful drivers for expanding and sustaining high value horticulture crop production in the region. Most producer groups selected for AGEXPORT support were or are now legally registered entities—as associations, cooperatives or private firms—a fact which has drawn them into the formal economy and given them access to services and support that otherwise they would not have had. AGEXPORT used project funds to help some producer associations become formal entities, gaining *personalidad jurídica* which in Guatemala is a prerequisite to obtaining finances and entering into sales contracts. Formalizing

⁸ Mellor, John. Ibid.

their legal status assisted beneficiary organizations in becoming more sustainable and viable organizations. Such formalization is also a clear benchmark on the road to organizational sustainability.

Second, as part of the more formal market economy, participating producers and producer groups have begun to respond more to sound market opportunities, producing when there is an articulated demand from buyers for the differentiated products they are increasingly more capable of producing. Awareness of these market opportunities is reflected in the knowledge that producer interviewees shared about, for example, the best agricultural practices to follow—e.g., Integrated Pest Management—in order to place their products in international markets.

Still, not all organizations benefiting from AGEXPORT legalization support have yet achieved levels of operation that promise long-term sustainability of their operations. More remote beneficiary producer groups are more vulnerable due to their distance from markets and less developed marketing skills. This was very apparent from interviews with producer group members and leaders in Totonicapán where their operations and land parcels are significant distances from paved roads.

Climate change, particularly manifested in climate extremes of drought, heavy off-season rains, and uncharacteristic cold spells, is horticulture producers' greatest perceived threats to competing effectively in horticulture value chains. The words that came from interviewed respondents' lips most consistently when the question of future concerns was raised were "*malas condiciones climaticas*." This contributed to the practice of hedging against unpredictable weather by only committing a small share of their land to horticultural crop production and continuing to "diversify" their production of agricultural crops to include traditional maize and bean for domestic consumption.⁹

INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING

Results from Engaging AGEXPORT in Project Implementation

At the overall project level, AGEXPORT strategic planning and awareness of small producer circumstances has been greatly enhanced by the project. This is evidenced in the explicit recognition of the small producer constraints that needed to be addressed in planning its value chain competitiveness assistance. Further evidence of strengthened AGEXPORT capacity is the October 2010 International Standards Organization (ISO 9001) Certification for its value chain alliance program. This ISO certification was itself one of the performance indicators that AGEXPORT was to achieve as part of Dynamic Markets project implementation.

Nonetheless, AGEXPORT did not have sufficient rural development implementation capacity to be a fully effective USAID partner when working with more remote and less market-oriented producer groups in the Western Highlands. Despite having a regional office based in Quetzaltenango, rural development clearly has not been the focus of AGEXPORT previously, whose principal mandate as an organization has been boosting Guatemala's exports.

Building AGEXPORT's rural poverty reduction outreach capacity—or teaming AGEXPORT with organizations having that capacity—is critical given the first finding above that better nutrition and living standards among rural populations do not necessarily follow from rising incomes in producer groups benefiting from AGEXPORT assistance. AGEXPORT's recruitment of rural staff under the Dynamic Markets project is a good sign, but none of these were incorporated as AGEXPORT permanent staff at project termination.

Impact on the Internal Management of Small Agricultural Producer Groups

In the departments targeted, achieving FtF objectives through improving the value-chain competitiveness of producer groups may require longer, more intensive and broader-based production and social development assistance than that provided under the Dynamic Markets project.

⁹ A better strategy might be that implemented by FUNCAFE (see box in previous section).

The evaluation notes that in the last two-year phase of project implementation, AGEXPORT transferred its value chain competitiveness interventions to more remote and less advanced producer groups in Guatemala's Western Highlands. This transition period provided an opportunity to test the degree to which the Dynamic Markets value-chain competitiveness model would work in FtF departments.

The answer is that the model produced mixed results. USAID and AGEXPORT anticipated that the two-year timeframe for grant-managed support to strengthen producer group value-chain competitiveness could be transitioned to the more remote regions of the Guatemalan highlands without much alteration. But evaluation team observations, supported by both beneficiary and key informant interviews, suggest that more time and more intensive support would be required to bring producer groups in many parts of the Western Highlands region to a promising level of self-reliance in their operations.

Even though producer groups needed to meet minimum capacity criteria to qualify for project assistance, the evaluation found that many seemed to require sustained support over more than a two-year assistance period to achieve targets for institutional sustainability, including legal registration, certification of their production processes and products and improved business skills. Producer groups in the Western Highlands departments appeared particularly to lag in achievement of their organizational development targets.

This was particularly problematic for some "late blooming" producer groups supported as the project approached its termination date. For example, one producer group in Totonicapán that the evaluators visited had not yet completed construction of its warehouse and had no place to store materials donated by the project for a drip irrigation system. As a result, the equipment provider simply dumped its cargo of drip irrigation piping and tubing along with seed and fertilizer inputs in a nearby secondary school field, putting the supplies and materials at risk of pilferage and loss in the open air and exposed to rain.

For these producer groups it simply was not possible to transition from social groups (Grupos de Amistad and Trabajo, by the Spanish name) to form commercially sound and legally registered producer associations within a short (i.e., two-year) period. The formation and legalization of producer associations for the collective production and marketing of higher value crops introduces a new dynamic into producers' agriculture strategies. The receipt of group training and the execution of collective projects have both introduced an element of cohesion that opens association members to a bit more risk taking. Further, the added remunerative employment that high-value crop production generates may not lead to much more income than before but it means that the part of income that previously was earned from seasonal migration to coffee farms and sugar plantations now can be earned at home. The result is more permanency in the community, which also facilitates more engagement in producer association operations and leadership.

Still, producer interviewees emphasized that they depended first on their own resources, and not group efforts, for their economic survival. Lack of trust is perhaps one of the biggest factors that producers find most difficult to overcome. Social capital—trust and cooperation—is slow to build among risk-averse producers as they transition to higher value horticultural crop production, and is one of the core reasons why longer periods of project support are required before producers are willing to fully participate in and benefit from more competitive value chains for their high-value produce.

The project has assisted producer associations to qualify for what appears to be the "new normal" in horticultural value chain participation—the marketing of goods certified to be produced and processed using good agricultural and/or environmentally sound practices. From its market research regarding what consumers seek in horticultural crops, AGEXPORT has determined that quality certification is now almost an industry standard. This partly reflects measures taken by Guatemala's major horticultural crop buyers, the US and European Union, which have recently introduced food safety standards that

must meet sanitary and phyto-sanitary (SPS) requirements to enter their borders. Similar standards are now expected by national and regional supermarket chains and by the hotel and food service industries, which also impose private quality standards. The evidence from producer and supplier interviews indicates that without producing and processing their horticultural crops to meet certification and quality standards, producers cannot compete in value chains supplying any of those markets.

AGEXPORT seems to have missed opportunities to assist producer groups in becoming more environmentally responsible in their operations. A component of USAID support to agriculture production and marketing is the completion of an environmental assessment and preparation of an environmental mitigation plan to enforce the appropriate use of only the appropriate agro-chemicals in cultivation and processing. AGEXPORT engaged the services of an environmental engineer to conduct these required environmental assessments and prepare environmental mitigation plans for each producer group assisted with Dynamic Markets project funding. The reports and plans were submitted to AGEXPORT but producer groups visited volunteered the information that they were still waiting for the mitigation plans to implement them. They even requested help from the evaluators in communicating their requests for copies of their environmental mitigation plans to AGEXPORT management.

GENDER AND UNDER-REPRESENTED POPULATIONS

Results of Efforts to Integrate Women into Farming Activities, Producer Association Management

Evaluation findings tend to validate that women participate in only a limited way in producer associations supported by the project. Gender disaggregated data on membership show the “participation” of women but say little about the form that participation takes. For example, at the time of the evaluation team’s field visits only one of the twelve producer groups reported having women members in any leadership roles and less than half indicated that they had had women members in leadership roles in the past. Nearly all reported, however, that significant shares of their producer members were women—from 20% up to nearly 60% depending on the commodity and region—though no discernable pattern was found. The evaluators found no example of a producer association entirely operated by and for women. AGEXPORT project staff reported that in the associations supported by the project, women were better and more responsible at performing administrative and produce handling functions—recording keeping, accounting, sorting and packaging—than men, but they still have more limited roles in leadership and decision-making.

Impact on Poverty from Project Interventions

No impact was observed that can be directly attributable to project implementation. Greater numbers of women have been employed in a range of jobs related to high value horticulture crop production, processing, handling and marketing; but the evaluation team found no evidence that this added income for women translated into any change on poverty levels. The lack of any baseline data, and the early project design which did not focus on poverty reduction among women make such measurement and attribution unreliable.

Women’s Involvement in Purchasing Decisions or Family Planning Decisions

During its field visits the evaluation gender specialist interviewed women about their involvement of women in purchasing decisions or family planning decisions but found no evidence of any linkage attributable to project implementation.

Diversity of Project Participants

The evaluation sought to determine if there was any bias in the selection of participating producer groups on the basis of gender or indigenous make-up of their members and potential members. Such inclusiveness was important if the Dynamic Markets project was to address longstanding structural problems of socioeconomic and political inequality and exclusion, particularly in rural areas and

indigenous communities where poverty is most extreme (71% poor and 24% extremely poor and malnutrition is far worse (59% overall, reaching 70% in many communities).¹⁰

In its early phases, AGEXPORT and USAID, in order to assure program success in boosting producer competitiveness, set demanding criteria for selecting producer groups with which to work in improving their value chain competitiveness. As the AGEXPORT cooperative agreement was modified to focus more on poorer communities in Guatemala's Western Highlands, USAID relaxed some of these more strict selection criteria to be more inclusive of producer organizations. These modifications offered more scope for participation of producer groups in more remote indigenous communities and indeed, more were included in the last phase of project implementation.

The evaluators found, however, that such indigenous groups require much more effort and time to become legal entities, adopt improved agricultural practices and participate more assertively in negotiating sales of their horticultural products. One result is that at project termination, two of these producer groups visited by the evaluation team in Totonicapán, Asociación Agrícola Unión y Fuerza (AGRIU) and Asociación de Desarrollo Integral Nueva Alianza (ADINA), were far from ready to be left to their own resources. Still with project termination, there was no plan in place for providing further support. To assure that sustainability of more remote and diversified producer groups, more than the standard 18 – 24 months and \$40,000 – \$60,000 of AGEXPORT technical and financial support and accompaniment seems necessary.

Adoption of 2009 USAID/Guatemala Gender Assessment Recommendations

In response to the 2009 Gender Assessment—as well as to realign its activities in support of the new Feed the Future Initiative—AGEXPORT arranged with USAID to use cooperative agreement funding to engage the services of “Vital Voices” to undertake a gender “diagnostic” and with INCAP to conduct a baseline nutrition survey. The Vital Voices diagnostic and recommendations were delivered to AGEXPORT in mid-2012, less than six months before project termination and with little time remaining for implementation. The evaluation team found no evidence that those recommendations had been applied generally to AGEXPORT value-chain programs whether funded by USAID or other donors.

OTHER FINDINGS

Unanticipated Positive and Negative Outcomes

Producer beneficiaries are receptive to adopting agricultural practices that help both the environment and mitigate risks of crop failure. Many producer group members interviewed reported experiencing climatic conditions that adversely affected their production, in some cases losses so severe that they had no marketable output. Particular instances related to frosts, freezing rain and even snow in areas where respondents could not recall them ever happening before. Respondents also reported unpredictable and excessive rains and drought which seemed to occur with greater frequency. During field visits to Totonicapán and Huehuetenango farmers showed the effects on horticultural plant development from a drought that the region was experiencing at the moment.

This appears to have made them more receptive to receiving and introducing good agricultural practices that not only help elevate the value added of their product but also to adapt to the climate extremes under which they work. Hillside contour cultivation using terraces, and drip irrigation to conserve water and produce during seasons with less chance of extreme (cold) weather, are examples. Producers could not identify other climate adaptation measures, but were open to experimenting and adopting them with AGEXPORT help. Such receptivity opens the door for USAID and AGEXPORT to improve agricultural practices and yields, while helping to stabilize incomes.

¹⁰ USAID, CDCS 2012/16. p. 38

Difference between Design Assumptions and External Uncontrollable Events during Project Implementation

Both climate and markets have provided unexpected “surprises” and USAID and AGEXPORT have promptly responded with changes in project design and implementation. Most notable is the impact that “Hurricane Stan” had on project implementation in 2006. The hurricane laid bare the vulnerability of Western Highlands producers to extreme climatic events. The quick Mission response to Hurricane Stan provided funds administered under the Dynamic Markets project to expand production and employment among members of producer groups eligible for project assistance. Improvements in producer group capacity to serve their members increased along with AGEXPORT understanding of the particular circumstances of resources and infrastructure in poor Western Highlands departments. This responsiveness to unexpected events in a fashion that enabled the Dynamic Markets project to remain “on target” for achieving its results can be attributed in large measure to the close collaboration between USAID and AGEXPORT when reprogramming of project resources became necessary.

FORESTRY ENTERPRISES IN GUATEMALA (RAINFOREST ALLIANCE) FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

The Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala (FEG) Project, implemented since 2006 by Rainforest Alliance, contributed to Strategic Objective 2 of USAID/Guatemala’s Country Strategy 2004-2011, Economic Freedom: Open, Diversified and Expanding Economies, through achieving Intermediate Result 2.1, More competitive market-oriented (small and medium) private enterprises. The project helped strengthen forestry SME concessions, enabling enable them to expand and enter higher value-added marketing chains in forestry and non-timber forest products. The project’s intermediate results targets were as follows: 1) forestry SMEs increased sales, 2) forestry SMEs generate more employment, 3) forestry SMEs improve their business skills capacity and competitiveness en local and international markets, 4) biodiversity and forest conservation is encouraged through sustainable forest management practices and environmental services mechanisms and 5) Global Climate Change Objectives advanced.

A logical framework for the project, relating project inputs to outputs, intermediate results and impacts, as well as assumptions, couldn’t be found in the reviewed documentation. Nonetheless, the principal project inputs, outputs, outcomes, intermediate results and impacts were structured by Rainforest Alliance in a PMP and a Monitoring and Evaluation Database system. The evaluation team performed an in-depth review of this information. Data extracted from this review process is summarized in the table below.

Result	Indicator		Target Results	LOP Result	Accomp %
IR1: Increased Sales of SME Sector					
LLR1.2: USD Value of Sales to High Value Markets	1.2.1. USD Value of sales in transition to certification	TP	48,808,326	48,742,850	100%
	1.1.2. Volume of certified products sold	NTP	5,880,000	3,593,750	61%
LLR1.3: Value of investments	1.3.1. USD Value of investments	TP	16,614,000	26,140,453	157%
		NTP	691,000	1,988,865	288%
IR2: Creating Employment					
LLR2.1: Jobs Created	2.1.1. Permanent jobs created	TP	1,388	1,981	143%
		NTP	255	172	67%
	2.1.2. Temporary jobs created	TP	16,390	20,325	124%
		NTP	1,493	3,576	240%
IR3: Conservation of Biological Diversity					
LLR3.1: Certified Hectares	3.1.1. Hectares maintained in certification	TP	500,000	496,693	99%
		NTP	300,000	423,830	141%
	3.1.2. Hectares newly certified	TP	134,324	171,959	128%
		NTP	155,500	423,830	273%
LLR3.2: Certified Operations	3.2.1. Number of New Certified Operation	TP	2,217	2,127	96%

		NTP	6	5	83%
IR4: Improve SME Competitiveness					
LLR4.1: SME's Competitiveness Increased	4.1.1. Number of SME's with improved business capacity	TP	65	93	143%
	4.1.2. Number of SME's accessing business and financial services	NTP	15	27	182%
	4.1.3. Number of SME's selling to markets for certified products				
LLR4.2: Strategic Alliances Created	4.2.1. Number of Clusters, business alliances, and partnerships created	TP	83	139	167%
		NTP	17	40	235%
IR5: Global Climate Change objectives advanced					
LLR5.1: People consulted	5.1.1. Number of people consulted		1,000	2,225	223%
LLR5.2: Nursery plants produced	5.2.1. Number of nursery plants produced		200,000	396,000	198%
LLR5.3: Reforested area -Ha-	5.3.1. Hectares of reforested areas		150	161	107%
LLR5.4: New Carbon projects facilitated	5.4.1. Number of forest carbon projects facilitated for development and market linkage		8	9	113%
	5.4.2. Number of forest carbon projects fully developed and under negotiation with buyers		2	1	50%
LLR5.5: Area under carbon projects developed -PDD-	5.5.1. Hectares under carbon projects developed PDD		454,000	943,500	208%
LLR5.6: Investments in reduction emission activities -USD	5.6.1. USD Value of investments in reduction emission activities		1,100,000	2,154,324	196%
LLR5.7: Carbon credits generated and/or sold	5.7.1. Number of carbon credits generated and/or negotiated		500,000	368,000	74%

PROJECT RESULTS AND SUSTAINABILITY

Project Performance and Effectiveness

Project effectiveness was assessed by comparing the project's achievements with its respective work plan and results targets. According to evidence examined (M&E database, annual and quarterly reports, field visits and key informant interviews), the project was effective on meeting the targets and expected results for the majority of the performance indicators established in PMPs to measure project's success.

Sustainable forest management certification for timber and non-timber products, along with the development and sale of timber and non-timber forest products, were effective in the conservation of forests with high biodiversity values, while providing communities with long-term opportunities for income/employment generation. The project's targets in terms of maintaining areas under sustainable forest management certification have largely been met. The targets on newly certified areas for timber products and non-timber products were also largely met. One interesting point is that overall area under Forest Stewardship Council timber certification in Guatemala

Selling high-value timber: the case of Gibson Guitar

The community forest concessions in the Mayan Biosphere Reserve in Guatemala have been working with Gibson Guitar Corporation to provide high quality, FSC-certified mahogany timber. Mahogany has been long favored by musical instrument manufacturers for its beauty, durability and the rich tone it produces. Ongoing demand for wood has significantly decreased the population of the mahogany trees. Unless they are carefully extracted, mahogany logging causes extreme environmental degradation—for every tree cut, another 25 are destroyed. Community forestry operations in Guatemala are changing the way trees are harvested and ensuring that mahogany and other tree species are protected. Gibson Guitars uses certified mahogany to make a special line of guitars. Rainforest Alliance has been training local sawmills to mill mahogany to Gibson's particular needs. Pieces that in the past would have been thrown away are now milled for Gibson guitar neck stock, which increases the yield from every mahogany tree. This support has allowed forest concessions to increase the sustained production of high-quality pre-dimensioned mahogany for guitar components with a low incidence of rejects, increased income and improved primary processing efficiency.

(especially in Mayan Biosphere Reserve) has been maintained over the past years, in contrast with other countries in Latin American region, where total area under sustainable forest management certification actually declined.¹¹

Community forestry concession model is a successful story on how community forest management in Guatemala achieved outstanding results on protecting biodiversity (annual deforestation rates dropped from 3% before the concessions to 0.16% currently¹²), and promoted economic development of participant communities.

The project has met its targets for increasing gross sales of timber and non-timber products of supported SMEs, however, the baseline value for gross sales at project inception was set to zero. This baseline value impairs the ability to analyze the trend of sales before the project began, limiting the possibility to determine whether the increment in gross sales of the supported SMEs is attributable to project.

The project's results vary in the different regions:

- In Petén, sales of non-timber forest products were significantly increased, especially in the last two years, exceeding the project's targets. This is related to the excellent results achieved in the export sales of xate palm. There is also a significant international market potential for products like chicle gum and allspice. But gross sales of other non-timber forest products, like ramón nut, are still very low.
- In Petén, the positive results of timber products sales are believed to have been influenced by introducing lesser-known species, like Manchiche, Santa María and Pucté, as new high-value chains. Likewise, the consolidation of FORESCOM (Empresa comunitaria de servicios del bosque, S.A.), a second level enterprise owned by community forest concessions and focused on adding value to timber products, has shown a positive impact on SME sales of timber products. It is the opinion of

FORESCOM increases value-added timber products from Community Forestry Concessions in Petén

Since 2003 FORESCOM, a community concession owned company, is offering certified wood products from the Community Forestry concessions in MBR in Petén. FORESCOM is focused on the production of value-added certified wood products, meeting worldwide standards for quality and sustainability. Product line-up includes: decking, flooring, parquet, housing and tongue-and-groove board. FORESCOM has played a key role on including certified wood from "lesser-known" species such as Santa María (*Callophylum brasiliensis*), Manchiche (*Lonchocarpus castilloi*) and Pucté (*Bucida buceras*) contributing to increase the total value of forest lands under community concessions, therefore, increasing communities' incomes. All FORESCOM products are FSC® certified for sustainable forest management, and features the certified seal from Rainforest Alliance. The processing plant has also been certified by FSC as a Guardian Chain of Custody.

FORESCOM is currently exporting its production to USA, Spain and other countries.

The community owned company was awarded as the Best Exporter of Value Chain Enterprises in 2010, and was also awarded as the Best SME.

evaluation team that FORESCOM business model has a good potential to be replicated in other regions.

- In the altiplano region, SMEs sales were increased, meeting the targets. However, sales amounts are considered still low. Producers are still selling their products individually. Taking into consideration the successful experience of FORESCOM in Petén, a promising opportunity is EKKO, a second level enterprise, recently created which will be consolidating production from individual producers, adding value and selling to high-value customers like KALEA in Guatemala and other potential international customers who have manifested interest.
- In the Verapaces region, SME sales were increased, meeting the targets.

¹¹ Source: Rainforest Alliance Guatemala.

¹² USAID Guatemala, Evaluación de las Concesiones Forestales en la Reserva de Biosfera Maya, Peten. 2008

SMEs' gross sales are expected to increase as more areas become FSC certified, and SMEs continue to increase their business skills.

Although project targets on sales of certified timber products have been met, a key issue remains that a significant portion of such sales correspond to wood with low value-added. Several conditions seem to be influencing this situation: i) there is a big international market for low value-added wood; ii) most community forestry concessions in Petén lack the financial capacity to afford the costs associated with harvest and primary processing (international buyers of low value-added wood offer advance payments for wood production); and iii) the main project strategy for adding high value is FORESCOM, which is focused on adding value through secondary processing of other species like Manchiche, Santa María and Pucté, leaving a significant portion of mahogany and cedar production to be sold with low value-added.

Project targets for SME strengthening have been exceeded in all three of the project's geographic areas, although greater success has been seen in Petén. SMEs in the Altiplano and Verapaces regions are still in the early stages of enterprise development, although the project's efforts to promote SME strengthening appeared to be highly valuable for beneficiaries.

Regarding the project's objective of assisting Guatemala to respond to climate change challenges, there have been mixed results. Project efforts have been very positive in strengthening national capabilities to participate in international carbon markets. In addition, project activity has been critical in fostering a learning process of local stakeholders on the implications and real potential benefits of carbon projects under the REDD+ (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) mechanism. The project facilitated the development of a number of carbon projects under the REDD+ mechanism, with a special focus on the GuateCarbon project in community forestry concessions in MBR in Petén.

The project reported that 5 carbon projects were facilitated, meeting the target. It appears that none of the facilitated projects have been completed (project design document (PDD) for GuateCarbon Project is completed, but not validated or registered; PDD for the other projects are under preparation). Although the project was not expected to accomplish the sale of projects in carbon markets, this is a key sustainability issue for the investments that USAID has made in these projects, given that they are still not receiving any funding from carbon credits, a condition that poses a threat to the completion of such initiatives. It is the opinion of evaluation team that community forestry concessions model has demonstrated success and sustainability in capitalizing the value of land and natural resources, and that potential income from carbon credits is an option to enhance this model, and not a necessary condition to ensure its success.

Project staff explained that delays and frustrations have occurred in the process related to: i) local stakeholders learning that the process of development of REDD+ projects was long and difficult, beyond what was expected when the project was designed; ii) a policy issue, regarding carbon property rights, which has not been resolved by the government, and iii) the project design miscalculated the period of time required to complete previous studies, such as a deforestation emissions baseline. As a result of these conditions, the project's target on carbon credits generated was not met, and local stakeholders have received none of the funds they expected from their participation.

"Pre-sale" agreements have been signed with international brokers for the future carbon credits that some of the supported projects are expected to generate once their design process is completed, and their projects are validated and registered. This situation is considered unclear, taking into account that, as stated before, the Government of Guatemala is still in the process of clarifying the carbon property rights in national lands; therefore, no one is still legally authorized to negotiate carbon credits. It has to be noted that this is a situation beyond the control of the project.

The target of \$1.1 million on "investments on emission reduction activities" was largely exceeded. However, there is a strong perception among key stakeholders interviewed that some of project's

critical expenditures were “ineffective” or “highly expensive, such as the baseline study on greenhouse gasses emissions from deforestation for “Tierras Bajas del Norte” region” According to interviewed stakeholders, the cost of some of the pre-requisite studies (in part funded by project) to access the REDD+ mechanism was extremely high, when compared with the potential REDD+ economic benefits for specific projects. The project’s strategy of contracting international consultancy companies has been questioned for the high cost of such contracts, as well as because they needed a period of time that largely exceeded stakeholders’ expectations. There is also a strong perception, mainly among community forestry concessions in Petén (co-proponents and co-funders of GuateCarbon Project), that the project contributed, in part, to creating excessive expectations on the potential economic benefits from REDD+ projects, as well as on the period of time required to formulate and develop a REDD+ project.

Quality of Project Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

As explained before, in its documents review the evaluation found no logical framework relating project inputs to outputs, intermediate results and impacts, or assumptions, which limited the ability to monitor project impacts. A PMP was designed to monitor project activities and advances toward the established targets. An M&E database system was created and maintained, including all indicators identified in PMP. Overall quality of project PMP is considered medium, because the design of the set of performance and success indicators doesn’t cover all relevant project activities and efforts. The evaluation team was able to identify several important project tasks that appear to have been implemented effectively and are not reflected by indicators in the PMP structure.

Baseline data for some of the indicators in the PMP seems to be counterintuitive. For example, although sales of certified timber were not zero prior to project initiation, baseline values set at zero for SME sales of timber products, which limited the ability to establish whether the target was met simply by maintaining sales at previous growth trends or whether a change in the previous trend was attributable to the project. This is not considered as a project fault since it was a decision of USAID/Guatemala to set baseline values to zero.

A large set of project activities, mainly those related to support to GoG institutions, are not reflected in the project’s PMP or its M&E database. Some of these activities are considered crucial for the achievement of the project’s main goals. One good example is the support given to Consejo Nacional de Areas Protegidas (CONAP) in Petén, where, through a subaward signed with Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), the project funded forest protection, wildfire fighting and biological monitoring efforts. Such efforts are considered critical by CONAP to preserve forest coverage and biodiversity in MBR.

Although most of the activities

Enhancing Forest Conservation through Management of a Sustainable Non-Timber Forest Product (Xate Palm) in Guatemala

Sustainable management of Xate palm (*Chamaedorea* spp.) has been a significant source of income for communities in forest concessions in Petén. Previously, communities were unsustainably extracting Xate palm from forest, selling to intermediary local traders and receiving low prices. Communities were not organized and didn’t have adequate management skills to operate a profitable and environment-friendly business. With the support of USAID, Rainforest Alliance, through the Forestry Enterprises Project in Guatemala, assisted the community forestry concessions in Petén to implement best management practices for sustainable management of non-timber products, obtaining FSC sustainable management certification and gaining access to responsible high-value markets. During 2009 and 2010, 18,953 bunches of Xate palm were exported, for an amount of US\$211,130. Sales were increased in 2011 to 63,950 bunches, registering an income of \$608,818 for the participating communities. Women are involved in this environmental-friendly business, actively participating in xate sorting and quality control. They also participate in performing management tasks in the communitarian enterprises. The project coordinated closely with the National Protected Areas Council—CONAP—and other national authorities to develop the regulatory framework to assure the sustainability and conservation of non-timber products from the Guatemalan forest.

implemented by partners under subawards contributed to the achievement of expected results, the evaluation team was able to identify partner's activities that were not included in the M&E database system or project reports. This situation limited the ability to assess the full extent of the impact of project activities funded by USAID.

Sustainability of Project Impacts

Maintaining certification of sustainable management of forests is a key factor for the sustainability of SME sales of timber products as well as non-timber products. CONAP requires that certification is maintained by concessions as a contractual condition. Nonetheless, several issues were identified as threats to maintaining certification. First, the cost of maintaining the certification is heavy for the SMEs, leading to a situation where only those with good sales levels to high-value markets are able to afford the cost. Second, the recent cancellation/ suspension of three of the community forestry concessions, due to loss of certification, demonstrates that the lack of support for these groups is a significant risk for their business model and therefore, for the conservation of the MBR natural heritage.

According to field evidence and M&E data, the project has been very successful in strengthening beneficiary SMEs. Supported SMEs have enhanced enterprise abilities, increased access to credit and financial services, and are more competitive and profitable. Successful high-value market linkages have been established through the project's efforts. There is a general perception among interviewed beneficiaries in Petén that project support on capacity building (training, management, product development, marketing, etc.) has been demonstrated to achieve highly positive impacts on their business activities, and a significant portion of supported SMEs are running profitable and sustainable business that will last beyond the project's life.

On the other hand, project efforts and investments in SME strengthening in the Altiplano and Verapaces are more vulnerable if support is suspended, since SMEs in these regions are currently in earlier stages of enterprise development and their market linkages are still incipient. A valuable lesson learned through this project is that, depending on the external and internal conditions of SMEs, long-term support of up to 10 years could be needed for the SME to reach a commercially viable level.

Visits to forestry concessions in Petén (Uaxactún and Carmelita) where communities live inside their concession-managed areas, showed that community members who don't belong to concessionary associations are showing an interest in sharing the benefits of the concessions. This situation can exert pressure on the forestry concession model, a consideration of rising importance as the first set of concession contracts nears its end, in approximately ten years.

Local SME empowerment supported by the project, higher in Petén than in the Altiplano and Verapaces, is considered a critical factor for the sustainability of the project's impacts.

Gender equity, translated in increased women's participation, leadership and management in economic activities supported by the project, is seen by beneficiaries as a change of vision that will have long-term positive impacts on family economy, education and nutrition.

The project made important investments and efforts in strengthening national stakeholder capabilities and supporting carbon projects to reach the global climate change mitigation markets. These efforts are considered by GoG institutions and local stakeholders as very valuable in contributing to national preparedness to participate in the REDD+ mechanism. However, all the supported carbon projects are still in the process to be completed, and due to this, the sustainability of the investments made by the project cannot be guaranteed.

Financial and technical support to forestry protection, monitoring and combating forest fires, as well as biological monitoring in the MBR, which WCS has been implementing with USAID financing, are highly valued by the responsible authorities (CONAP) and of great importance to maintaining the governance

and the ecological integrity of the MBR. The field visits confirmed that CONAP does not have the financial and technical resources to address these issues and that WCS does not have a financial leveraging strategy in order to continue this critical task, should USAID financing and support not be available in the future.

Changes in Income and Employment Opportunities

Performance indicators of employment generation show that the project was successful in meeting its targets. A remarkable success is the case of jobs generated for women working with non-timber forest products, where M&E indicators show that project largely exceeded its target. This success is highly influenced by groups of women working on Xate palm and ramón in Petén.

There are no specific indicators regarding income generation in the project's PMP. However, indicators showing increased SME sales and data collected through interviews with individual beneficiaries demonstrated that significant increases in income have been promoted by the project in all three geographic regions. This evidence is more conclusive in Petén.

The nature of economic activities supported and strengthened by the project implies that a large proportion of jobs generated are temporary and/or seasonal (e.g., timber and non-timber forest products harvest, sorting and packing of xate, gathering ramón or allspice).

Increased numbers of SMEs and larger and better organized SMEs supported by project activities led to the creation of employment opportunities in all three geographic regions. Creation of additional employment opportunities is expected with the consolidation of the EKKO initiative in the Altiplano region.

According to the project's M&E data, employment generation attributable to project efforts is geographically distributed as follows: Petén 46.78%; Verapaces region: 34.85% and Altiplano region 18.38%.

Changes in Food Security (Particularly Household Malnutrition)

Although improving food security/reducing malnutrition was not a specific goal for FEG project,

Enhancing Forest Conservation through Management of Virtual EKKO, the first production center of the Guatemalan Highlands

In Guatemalan western highland, a region where population density is a source of significant pressure to forest, Rainforest Alliance, with funding from USAID, has been supporting the forestry SME sector. Before working with RA, small carpentry workshops used wood from illegal sources, producing low-quality products. RA support to SME focused on improving the competitiveness of SME, strengthening their business and entrepreneurial skills, optimizing transformation of raw material, and fomenting the use of wood from legal sources.

However, access to markets remained as a weakness of their business model. Since 2011, RA supported the creation a business concept based on a "Marketing Center for Forest Products," focused on grouping 17 SME production of wooden furniture and accessories, to increase their combined competitiveness. This initiative, now known as EKKO is virtual showroom on the internet, where customers can buy from a diverse catalog of wooden products from participant SME. EKKO is now a legally registered and operating company, which is currently establishing business alliances with national and international customers in the high-value wooden product market.

qualitative data collected through interviews with project beneficiaries in community forestry concessions at Uaxactún and Carmelita in Petén showed that increased income for women participating in SMEs supported by the project are influencing how family income is being spent, prioritizing education and food quality for family members. Women obtaining increased income are participating in diverse activities inside the SMEs, including being SME association members, working on xate palm sorting and packing or ramón gathering, and being employed by an SME in management or secretarial activities.

Evidence of changes couldn't be observed in the Altiplano or Verapaces regions, where food insecurity and household malnutrition prevalence is

higher than in Petén. In the Altiplano region, field visits were focused on carpentry facilities mostly located in urban areas. A very limited amount of female involvement was observed in these SMEs. Selected interviewees (SME owners and employees) were unable to identify changes in food security, related to project support to their SMEs. Another relevant factor is that in the Altiplano region, the project focused on small and medium carpentry workshops, considered as a group with low vulnerability to food insecurity, according to conditions observed in the field.

Evidence of Any “Spill-Over” of Impact to Non-Participants in the Project

In field visits to remoter community forest concessions in Petén, specifically Uaxactún and Carmelita, evidence of a spill-over effect was observed and confirmed by interviewees. Increased income achieved by SME members and employees in the last ten years has induced the creation of new informal businesses in these communities; merchants started visiting the communities to sell products such as chicken, meat and vegetables (trade activities different than forestry). Also, “pacas” (stores selling pre-owned clothes and shoes) appeared in those communities.

Interviews with members of SMEs at community forest concessions closer to municipal hubs in Petén (located in El Remate and Melchor de Mencos) showed that beneficiaries are using additional incomes mostly on i) opening new businesses as “tiendas”; ii) buying land, cattle or houses, and iii) paying personal debts.

In the Altiplano region, SME owners interviewed said that additional income attributable to project support is mainly being re-invested in the SME or in opening other businesses such as small grocery stores.

Beneficiaries in all three geographic regions were questioned on how they are spending additional income from their participation in project-supported SMEs. Their answers were ranked from most to least expended as follows: i) education, ii) improvements in food quality, iii) improvements in family clothing and shoes, iv) improvements in house quality, v) vehicles (mainly motorcycles) and vi) recreation (mainly satellite TV systems).

INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING

According to the evidence examined (M&E database, annual and quarterly reports, field visits and key informant interviews), the project has performed intensive and effective work in strengthening the capacities of supported groups. According to beneficiaries and other stakeholder, such efforts have been critical in achieving SME competitiveness, profitability and, therefore, commercial success. Specific targets on SME assistance and strengthening have been largely met by the project.

Capacity building activities focused on training, management, accounting, finance, marketing, product processing and gender issues have strongly contributed to consolidating SME business abilities in the three geographic regions. These activities are highly valued and appreciated by beneficiaries. One example that was frequently mentioned by beneficiary SMEs as very effective in strengthening their business capabilities was a financial management software tool, implemented by the project. Use of this software was a clear sign of organizational strengthening.

Visits to project sites showed that project efforts in institutional capacity building achieved different levels of success in the three geographic regions. SMEs in Petén showed higher levels of enterprise development, functioning as formally established businesses, exporting their certified products to high-value markets both individually as well as grouped under FORESCOM, with appropriate access to financial services. SMEs in the Altiplano region are mostly small urban carpentries, still selling their products individually and showing earlier stages of enterprise development. SMEs in the Verapaces are mainly timber producers and carpentries that are selling their products both individually and grouped under a number of associations like (Asociación de Carpinteros de Alta Verapaz (ASOCAV). These groups also show earlier stages of enterprise development, if compared with Petén forestry concessions.

It has to be noted that USAID has a history of supporting the concessions process in Petén for more than 15 years, a fact that tends to explain the difference.

According to beneficiaries in the three geographic regions, institutional capacity building efforts performed by the project play a key role in SME sustainability, because increased business capacities will continue benefiting SMEs beyond the life of the project.

The evaluation team notes that Rainforest Alliance is engaged in a Professional Development Program focused on strengthening its own capacities by offering training opportunities to its employees. According to RA staff, this has been a key strategy that contributed to the project's overall success.

The forestry handicrafts sector has received little support in Guatemala. Due to the high tourism potential of Guatemala, it is thought that the sector has a high potential for growth. It is feasible to strengthen this type of SME sustainably, considering their low impact on natural resources, and their potential to include vulnerable populations such as women and elderly to generate employment and income and take advantage of the opportunities that national and international tourists represent. Although the project was not committed to work with handicraft SME, support was provided to "Cooperativa Los Unidos," a wood handicraft cooperative in El Remate, Petén. The visit to this SME showed a good potential and participation of women in this association.

GENDER AND UNDER-REPRESENTED POPULATIONS

According to evidence reviewed, the project implemented gender strategies and specific efforts to foment the economic empowerment and participation of women. It included the formulation of a document entitled "Estrategia Interna para su Aplicación en el Alcance de Resultados de Manera Equitativa," which outlines strategic lines to achieve project results with gender equity. This demonstrates a good level of adoption of applicable recommendations from USAID/Guatemala's 2009 Gender Assessment.

Additional to the gender training offered to beneficiary SMEs, interviews with Rainforest Alliance staff members and documental evidence showed that technical staff received continuous training on gender. The evaluation team has the perception that both efforts yielded a clear impact reflected in women leadership in forestry concessions in Petén.

Most project performance indicators in the M&E system, as well as the PMP, are disaggregated by men and women. Success on women's participation in all levels of SME operation varies by region. In Petén, increased women's participation in "juntas directivas" and decision making positions has been observed. In the forestry concessions, women have benefited economically, have high levels of empowerment and have assumed active roles in management. Women's participation is significantly lower in the Altiplano and Verapaces regions, where it is generally reduced to secretarial or accounting roles.

M&E data show that the project has achieved significant positive results in the areas of job generation for women, largely exceeding its targets for both timber and non-timber products. Products such as xate palm and ramón in the Petén region are heavily influencing these numbers.

M&E data and field visits showed that training focused on women had a strong emphasis on the project's capacity building strategy; training indicators showed that the project exceeded its targets in the three regions, as follows:

- Number of women that received training on timber products: 3,816 (target exceeded by 251%).
- Number of women that received training on non-timber products: 4,565 (target exceeded by 73%).
- A key factor was that the women's training was focused on economic production subjects and not just on traditional women's household tasks.

Interviews with beneficiary women revealed that women's increased income is influencing decision-making on household purchases, prioritizing expenses in improved education and food.

Geographic coverage has allowed the project to reach beneficiaries from diverse ethnic groups, and immigrant populations (e.g., immigrants from other regions of the country settled in community forest concessions in Petén). Gender strategies allowed the project to reach women and children.

COMMUNITY TOURISM ALLIANCE (COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL) FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

The Community Tourism Alliance project contributed to USAID's 2004 – 2011 CDCS Strategic Objective #2, Economic Freedom: Open, Diversified, Expanding Economies, through achieving Intermediate Result 2.1, More competitive market-oriented (small and medium) private enterprises. It did this by increasing the competitiveness of community-based tourism and handicrafts value chains. Performance indicators measuring the impact of project contributions at the SO-2 level included: 1) the cumulative value of sales of tourism services, and 2) number of full-time-equivalent jobs generated directly by participants in tourism value chains. Measures of project performance at the IR-2 results level include the number of community tourism associations strengthened and the number of tourism service provider households and household members benefitting from USG assistance, disaggregated by sex.

PROJECT RESULTS AND SUSTAINABILITY

All of the Community Tourism Alliance project's high-level results targets were met or exceeded during the life-of-project, except for generation of employment and number of SMEs created (see table, below). In reviewing the results documentation and through direct observation, verification of field sites and key interviews, it is evident that the project's strategic approach (strengthening tourism and handicrafts value chains, and pursuing market-based conservation strategies through tourism and handicrafts sectors) was sound. Project records also indicate that the following intermediate results targets were also met—facilitating access to market, capacity of communities to co-manage and conserve cultural resources, and participation in the conservation of biological diversity.

Community Tourism Alliance (CTA) Project Results Targets and Achievements

Indicators	Global Target	Cumulative Total	% Accomplished
Economic Growth Private Sector			
Productivity			
Income generated	20,000,000	23,181,083	116%
New Jobs created (FTE)	8,700	6,692	77%
Number of Visitors	675,430	962,789	143%
New SMEs created	220	175	80%
SMEs access bank loans	196	359	183%
Credit allocated for tourism and handicrafts initiatives	1,005,581	1,496,033	149%
Strengthened Organizations	1,124	1,245	111%
Public Private Dialogue Mechanisms	4	4	100%
Natural Resources and Biodiversity			
People with economic benefits from NRM practices	10,869	12,631	116%
People trained in NRM/biodiversity conservation	7,210	7,609	106%
Feed the Future Indicators			
Per capita expenditures food/non-food	1.07	2.80	262%
Persons trained in agricultural sector productivity	748	5,083	680%
SMEs/CBOs receiving USG assistance	106	110	104%
Women's organizations assisted	33	40	121%
Rural HHs benefiting from USG assistance	389	439	113%
Value of Sales	359,906	390,391	108%
Value of New Private Sector Investment in agriculture sector or nutrition	62,694	385,204	614%
Leverage (US\$)	\$ 8,572,000	\$ 10,992,742	128%
Cost Share (US\$)	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 2,610,296	100%

Source: Counterpart International.

Changes in Income, Poverty Reduction and Employment Opportunities

The project increased incomes to beneficiaries who had not previously engaged in the formal marketplace, and significantly during its final 18 months, due to the success of the handicrafts value chain. Throughout the life-of-project the tourism services value chain generated significantly higher income growth than the handicrafts value chain. However, in the past year, the handicrafts value chain has skyrocketed, and superseded the tourism value chain in the last quarter. The Table below provides an illustration of these trends.

CTA Beneficiary Income Generated from Tourism and Handicrafts (FY 2011)

Income Generated	Accumulated Total Income generated (LOP) (2010)	Year 2011	Year 2011	Year 2011	Year 2011 4th Qtr	TOTAL Year 2011
		1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr		
From Tourism	\$ 9,740,912	645,604	807,795	830,026	989,447	3,272,873
From Handicrafts	\$ 3,783,764	22,925	29,589	220,829	1,037,300	1,310,644

The reasons for this increase in the handicrafts value chain were twofold: (1) the combined impact of the security situation resulting in disappointing tourism arrivals, and (2) the refocus of the geographic

project area toward FtF department sites meant that the tourism value chain opportunities were not as robust. Counterpart shifted its focus to reinforce export-oriented handicrafts, which seems to have been a successful strategy.

A micro-credit activity supported by the project has also shown positive income growth, particularly in the project's final 18 months. An alliance with Guatemala's Microfinance Network (REDIMIF) was developed in 2011 to facilitate access to credit for rural handicrafts and tourism producers in the region through its subsidiary institutions. Seven new lines of credit were established and three community micro-credit facilities were formed. The Asociación Para el Desarrollo Integral del Lago Atitlán (ADICLA) microcredit program for tourism/handicrafts generated 231 full time jobs and \$187,000 in sales, facilitated by loans for such things as equipment and other investments (over a period of 8 months). The success of this has spurred ADIGUA, a micro-finance institute, to raise its loan portfolio to tourism-related services and products from 5% to 16%, with expectations that it will go up to 20%.

These two factors, the growth of high-end handicrafts and micro-credit financing, during the final two years of the project, have positively increased incomes at a significant rate.

Employment Opportunities

The Project did not fully reach its employment generation target in part because of security issues and other exogenous shocks. However, handicrafts produced for export were unaffected, and continue to grow, with strong employment potential.

The general security situation deteriorated sharply in Guatemala, particularly in the Petén and the Verapaces with states of siege and drug trafficking-related incidents. Guatemala also experienced climate vulnerabilities with many roads impassible particularly in the highlands and especially the two main roads leading to Lake Atitlán. Both of these challenges impacted the general image of the country, for tourism arrivals, conditions in the local communities to carry out projects, and enabling conditions for the tourism trade. In addition, the Avian Flu and the economic downturn in the United States and Europe affected tourism numbers worldwide, including in Guatemala.

The number of jobs targeted to be created also was predicated on the disbursement of a \$16 million credit program (GuatInvierte) that was targeted to SMEs and micro-enterprises in the tourism sector. This investment fund was never disbursed, due to factors outside of the project's control. In 2006, 107 loans were granted to the tourism and artisan sectors for a total of almost a half million dollars by GuatInvierte. These loans created 107 new businesses, 360 new jobs and an estimated seven million dollars in revenues. In early 2007, the credit program continued to expand with 24 loans totaling around \$300,000. However, in mid-2007, GuatInvierte and DaCrédito stopped providing new credit. Their explanation was that loans had been stopped because more than 1% of the first loans disbursed were overdue.

Although CTA and its partners spent several months analyzing the situation and encouraging GuatInvierte and Dacrédito to reestablish the loan program, they weren't successful. There were broader negotiations between the Government of Guatemala, Guateinvierte and the bank. Eventually, Banco de la República sold its operations and became absorbed by another bank and Guateinvierte significantly lowered its profile and outreach efforts as the amount of funding for rural credits through this mechanism was significantly diminished.

A lesson learned from this is that local branches and local microfinance institutions are more flexible and able to cater to special needs, they require support and assistance in discovering and working with new niches such as tourism and handicrafts but at least have some flexibility to initiate the process.

However, the project significantly increased employment opportunities for beneficiaries by supporting 175 SMEs with technical assistance to scale up and enter the formal marketplace, through the provision

of business development services, distribution of \$1,496,033 for microcredit projects in tourism, and marketing activities. This was especially evident in the last 18 months of the project, with the production for export of handicraft groups.

Poverty

The Project improved the quality of life of 300 producers of handicrafts (majority indigenous women) most of whom had never earned income before, and 700 community guides who became part of the labor pool (although they were not all working full time, they were earning competitive wages). It introduced tourism to communities that had never received tourists before, changing cultural attitudes, and integrating communities into the marketplace. The Project did not collect data on the impact of increasing incomes on family wellbeing except for during the final year of the project under the Feed the Future Initiative, but field visits and beneficiary interviews suggest that increased income generated by women producer groups was shared for better nutrition and education among family members.

Food Security

The shift in focus to FtF departments added new challenges to the task of achieving economic sustainability for community-based tourism value chains. Although the project did not have any specific food security objectives, in 2010 there was a modification to the Cooperative Agreement that mandated an expansion of its activities into new geographic regions (Totonicapán, Huehuetanango, Quetzaltenango and Quiché), in line with the Mission's objective to focus resources on the FtF departments. New approaches were introduced to spark economic development in a region that is more isolated from traditional tourism routes and faced higher rates of poverty and malnutrition. Counterpart's response to this challenge was to develop a new emphasis on the handicrafts value chain and emerging destinations (areas of interest for conservation). The handicrafts value chain has potential for sustainability and scalability, particularly with the alliance with Comunidades de la Tierra, and producers under AGEXPORT/Handicraft Commission.

It is still too early to tell whether the “emerging destinations”¹³ in the Tourism Value Chain are sustainable, especially in remoter areas. Although the Project focused efforts on promoting sites and linking them to markets, some of them appear to derive from a “supply-driven” approach in which tourism demand must be created for the site to become successful. If the sites are not connected to a national park or protected area, they are likely to have little or no institutional support from the public sector, and they may suffer as well from inadequate infrastructure—especially unpaved roads—impeding their development into sustainable destinations. Should the hoped for tourist visits not materialize in

Models of Support to Handicrafts Producer Associations

Through an alliance with AGEXPORT's Handicraft Commission the project provides technical assistance to scale up the ability of handicrafts producers organizations to design new handicrafts products based on recent market trends, using traditional materials and techniques. The project facilitated re-branding from “handicrafts” to “hand-made” to place the products in higher-end markets. Additionally, through an alliance with Comunidades de la Tierra, the project incubated groups in the Western Highlands and formed a social enterprise called “Grupo Saquil” with the brand name WAKAMI. Grupo Saquil includes a commercialization unit to develop and export fashion products under the Wakami brand and a business incubation unit run by the non-profit Comunidades de la Tierra. Grupo Saquil has secured contracts in the U.S., Panama, Mexico and Europe.

These models differ in that Grupo Saquil is an integrated development model with recycling, social programs (solar panel kits, water filtration systems, improved stoves and backyard gardens) and profits that go back to the membership. AGEXPORT on the other hand selects groups that are already producers but need training in refining design, and links to markets. Once these linkages are made, groups “graduate,” and AGEXPORT moves on to assist new groups.

Both models are succeeding in connecting producers to higher-end markets, with the WAKAMI brand, in particular, superseding all expectations.

¹³ Parque Ecologico Cerro Sija, Parque Ecologico Comunitario/Chaumazan, Sendero El Aprisco (private natural reserve), Reserva Natural Privada Comunitaria Loma Linda, Parque Regional Municipal Todos Santos, ZVD Volcan Chikabal

sufficient numbers, the institutional strength of the community tourism associations are likely to wither, jeopardizing any community development successes made.

On the other hand, the Handicrafts Value Chain has potential for sustainability in areas that do not have potential for community-based tourism. Counterpart activities under Feed the Future focused on incubating new handicrafts producers groups in the Western Highlands, and designing value-added product collections and integrating them into commercialization activities. The Wakami Handicraft Value Chain (see box) consists of 15 SMEs with 300 people (90% women) producing handicrafts and earning income now for the first time. WAKAMI has dedicated buyers that solicit products with specific quantities and quality in standing orders. The handicraft groups reported that they are actively recruiting members to meet the rising demand.

Through Counterpart's alliance with AGEXPORT/Handicraft Commission, market links for handicraft products were facilitated with visits of international buyers, participation in international fairs, and festivals at the national and international levels (including festivals in Wal-Mart Central America and Cemaco). To date, the New World Crafts Central America Handicrafts Trade Show (in 2011) and the New York Gift Show, among other commercialization events have grown larger every year with products exhibited of higher quality.

However, the Grupo Saqil/WAKAMI did not bid activities to be fielded in FtF sites in USAID's future project because the regions are considered too remote for their integrated development model. Grupo Saqil is a social enterprise and works on the basis of incubating "WAKAMI villages" in close proximity to each other in order to learn from each other, train each other, recruit members and market collectively. It is not cost-effective to have individuals geographically spread or groups too distant from collection points. A part of the cost issue is that the women who are heads of the enterprises have to assume the costs of transportation, and in addition, would have to be away from families and family responsibilities.

The AGEXPORT model is not constrained by these parameters because it is not a social enterprise. However, should AGEXPORT expand into the Western Highlands to reach more producer groups, it may encounter similar challenges (informal groups with basic skills and remoteness to sales/collection points becoming a limiting factor for participation).

Tourism value chains can be expanded horizontally, linking complementary initiatives that strengthen, diversify or add value to the existing ones, or vertically, integrating new providers, services or products to the chain. If the chain is integrated enough, geographic spread may not be an issue. The geographic expansion of the tourism value chain to remoter areas may not be sustainable. The handicrafts value chain, however, has potential to be sustainable even in such areas, if transport barriers can be overcome.

Sustainability beyond Project Life

Some activities involving community-based tourism in remoter areas are still struggling to find their footing. Where project activities have been co-located near National Parks or Protected Areas there is evidence of sustainable employment opportunities (such as stabilized and recovering numbers of tourist visits following a steep drop due to security concerns). Expanding community-based tourism to remoter areas, without such institutional linkages, has proven to be a challenge. Initially the project was supposed to work in all 59 sites within the National Tourism Conservation Network. Working in collaboration with INGUAT, the pressure was on the project to include as many sites as possible. But after analyzing the sites for tourism potential, only 14 were selected, based on criteria for their assets, social capital and marketability. Nonetheless, in hindsight some site selections appear to have been "supply-driven," that is, based on a strategy of attracting tourists to an unknown and previously undeveloped site, as opposed to "demand-driven," relying on existing and proven sites.

This would appear to be the case with the site selection of Lagunas de Sepalau. This site is not part of a protected area or national park and receives no state funds or training. The community had recently acquired a zipline intended to be a tourist draw. Counterpart's role was in training the guides, especially in safety procedures. But the road to Lagunas de Sepalau was of poor quality and had not been maintained, hindering access to the site. Once there, there were no tourist facilities to speak of, other than the zip-line and some walking trails. The number of visitors had seen a steep decline. The Community Association was functional, but the number of guides had dwindled. Without an uptick in tourist visits, the motivation for this Community Association to protect biodiversity and to carry out sustainable tourism activities was expected to decrease.

In contrast, the National Park Yaxhá could be a model for developing tourism around archeological sites, working with communities in protected areas. Here the Community Tourism Association has developed an organizational structure with females taking leadership positions. The Yaxhá National Park is unique in that it has a "patrimonial fund" in which park fees are re-invested in the National Park and the funds are negotiated with the community associations for development of tourism services. There is mutual interest between the Park and the community to protect the Park, and increase sustainable tourism to the Park. The Community Tourism Associations are now working with the National Park to develop tourism services, tourism products and a "Public Use Plan." In this case, sustainability is not an issue.

Regarding the geographic areas of Feed the Future, the Project has chosen to work with community owned forests and a municipal forest, a strategy which has potential for sustainability though it is too early to make that determination. They have also responded by focusing on the handicrafts value chain, which has been a success based on volumes of sales that have been steadily rising. In sum, community-based tourism with some form of institutional linkages to the public sector are mutually reinforced and can be sustainable, but in remote areas without such institutional linkages they may struggle unless they are firmly integrated into a "demand-driven" value chain.

INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING

Results from Engaging Local NGOs, Government Institutions in Project Implementation as Manifested in Planning, Management, and Implementation Capacity

The Community Tourism Alliance institutionalized biodiversity conservation into the tourism sector. The Project began in 2006 when the term "community-based tourism" was not recognized as a specific focus for tourism development or conservation. Within six years of project implementation, there has been a dramatic change directly attributable to Project efforts.

The project integrated biodiversity conservation into tourism policies and legal frameworks of key institutions, including the Instituto Guatemalteco de Turismo (INGUAT), Consejo Nacional de Areas Protegidas (CONAP), Ministerio de Cultura y Deportes (MICUDE), Consejo Comunitario de Desarrollo (COCODEs), Instituto Tecnico de Capacitacion y Productividad (INTECAP), Comites de Autogestion de Turismo (CAT), Consejo de Turismo en Areas Protegidas (COTURAP), and decentralized the process for community-based tourism development at the local level.

Community-based tourism associations and municipalities now have the operational tools to engage in co-planning and co-management. The project helped to develop the necessary legal and enabling environment for community based tourism to take place as a result of a host of tools, policies, management plans, codes of ethics, regulations, co-administration of conservation sites, and best practices as illustrated below:

- Protected Area Tourism Impact Monitoring, Evaluation Manual
- Prevention and Tourism Planning and Management in Protected Areas Guide
- Community Tour Guides Best Practices and Certification

- Sustainable Tourism Good Practices Guide and Monitoring and Evaluation Manual
- Catalog of Community Tourism Destinations
- Sustainable Tourism Code of Ethics
- Sustainable Tourism Impact Assessment for Protected Areas
- Recommendations and Action Plan to Integrate Biodiversity Conservation in Guatemala Tourist Policies
- Unified Visitor's Register for Tourists in Protected Areas

Although some of the policies are pending approval (e.g., the Policy for Tourism in Protected Areas and the Regulations for Protected Area Co-Managers), many are being implemented in practice (notably Public Use Plans in Yaxhá and Carmelita.) Commitment at the highest levels (INGUAT, CONAP, MICUDE) will be needed to push policies through to maintain momentum. But the legacy the Project has left, of tools for integrating community-based tourism into conservation strategies for Protected Areas, is substantial.

Development and use of state-of-the-art technology has created a solid knowledge base and helped position Guatemala as a world-class destination. The project is noted for having assisted INGUAT and CONAP upgrade their inventory of external publicity and internal marketing, from guides to websites, brochures and a “geotourism map.” These marketing materials are beautifully put together and packaged to make Guatemalan tourism appealing and accessible. The project ensured uniformity and quality of information, cataloguing information/destinations, branding, messaging, and consolidating destinations, while improving tourism services. However, it is what is behind the production of the marketing material that is most notable. Counterpart has helped to create a solid knowledge base of material that is backed by scientific inventories of birds, archeological sites, cultural heritage, and national parks, and in all cases, was done as a collaborative effort with many institutions and participating communities. This research is the base upon which CONAP will be able to apply for Global Environmental Fund support, and is a legacy of the project.

There were some stumbling blocks in disseminating some of the good works, such as the “Checklist of the Birds of Guatemala” and the “Guide to Guatemala’s Protected Areas,” because of the centralization of INGUAT. The Project has circumnavigated this by uploading all of the information onto the web so that it is publicly available and will be building blocks for years to come.

The Project’s novel and flexible approach resulted in more participatory engagement, commitment and leverage. Counterpart began with a traditional design, involving a public private partnership with a list of partners from government and the private sector, but it evolved into a more dynamic, flexible and horizontal structure. The Community Tourism Alliance model, as it developed, was made up of many small and large organizations that played specific roles. Counterpart’s role was as a broker, to look for projects “ready to go,” identify a local partner, and design tailor-made solutions forming alliances and leveraging technical assistance as needed.

The micro-credit activity is a good example. Counterpart had spotted the need for micro-credit in Totonicapán and Sololá to increase tourism micro-enterprises and handicrafts. Counterpart put together a “model” for: a) identifying potential SMEs who needed credit; b) providing them with technical assistance and business skills; and c) assisting them with marketing. In alliance with Asociación Para el Desarrollo Integral de Guatemala (ADIGUA), Instituto Técnico de Capacitación y Productividad (INTECAP), Asociación Para el Desarrollo Integral del Lago Atitlán (ADICLA), municipalities, Secretaría de Obras Sociales de la Esposa del Presidente SOSEP, mancomunidades (community development committees) and Sololá’s Tourism Commission and others, they launched the “Economic Reactivation of the Tourist Sector in Western Guatemala” to support “clients in tourism” with capacity building and marketing to become more competitive. The result has been the consolidation of a Tour Operator, six

handicraft fairs, and credit provided to 299 SMEs in the region, generating 231 jobs in less than one year. The horizontal alliance approach resulted in more “quick wins” with sustainable results at scale through commitments and investment that leveraged skills on a true “partnership.”

Results of Projects on the Internal Management of Small Producer Groups and Tourism Providers

SMEs are accessing markets through functioning value chains. Counterpart International created a program named “*Logremos que su empresa ó destino turístico venda más,*” providing access to credit, technical assistance on operations and administration and finance, introducing new product designs, communication and vocational training. Forty SMEs (handicraft producers) are now registered, able to carry out simple accounting, and are offering new product lines generating \$1,310,644 in sales in 2011.

In addition, in only one year and a half, five handicrafts enterprises have been established under the brand name WAKAMI. These are incubated groups that are now registered, organized, keeping accounts, producing for the market, and actively recruiting new members to fill the market demand for their products. Their vision is to grow from 300 members to 1,000 while generating \$1 million in revenue.

In the regions of Petén, Alta Verapaz, and Quetzaltenango, 20 tourism businesses and/or destinations joined together to link tourism service providers and producers that had heretofore been disconnected and/or competing. The Project facilitated access to markets through the elaboration of commercialization tools, such as tourism packages, web sites, and promotional materials directed to specific market segments. These SMEs are now functioning as part of an integrated tourism value chain and are undertaking joint and collaborative marketing under the banner “Vivente Verapaz Alliance” with 175 members offering adventure tourism packages.

The project registered 175 new SMEs and strengthened 1,245 organizations, integrating them into tourism services and handicrafts value chains. The project improved SMEs’ business practices, improved their products through better tools and designs, and strengthened their negotiating capabilities enabling them to access credit and link to higher-end markets. These enterprises are likely to continue with or without donor support because they appear to be commercially viable.

In addition, community based tourism organizations and Community Tourism Associations are coordinating on Public Use Planning commissions now that they have representation on COCODES through the Tourism Commission created within the COCODE, institutionalizing communities as co-managers and key stakeholders in the development of tourism destinations.

GENDER AND UNDER-REPRESENTED POPULATIONS

Results of Efforts to Integrate Women into Producer Association Management

There were varying levels of integration of women in Community Associations and Producer Association Management. There is some evidence that where Community Tourism Associations (CTAs) have links to National Parks and Protected Areas, the CTAs are stronger in terms of women in leadership positions and as decision-makers. This was the case with the Yaxhá National Park Community Tourism Associations and the Candelaria National Caves Community Tourism Association. In contrast, in Lagunas de Sepalau, the CTA was lead by a male, the three members of the board were male and no females were represented.

Women’s empowerment starts with prosperity and there is no clearer connection than in the handicrafts value chain. In handicrafts groups, women made up 90% of the members, and were clearly managing and controlling all aspects of the association. The case is weaker in the tourism value chains. Evidence shows that language is a barrier to under-represented populations in tourism services as tourism workers must deal with clients, which require literacy and language skills in Spanish. Counterpart initiated some language training activities to counteract this but more could be done.

While women have gained leadership positions to varying degrees (particularly observed in the Petén), if Community Tourism Associations falter due to lack of tourism revenues, gains for women in leadership positions may also falter.

Evidence of Impact on Poverty from These Project Interventions

For women participating in the handicrafts value chain, positive changes were observed in household diet, education and wellbeing. Examples include 300 women who had never before received an income were earning wages sometimes higher than their partners. Testimonials from women in five producer organizations suggested that this may have had reduced violence in the household. In one instance, a woman said she had been so empowered that she was paying wages to her husband to help her produce more bracelets for income that she used for the family's benefit.

Evidence of Women's Involvement in Purchasing Decisions or Family Planning

Women participating in the handicrafts value chain have gained equity in decision-making in the household. Reports indicated that 300 women were growing backyard gardens, purchasing solar kits and eco-filters. A small sample study¹⁴ suggested that, for women respondents, positive changes were observed in household diet and education and well-being (height/weight had improved in children under 12 in five producer associations).

Diversity of Project Participants

Project reporting showed that, in the handicrafts value chain, approximately 90% of participants were female. The project's geographic focus was in areas with under-represented populations. Indigenous beneficiaries made up approximately 80% of the handicraft groups in the Western Highlands. Recently efforts were made to incorporate youth and boys into producer groups. More could be done on gender awareness with men and youth.

Adoption of Applicable Recommendations from USAID/Guatemala Gender Assessment, 2009

The recommendations from USAID/Guatemala's 2009 Gender Assessment were adopted and implemented by Counterpart International. Acting upon the recommendations from the Gender Assessment, Counterpart contracted a consultant to assess Counterpart's gender strategy. A new Gender Strategy was formally adopted in 2011, and gender training took place for all field staff. A manual was also written to assist field staff to incorporate gender into their activities with a menu of options specifically tailored to different situations and contexts. The number of women in producer groups increased in the past year according to the files reviewed. Counterpart also began to actively recruit men to participate in gender workshops.

OTHER FINDINGS

Unanticipated Positive and Negative Outcomes

Instability of the central government institutions limited possibilities for coordination and implementation. The director of INGUAT changed five times during a four-year period with several dramatic overhauls within the MICUDE of personnel and positions. High-level rotations within these key institutions hampered adequate coordination. As successful as the project was at supporting activities within these institutions, they were not able to work at senior levels.

The project compensated by forming alliances with technical units within CONAP and INGUAT and other line departments of government institutions. The alliance model the project adopted was effective, as it enabled them to work with and engage partners at lower levels who had the technical skills needed,

¹⁴ Comunidades de la Tierra conducted a study over a period of one year (August 2011-August 2012) monitoring 16 children under the age of 12 from five handicraft producer groups in Totonicapán. Over this period all had improved weight/height compared to standard and 100% were attending school.

and who were less likely to change with political times. This however may have left little institutional knowledge of the program at the top and no vested interest in making sure the reforms are continued.

Quality of Project Monitoring and Reporting Systems

The quality of project monitoring and reporting systems was found to be adequate. Two indicators, as discussed above (number of jobs created and number of SMEs created), were affected by exogenous issues. A third indicator had potential for duplication: “number of visitors” included number of visitors who registered at a Community-Based Tourism destination as well as a visitor who “used products or services from beneficiaries of the project.”

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTIVITIES

CROSS-CUTTING RECOMMENDATIONS

The following section presents cross-cutting recommendations relevant to future USAID programming. In subsequent sections, project-specific recommendations are presented.

Project Results and Sustainability

USAID should ensure that programs in Guatemala’s Feed the Future departments designed to support small agricultural producers also include support to improve the productivity and environmental sustainability of their traditional food security systems (cultivation of corn and beans), in part by linking them with the full array of USAID programs available to beneficiaries in their region, to ensure that they have viable alternatives to improve the health and nutrition of their households.

USAID should review whether a recent waiver allowing grants of seeds and seedlings that are more resistant to the effects of climate change should be utilized to help small producers replace coffee plants that are aged and/or not resistant to infestation and fungus.

In all future value chain support activities supported by USAID projects, implementing partners should insist that prior to initiating specific product lines, producer associations prepare business plans that demonstrate a realistic payback period (timeline to achieve positive net income), based on a study of the existing market for the product or service the assisted groups propose to supply.

Given the lack of a direct link between increased income and improved family nutrition, USAID should provide sufficient funding to support “social interventions” in its future programming. However, given that these types of interventions are not part of the traditional mandates and operations of either ANACAFE or AGEXPORT, USAID should ensure proper partnering with organizations that have the expertise to deliver such health and nutrition services going forward.

Institutional Capacity Building

USAID’s decision in future projects to segment the geographical areas of activity by ANACAFE and AGEXPORT, and ask them to take on value chain support of products outside their areas of technical expertise, means that there will be a need to emphasize complementarities and cooperation between the two institutions in all FtF regions.

In its policy dialogue with high-level GOG officials, USAID should emphasize the complementary role that the public sector must play in the FtF departments, by providing needed infrastructure, information, security and access to financing and other inputs to successful value chain development.

To continue to build on the results achieved to date in forest protection, in the next round of forestry concession bids USAID should foment a policy dialogue with CONAP and ACOFOP to ensure that social issues/priorities are addressed more explicitly along with environmental and business priorities.

Gender and Under-Represented Populations

USAID should provide follow-up and feedback to the implementing partners on their responses to Gender Assessment recommendations to ensure that the recommendations are understood and effective in producing results.

For work in the FtF regions, USAID implementing partners should endeavor to field staff with local language capabilities.

Projects working with indigenous communities (particularly the Feed the Future activities with their emphasis on women's empowerment and health and nutrition) should have staff and budget committed to gender integration, and direct input to strategy and implementation from indigenous gender experts. The latter might be achieved through the inclusion of indigenous gender experts on the staff or as core advisors, or through inclusion of indigenous women's NGOs as partners.

Other Cross-Cutting Recommendations

In future projects, baselines should reflect actual forest product sales levels by concessions prior to project initiation, and indicators should be carefully specified to provide information about product differentiation and value added through environmental or other types of agricultural product certification.

In addition, recognizing that FtF activity monitoring going forward is likely to include household surveys of expenditures and wellbeing, producer groups may also be encouraged to start monitoring cash crop price and production cost trends for the average smallholder, to get a sense of the determinants of household disposable income.

COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISES IN COFFEE (ANACAFE)

From the findings and conclusions of the Competitive Enterprises in Coffee project evaluation emerge several actionable recommendations for USAID/Guatemala consideration in implementing its development assistance programs going forward:

Achieving Project Income, Employment and Poverty Results and Objectives

USAID should take into account that, given that the reduction of poverty and national food security are part of the expected outcomes from ANACAFE/FUNCAFE activities, there should be an adequate level of integration into Feed the Future conceptualization and planning, as well as operations. The approach should focus more on the rural family than on the coffee producer. Recognizing ANACAFE's unique capacity to provide support in coffee production, yields, milling, quality and sales, nonetheless, increased emphasis on the economic empowerment of women, creating awareness in men about the importance of the quality of expenditure towards benefiting the families, and increasing education and food and nutrition, all will be key to achieve a successful operation of ANACAFE/FUNCAFE activities under Feed the Future.

USAID should keep up the pressure over the certification topic, not only to ensure that good practices are being used, but also to promote environmental responsibility in the production and milling process. Even though certification is a topic highly supported by ANACAFE and the Federation of Cooperatives, to this day, the cooperatives have only started implementing good agricultural practices and implementing quality standards. In theory, these certifications guarantee higher prices for increased quality, and ANACAFE is aware of the advantages that come with certification; but the cooperatives are far from making the idea their own. The evaluation team recommends that ANACAFE as well as the Federations insist on this topic and support cooperatives more directly towards achieving certification.

USAID should study and propose tools to improve credit access for cooperatives and associations of small coffee producers, because access is limited and this forces a high degree of dependency on the Federation, while reducing their ability to move ahead in important topics such as renewing coffee

plantations, and adapting to climate change. Public trust funds may be considered, directed toward support of small coffee producers. The creation of guarantee funds, supported by USAID's Development Credit Authority, also may be an option to support credit programs from private banks for small coffee producers so they can diversify their opportunities to grow.

Achieving Project Food Security and Nutrition Results and Objectives

USAID should instruct ANACAFE and FUNCAFE to correct promptly the improper installation of community vegetable drip irrigation systems at the expense of the implementing partners in order to be in full compliance with the cooperative agreement just ended. Without water barrel lids and in-line shut-off valves, the effectiveness of the home gardens as sources of vegetables for improved family nutrition is significantly reduced. FUNCAFE was negligent in its responsibility to ensure that the drip irrigation system supplier provide lids for the water barrels—as is clearly detailed in the “Instructions for Use” label below the USAID and FUNCAFE logo label on each barrel. FUNCAFE should also purchase and oversee the installation of in-line shut-off valves for the drip lines so that water delivery to plants and conservation of gravity fed water from the barrels can be properly managed by beneficiaries.

Building Local Institutional Capacity

The coffee federations have set up a management and accounting control system for cooperatives within the federation. The system has been useful for the federations but has kept the cooperatives from achieving their own system, one that can provide them with more flexibility. The evaluation team recommends that USAID and ANACAFE supervise this mechanism to strengthen management controls of each cooperative, as a way to empower organizations to achieve institutional sustainability.

The coffee federations have -strategic plans and administrative plans; however, cooperatives within the federation lack such management tools. The evaluation team recommends that USAID and ANACAFE invest additional efforts to extend the planning tools to individual cooperatives to improve the strategic and administrative decision-making of the management councils of each cooperative.

Increasing Participation of Women and Underrepresented Populations

USAID should support ANACAFE so that it can use the gender tools developed by the association's gender consultant to conduct periodic training and awareness sessions for its staff both in the Guatemala City central office and in its field offices.

USAID should support ANACAFE/FUNCAFE, so that they can implement in a more aggressive way programs to make men aware of women's participation and economic empowerment, so they become a reality. The evaluation team also recommends that USAID support ANACAFE/FUNCAFE so they can continue training programs for young men and women.

Informing Feed the Future Initiative Planning and Implementation

The evaluation team recommends that USAID continue emphasizing among small farmers the importance of including good practices in their daily work, most of all climate change adaptation practices. The evaluation team recommends studying public policies through the USAID Policy and Regulatory Support Project, including incentives to encourage the promulgation of best adaptation practices. Given the importance of water conservation and efficient water use, it is important to study how to incorporate integrated watershed management plans into USAID programs administered by ANACAFE.

The evaluation team recommends that USAID support ANACAFE to include more precise climate information systems and to design early warning systems to anticipate extreme events, with the purpose of having timely adaptation measures appropriate to climate events.

The evaluation team also recommends that USAID should prompt ANACAFE to reinforce research and technology transfer programs regarding integrated management of coffee plagues and diseases, including the coffee “roya” fungus.

Improving Project Design, Implementation, Monitoring and Reporting

USAID should take into account when designing new projects, especially in FtF departments, the general conditions under which the Mellor model of value chain-driven growth can be successful, including the minimum size of plots (e.g., larger than 0.5 hectares of coffee) and the existence of basic market infrastructure (e.g., paved access roads and affordable transportation). In remoter areas where these conditions are not present, USAID may need to look toward alternative intervention models.

USAID should integrate into its future monitoring and evaluation activities the capability to assess periodically the relative cost-effectiveness of the implementing partner’s project components, with a view toward expanding those that are most cost-effective in terms of income or employment generation, and either discarding or redesigning those that are least effective.

The evaluation team recommends that USAID make sure that the monitoring and evaluation system of any new project designed to support small coffee producers should include a baseline survey for the main performance indicators included in the PMP.

Supporting Local NGOs Until Sustainable

ANACAFE / FUNCAFE have proven effective in achieving the project’s goals, but must overcome the observed deficiencies regarding social assistance and product diversification. USAID must ensure that any future support to ANACAFE and FUNCAFE is articulated and coordinated with the different producers’ cooperatives and/or associations with the aim of targeting assistance to both producers and their families.

ACCESS TO DYNAMIC MARKETS FOR RURAL SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES (AGEXPORT)

From the findings and conclusions of the Access to Dynamic Markets for SMEs project evaluation emerge several actionable recommendations for USAID/Guatemala consideration in implementing its development assistance programs going forward:

Achieving Income, Employment Results and Sustainability

USAID should include a household expenditure focus in future assistance objectives. The evaluation recommends that future high-value horticultural value-chain interventions should include project interventions that address better management of household expenditures that result from rising incomes. These interventions could include, in addition to social extension support for better hygienic and dietary practices, the introduction of more fuel efficient stoves, potable water technologies and family gardens. These interventions not only introduce better health and dietary practices but also result in expenditure savings that leave more disposable income to the smallholder family, which in turn can contribute to generating jobs and incomes in the local rural non-farm economy. While these have not been standard AGEXPORT interventions in the past, looking to the future, they offer ways of improving the quality of life and well-being of producers and their families.

In addition, recognizing that FtF activity monitoring going forward is likely to include household surveys of expenditures and wellbeing, producer groups may also be encouraged to start monitoring cash crop price and production cost trends for the average smallholder, to get a sense of the determinants of household disposable income.

USAID should consider the extent to which the Mellor model conditions for agriculture-led growth are met when selecting producer groups and producer members for future value-chain support. A range of conditions must be present in order for improved value-chain competitiveness of beneficiary producers

to have a spillover effect on jobs and incomes in local rural non-farm activities. Proximity to paved roads and other infrastructure needed to get product to market continues to be a constraint and is worthy of serious consideration as a criterion for selecting and working with potential high-value horticulture crop producers.

USAID should also encourage Feed the Future implementers to build on producers' climate change concerns to engage them in the adoption of good agricultural practices. While current climate change adaptation measures for soil and water conservation can certainly be extended to members of additional producer groups supported by USAID under the FtF initiative, the scope for introduction of other technologies should also be explored.

Achieving Food Security and Nutrition Results and Objectives

USAID and its implementing partners should examine systematically what are the necessary and sufficient conditions for improving food security and nutrition among SME value-chain producers and their families. The evidence is strong that improved incomes and more jobs do not necessarily translate into better diets and living standards. The household dynamic and the understanding of both sexes about how best to allocate added income and to manage new labor requirements from high-value horticultural crop production are critical to improve the well-being of the rural poor.

Building Local Institutional Capacity

USAID should examine more closely the amount of time and resources needed to develop the capacity and experience of Western Highlands producer groups to become sustainable with outside assistance. These expectations should be reasonable and based on experiences already gained within its portfolio of Economic Growth projects working under the conditions and with the types of producers and producer groups more typical of the Western Highlands region. This is particularly true when setting inclusivity goals for working with producer groups made up of and led by women and under-represented populations, often of indigenous origin, with limited Spanish language communications skills and significant cultural constraints.

USAID should follow up with AGEXPORT to verify that copies of environmental mitigation plans prepared under the Dynamic Markets project are delivered to producer groups, preferably along with guidance on how to implement the plans. Presently, these plans are in AGEXPORT archives and not in the hands of producer group leaders who could use them to improve their operations and sustainability.

Increasing Participation of Women and Under-Represented Populations

USAID should include as part of its strategy for improving the economic empowerment of women, programs aimed at increasing men's awareness of women's roles in production decisions and household money management, particularly when what is involved is money earned by women themselves. Further, women should be encouraged to be involved in making decisions about savings in expenditures through, for example, family production of vegetable crops and use of more efficient wood burning stoves.

Informing Feed the Future Initiative Planning and Implementation

USAID should also explore helping to put into place alliances between AGEXPORT and other organizations capable of helping small poor rural producers and their families to improve their food security and wellbeing from value chain participation.

Improving Project Design, Implementation, Monitoring and Reporting

USAID should continue its plans to monitor incomes using sales data as well as expenditure data as a proxy for net income, including the FtF household expenditure indicator as a "proxy" for income. This may avoid many of the shortcomings introduced by using gross sales revenue as an income measure.

Still, sales data can be useful, if the data are collected and analyzed properly. To do so, USAID should instruct implementing partners to compile and report on sales revenues both in terms of total value and

disaggregated by type of certification. The context of gross sales values in terms of net income earned by the average producer may also be cross-referenced by carrying out trend analyses of product prices and input costs at the producer association level. In addition, the share of sales revenue generated by producer associations made up of—or led by—women or under-represented populations would be a useful indicator of the degree to which gender equity and inclusivity is being achieved.

But first, USAID should more clearly define what it means by “environmentally certified products” in its PMP results indicator definitions. Among the candidates are GlobalGAP, organic certification, fair trade certification,¹⁵ the quality standards of private buyers, and others, and it would be useful to track each certification separately to determine which yields the highest margins in terms of net incomes for the small coffee producers and their families.

Supporting Local NGOs Until Sustainable

Finally, USAID should allow implementing partners more flexibility in budgeting the amount of time and the level of effort they need to expend to build the capacity of local producer associations to be self-reliant. This is particularly true of producer associations to be reached as part of the FtF Initiative in Guatemala’s Western Highlands, where the initial level of members’ understanding of business concepts, accounting, marketing and good agricultural practices is much more elementary going into competitive value chain development programs.

FORESTRY ENTERPRISES IN GUATEMALA (RAINFOREST ALLIANCE)

From the findings and conclusions of the Forestry Enterprises project evaluation emerge several actionable recommendations for USAID/Guatemala’s consideration in implementing its development assistance programs going forward:

The evaluation team recommends supporting efforts to increase areas under certification of timber products and non-timber forest products, as well as to keep supporting SMEs that haven’t reached the level of income to allow them to achieve and keep the certification of their areas. Certification as a strategy to achieve economic growth and conservation of natural heritage has been demonstrated to be effective in this project; however, it represents a cost that can only be covered by SMEs that already have a good level of income from the trade of certified products to high value markets.

The sale of certified timber products from SME concessions increased in the three regions of the project. However, a significant part of the sales corresponded to timber with no added value. The evaluation team recommends focusing future support on promoting mechanisms (financial, technical assistance and investments in technology) to add value to the timber sold, which, according to what has been seen through the project, has the potential to significantly increase the income of the SME concessions.

The evaluation team recommends continuing the promotion of sustainable management and merchandising of value-added non-timber forest products drawn from concession areas where forestry management is certified as sustainable. The experience of the FEG project shows that several such product lines have great development potential in Petén and other regions, as well as tangible benefits regarding inclusion of women in production activities. Options for supporting these segments are: i) to support more forestry concession SMEs involved in xate palm sustainable management and trade in international markets; ii) to assess the commercial viability of other NTFP by conducting business plans, ensuring that future USAID support is focused on products with viable commercial opportunities (demand-driven focus); and iii) to continue efforts focused on maintaining and increasing protected areas where forestry is certified as sustainable.

¹⁵ Although not necessarily related to environmental certification, fair trade certification includes standards relating to gender equity.

To achieve a consistent and sustainable increase of certified timber sales from the altiplano and Verapaces regions in the future, the evaluation team recommends promoting and consolidating business models focused on grouping supply and adding value. The successful experience of FORESCOM in Petén justifies this recommendation. It needs to be taken into account that timber species are different (tropical species in Petén and mainly coniferous species in Verapaces/altiplano), which leads to differences in potential markets, certification implications, and so on. Virtual EKKO is a good example of a second-level enterprise with a promising potential for the replication of the grouped business model.

The experience and lessons learned from the FEG project require acknowledgement that the time frame required by forestry SMEs to reach the point of sustainable trading can be long, up to ten years. The evaluation team recommends that future project designs to support forestry SMEs take this temporal lesson into account, to reduce the risk of investing USAID funds to strengthen the forestry enterprises sector in efforts that will not be sustainable in the future. One way to do this is to concentrate on building local institutional capacity capable of carrying forward activities in support of the SMEs once USAID project funding ends.

The evaluation team recommends to continue supporting the carbon REDD+ initiatives that the project facilitated and supported, with the clear understanding that without some additional financial support and technical assistance, USAID's investments these initiatives could be at risk. Nonetheless, given that as yet the initiatives haven't been able to reach international carbon markets, and therefore no funding from carbon credits has been received, the level of funding for REDD+ initiatives could be reviewed.

In order to support the consolidation of the community forestry concession model in Petén, which is a critical factor for sustainability of forestry SMEs and for the protection of the region's natural heritage, the evaluation team recommends to promote dialogue among government authorities and local stakeholders regarding the award selection criteria to be considered within the solicitation process for the next round of concessions. The dialogue might, for example, help define the roles of the concessionary associations vis-à-vis other community groups settled within the forestry concession management units. Among other options, it should be possible to envision the social roles to be played by the concessionary associations, and how they might include new community groups, or achieve defined community goals, within the context of the new concession contracts.

The evaluation team recommends continuing with the support that the FEG project provided to CONAP on financial and technical support for forest protection, monitoring and wildfire prevention and biological monitoring in the MBR. This effort has been demonstrated to be critical to maintain governance and ecological integrity of the Mayan Biosphere Reserve, which is the basis for forestry SME model sustainability.

Considering the resulting potential benefits related to increasing women's income, regarding food security and inclusion in decisions about family expenses, the evaluation team recommends that future projects be designed using strategies focused on promoting the participation of women in paid economic activities (such as employment in a non-timber forest product value chain, or in SME management and operation). Particular emphasis should be placed on FTF departments, where the participation of women is less and social and cultural conditions make progress harder to achieve.

Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

The evaluation team recommends that future projects be designed to encourage the use of M&E systems which systematically cover all relevant areas of project action, including subagreements and support provided to government stakeholders. This will increase the effectiveness of monitoring the progress toward expected results and goals, as well as the ability to modify the course of action when required. The evaluation team also recommends promoting rigorous baseline data collection to allow for later characterization of impacts and achievements attributable to the USAID projects, including the analysis of trends existing before the project's inception.

The evaluation team recommends defining performance and impact indicators for the activities managed by implementing partners (sub-awardees), and including them in the PMP and M&E systems of similar future projects. This will allow for increasing the effectiveness of tasks undertaken by implementing partners, as well as assessing the full extent of the impact of USAID-funded projects.

Institutional Capacity Building

The evaluation team recommends that future efforts to enhance the competitiveness of the sustainable forestry SME sector should promote capacity building focused on adding value to certified timber products. The FEG project experience has shown that adding value to timber products has the potential to considerably increase the revenues of forestry SMEs.

The evaluation team recommends continued support in the capacity building of the sustainable forestry SME sector, which demonstrated effectiveness to build a viable and environmentally sustainable business model. Increasing the number of created and strengthened sustainable forestry SMEs should be a goal, mainly in the FTF region, where there is potential to develop the forestry business.

The evaluation team recommends that future projects support wood handicrafts SMEs, considering their low impact on natural resources, and potential to incorporate vulnerable populations, such as women and elders, into the generation of jobs and income, as well as their potential to benefit from the opportunities from national and international tourism.

Gender and Under-Represented Populations

The experiences of the FEG project regarding promotion of the participation of women in economic and sustainable activities are extremely valuable. There are numerous success stories from the Petén region. The evaluation team recommends that future efforts in the FtF departments to include women in economic activities, as well as in decision-making positions within sustainable forestry should draw upon these lessons. This could include encouraging women's participation in SME tasks such as management, administration and sales, among others.

Women's training has been critical in this project and has had the potential of increasing the benefits of forestry SMEs, given the demonstrated influence of income regarding family economy, food, education and health. The evaluation team recommends that future projects to support forestry SMEs focus on and give emphasis to training of women, with a focus on economic activities, as part of their strategies.

Socioeconomic and cultural conditions of many regions in Guatemala obstruct the participation of women in economic activities. In this context, The evaluation team recommends that the gender strategies of future projects to support forestry SMEs should incorporate strategies to make men aware of this reality, as a fundamental issue for the integral gender focus to succeed.

COMMUNITY TOURISM ALLIANCE (COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL)

From the findings and conclusions of the Community Tourism Alliance project evaluation emerge several actionable recommendations for USAID/Guatemala's consideration in implementing its development assistance programs going forward:

Achieving Income, Employment Results and Sustainability

USAID/Guatemala should continue to support tourism activities in and around National Parks and Protected Areas under its new Country Development Cooperation Strategy, Development Objective Three, Improved Management of Natural Resources to Mitigate Impacts of Global Climate Change. USAID could incorporate community-based tourism as one of the core components of forestry and national park management.

Community based tourism has been an effective generator of employment, entrepreneurship and a mechanism for conserving biodiversity, particularly in the Maya Biosphere Reserve. Community based

tourism has played a role in stimulating environmental education, women's empowerment and leadership, and accelerated community development.

USAID should continue to foster the synergy between community-based tourism and conservation by:

- a) supporting community based organizations to incorporate community protection of forested areas in community plans, and to participate in Public Use Planning of multi-use zones; and
- b) incorporating community based tourism as a core component of forestry and national park management.

This kind of mutually reinforcing relationship is key to sustainability of natural resource conservation and maintaining the integrity of heritage sites. Accordingly, USAID should continue to:

- a) consolidate Community Tourism Associations to provide tourism services/products (encouraging a balance of gender representation and leadership),
- b) support vocational training for communities surrounding parks and consider alliances with academies and universities to include community based tourism in their curricula;
- c) train "guarda recursos/bosques" and "community tourism guides" in coordination with CONAP; and
- d) support certification of the guides as a key objective.

This latter activity is also a proxy indicator for successful decentralization of CONAP's bottlenecked processes. Cultural heritage tourism and nature travel are growing segments of the tourism industry and should continue to be a focus for USAID to provide employment to communities around parks and protected areas that will in turn protect the natural resource base of their surroundings

USAID should also insist that all producer association value chain activities (both in tourism services and in handicrafts) be grounded in commercially viable business plans that take into account the existing market for the product or service and avoid supporting projects purely for community development goals or conservation goals.

Finally, USAID should conduct a case study of the micro-enterprise activity with ADIGUA and ADICLA to capture lessons learned as well as a follow-on evaluation of the success/or failure of the beneficiary SMEs after three years.

Institutional Capacity Building

In its policy dialogue with high-level GoG officials, USAID should emphasize the complementary role that the public sector must play in the Feed the Future departments, by providing needed infrastructure, information, security and access to financing and other inputs to successful value chain development.

To continue to build on the results achieved to date in community based tourism, USAID should foment a policy dialogue with CONAP and INGUAT to ensure that social issues/priorities are addressed more explicitly along with environmental and tourism priorities.

Improving Project Design, Implementation, Monitoring and Reporting

USAID should encourage implementing partners to create alliances with various stakeholders and work with mid-level technical units of line ministries to build capacity within units and encourage decentralization of head offices. This will increase the strength and sustainability of value chains.

USAID should capture the lessons learned from the successful model developed by Counterpart "Boost your Business" integrated services package which customized technical assistance from Basic to Plus depending on the SME need. This model could be replicated in future SME strengthening activities particularly in the Western Highlands.

Informing Feed the Future Initiative Planning and Implementation

In the Feed the Future departments, USAID should encourage implementers to coordinate and cooperate to increase income, and improve food security and wellbeing of producer groups. USAID should:

- a) develop a model based on successes achieved by Grupo Saqil, the social enterprise model;
- b) foster an alliance among AGEXPORT, ANACAFE and NGOs with community development capacity; and
- c) provide integrated packages to handicrafts producer groups including capacity building, basic skills and social development services (nutrition/health.)

Putting in place an alliance between the AGEXPORT/Handicrafts Commission with an organization that is capable of helping small handicraft producers and their families to improve their food security and wellbeing from value chain participation is particularly important, as USAID's FtF strategy expands into the Western Highlands where producer groups are at lower levels of social development. In order to increase food security and wellbeing of producer groups, more resources will be needed to offer integrated packages of business skills development and commercialization, with social capital development and technical assistance accompanying this process.

This will require extensive support to bring producer groups up to a promising level of self-reliance in their operations and ensure the additional income from handicrafts is used to improve household nutrition, education and wellbeing. USAID should examine the Grupo Saqil social enterprise model to capture best practices. While AGEXPORT is not likely to convert to a social enterprise model, it can capture lessons learned from Grupo Saqil in how best to form an alliance between an NGO that can provide social development assistance and outreach capacity with the marketing and commercialization arm of AGEXPORT. This could be done on a sub-award basis, and could include indicators that capture Feed the Future objectives

Gender and Under-Represented Populations

USAID should conduct a study examining what the participation level of women is in community based tourism and what roles they have, and compare these findings to norms in the region and worldwide. This could help determine what the barriers to entry are which could be addressed in future USAID activities.

ANNEXES

Annex A: Scope-of-Work for the Evaluation

Annex B: Evaluation Tools

Annex C: Sources of Information

Annex D: Statement of Any Unresolved Differences of Opinion

Annex A: Scope-of-Work for the Evaluation

SECTION C –STATEMENT OF WORK

C.1 BACKGROUND

Consistent with the new Evaluation Policy,¹ 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.² 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 objectives³ (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)⁴. The success of these project components will heavily influence upcoming FtF and

¹ <http://transition.usaid.gov/evaluation/USAIDEvaluationPolicy.pdf>

² For more information, see <http://www.feedthefuture.gov>

³ Annex III 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				
Projects To Be Evaluated	Access to Dynamic Markets for Rural Small and Medium Enterprises	Competitive Enterprises in Coffee	Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala	Community Tourism Alliance
Agreement #	520-A-00-05-00009-00	520-A-00-06-00103-00	520-A-00-06-00099-00	520-A-00-06-00092-00
Award Dates	October 2004 – September 2012	June 2006 – September 2012	September 2006 – September 2012	April 2006 – September 2012
Total Estimated Cost	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$7,700,000	\$6,700,000
Implementing Organization	AGEXPORT	ANACAFE	Rainforest Alliance	Counterpart International
Agreement Officer's Representative	Glenda de Paiz	Glenda de Paiz	Maria Teresa Robles	Maria Teresa Robles

Project Information – Mid-term Evaluations		
Projects To Be Evaluated	Inclusive Market Alliance for Rural Entrepreneurs	TIERRAS / Land Conflict Resolution
Agreement #	520-A-00-07-00216-00	520-A-00-07-00225-00
Award Dates	September 2007 – February 2014	September 2007 – September 2013
Total Estimated Cost	\$2,600,000	\$2,200,000
Implementing Organization	Mercy Corp / WalMart	Mercy Corp
Agreement Officer's Technical Representative	Glenda de Paiz	Maria Teresa Robles

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 Quiché.

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 FtF Focus country, the evaluation must also address the objectives of the Mission's FtF 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 IMARE 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?

⁵ Sectoral Distribution Model of Employment Growth in the Guatemalan Highlands, USAID 2006.

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 with 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 compliment the final report and presentation.

THE MID-TERM PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS SHALL:

- (a) Examine the performance to-date of the IMARE project implemented by Mercy Corps/Wal-Mart and the TIERRAS Land Conflict Resolution project also implemented by Mercy 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 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 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 refine 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 FtF and GCC Initiatives and their supporting literature, including the Mellor 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 FtF 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 FtF 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 1: Illustrative List of Beneficiaries and Stakeholders

Program	Beneficiaries	Other Stakeholders
Access to Dynamic Markets for Rural Small and Medium Enterprises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small male- and female-headed producer households and workers, particularly in high value crops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private firms and market intermediaries with interest in quality high value produce for domestic and export sale
Competitive Enterprises in Coffee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small rural producers of specialty coffee or other commodities (typically families) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local and regional producer and marketing organizations and local community based organizations (CBOs) supporting improved household consumption/nutrition
Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small and medium-scale forestry concessionaries Mayan Biosphere Reserve (MBR) communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBOs particularly in the areas with potential for introducing sustainable income-generating forestry practices—product harvesting, nature tourism
Community Tourism Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local community and rural-based tourism service providers (e.g., guides, concessionaires) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local tourism boards in Peten, Alta Verapaz, Solola, and Quetzaltenango
Inclusive Market Alliance for Rural Entrepreneurs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small rural farmers and farmer marketing organizations with high value specialty produce 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban supermarket chains and other agribusinesses that process and market high value, locally produced food
Tierras/ Land Conflict Resolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displaced persons/households with pending land use/ownership claims or disputes to be resolved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GoG Office of Agrarian Affairs (SAA) NGOs and CBOs in El Quiche and Alta Verapaz COCODES and Municipal planning offices Mediation centers supported by SAA and municipalities

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 (ENSMI in Spanish), and USAID's recent Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index⁶ 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 ENSMI could aid in understanding nutrition levels in communities where the programs/projects are functioning.

END OF SECTION C

⁶ <http://feedthefuture.gov/article/release-womens-empowerment-agriculture-index>

Annex B: Evaluation Tools

Data Collection and Interview Guides Used

Competitive Enterprises in Coffee (ANACAFE) & Access to Dynamic Markets for Rural Small & Medium Enterprises (AGEXPORT)

Implementing Partners Interview Guide (Project Directors, Technical and Field Staff and Consultants)

Interviewer: _____

Date: _____

PART 1: RESPONDENT INFORMATION

Name:	Title/Function/Sex:
Organization:	Contact Info:
Relation (past/present)to the Project:	Period Project Involvement:

PART 2: PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT

1. What have been the principle achievements of the project that you have seen or experienced?

- What evidence can you provide of improvements in: participants' incomes, employment, gender participation, household food security, child nutrition, production or marketing practices that you can attribute to the project? What were any unintended results – favorable or adverse? What was the M&E system used? How were beneficiaries chosen?
- How did project address Feed the Future Initiative particularly as it relates to incorporating 'vulnerable populations'.
- Where has the project (or its partners) fallen short of expectations in achieving its objectives or results targets? Where has the project (or its partners) exceeded expectations? What unintended consequences or unexpected outcomes of project activities have occurred? Were there changes in project design in course of implementation including changes in external conditions.

2. Sustainability

- What has the project done to improve the long-term sustainability of participating local organizations at the community and enterprise (marketing, production, services) levels?
- What evidence can you provide to show 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? With community organizations?
Obtaining operating revenues from member beneficiaries or donors other than USAID or the USG.

3. For implementing project components, activities, interventions

- Where has implementation fallen short of expectations? Exceeded expectations? Where are its weaknesses still? Strengths? What corrections have (or need to be) made for?
- Implementation internally involving coordination and communications among project partners?
- Implementation externally in coordination and communications with USAID and other USG agencies and programs?
- What lessons have been learned or best practices identified during project implementation for improved future project design/implementation?

4. 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?
- What results were obtained from engaging local institutions?

5. Gender and Underrepresented populations

- How has the project addressed the issue of equitable gender participation and (economic) empowerment of women?
- Has project staff had gender training? Who and what kind of training?
- What resources did USAID provide to help you incorporate gender assessment recommendations into your work plans and implementation?
- 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?
- What special measures did the project take to promote viable women's producer groups?

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

ANACAFE:

- At the end of the project, it is expected that approximately 45 (78) organizations of small coffee producers can apply agronomic technology to their plantations to improve coffee productivity, sustainability and production yields.
- A major objective will be to strive to increase the yields of small scale producers from the current 9.5 cwt per manzana, by approximately 20%, to 11.5 cwt (quintals) per manzana (and to accomplish this without additional capital investment through bank or intermediary credit).
- At the end of this follow-on activity, ANACAFE will successfully re-convert and improve operations and coffee bean quality in at least 15 (40) wet mills of the small coffee groups assisted under this extension.
- At the end of this follow-on activity, about 45 groups assisted under this amendment will be able to comply with national standards (Waste Water Law) and will also be able to meet the requirements for various certification and quality assurance programs.
- At least 30 new organizations plus around 15 organizations supported under the current cooperative agreement are capable of meeting the production and marketing objectives stated for each of these areas: i.e. production increases of 20% (9.5 cwt parchment per manzana, to 11.5 cwt per manzana)
- Upon completion of the Project, at least 45 organizations will have structured accounting systems in place.
- Identification of 2-3 other broker/intermediary buyers that the small-scale producers are able to sell to directly, at a higher price than what they have previously received.
- Identification of at least one major coffee producer/exporter per region that is interested in collaborating with small-scale producer groups in regard to quality control workshops, and potential joint marketing arrangements for the benefit of the small producers as well as added volume and environmental benefits for the larger producer.
- At least eight potential buyers, roasters or intermediaries will be contacted by ANACAFE for a site visit to small-scale coffee producer groups assisted.
- Building on the *Asociación Chajulense* experience, ANACAFE will identify and strengthen at least one association of small coffee producers group that can implement a similar model so that, upon completion of the Project, it will have been

strengthened and will have the contacts necessary to be able to market its coffee directly.

- Business roundtables will be set up among local producers in order to determine the amount and quality of the product that can be offered on the market. The Project will take advantage of relationships with national coffee exporters and producers that can provide technical support for the grower groups in marketing their coffee.
- A minimum of 175 small coffee producers (young associates) will be certified in productivity techniques and practices and business management and competitiveness.
- A minimum of 800 producers will be trained (short-term) through the “Learning to Compete Better Program” from ANACAFE.
- At least 30 new small coffee producer organizations will be adequately equipped with essential office furniture and computer equipment and trained in its use.
- ANACAFE will implement activities that reduce or support the reduction of vulnerability of human or natural systems to the impacts of climate change and climate-related risks (Global Climate Change/Adaptation). Illustrative activities include: soil conservation techniques and activities related with watershed management.
- At least 45 grower groups will benefit from resources invested in implementing cultural practices to protect and manage natural resources (live barriers, watershed protection)
- Teaching material will be prepared to inform grower groups about the importance of integrated watershed management and climate change.

AGEXPORT:

- No. of new rural businesses receiving USAID assistance to improve their management practices 40
- New sales of goods and services as a result of USAID Programs \$5.0 million
- New sales of goods and services under environmental certification \$1.5 million
- No. of new value chain alliances 30
- No. of rural households benefitting directly from USAID interventions 1,500
- Number of jobs generated as a result of USAID programs (the equivalent of a full time job for one year) 4,000

- Number of new firms certified or in process of obtaining certification 20
- Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USAID assistance 5
- Number of people trained in trade and investment capacity building 2,000
- Number of public-private dialogue mechanisms utilized as a result of USAID assistance 5
- No. of firms receiving assistance to invest in Improved technologies 40
- Number of producer organizations receiving USAID assistance 70
- Number of individuals who have received USAID supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training 1,500
- Number of women's organizations/associations assisted as a result of USG supported interventions 5

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE

(RESPONDENTS FAMILIAR WITH THE PROJECT)

Talking points:

- USAID seeks to learn how it can improve the effectiveness of its programs in reducing poverty, improving food security and ameliorating global climate change, particularly in the western highlands of Guatemala.
- To inform future planning we are evaluating ways that the _____ project has:
 - Raised small rural producers' incomes
 - Increased access to markets, product design and financial services to SMEs
 - Strategically use public-private alliances
 - Generated employment in agricultural and other rural enterprises
 - Increased the role of women in these rural enterprises as decision makers, users of credits and participants in rural incomes.

Interviewer: _____

Date: _____

PART 1: RESPONDENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name:	Title/Function/Sex:
Organization:	Contact Info:
Relation (past/present)to the Project:	Period Project Involvement:

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?

- Raised small rural producers' incomes
- Increased access to markets, product design and financial services to SMEs
- Did they create widespread employment/types of jobs created sustainable

- Was there a difference between level of success when working at different levels (that is, they target SMEs and Community Organizations that already have some potential for success, what about with vulnerable populations or under-represented?)

- **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?

- Has Coffee/Horticulture Chains revenue increased? Where are they arriving from?
- Where are they going (What can be attributable to Anacafe/Agexport?)
- Are there more beneficiaries now than before?
- Are they doing some adaptation practices to the global climate change?
- Are they using newly established routes that Anacafe/Agexport helped to create/market?
- Has more investment come to the area as a result of Anacafe/Agexport assistance in improving Productive infrastructure?
- Any spin-offs/multiplier effects? Look at value chain, what makes it so uniquely successful?

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 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

Name:	Sex:
Organization:	Contact Info:
Relation (past/present)to the Project:	Period Project Involvement:

PART 2: RESPONDENT'S EXPERIENCE WITH THE PROJECT

1. What participation – e.g., producer group member, training course participant, other - have you had in the project?
2. How has this participation benefited you – e.g. in employment, incomes, food security, empowerment, other?
3. What have been the principle achievements of the project that you have seen or experienced in other participants? What have you heard other participants say about the project? Others who have NOT participated in the project?
4. Has the project improved the organization in which you are a member? How? Have you had a leadership role in the organization in which you are a member?
5. What will happen when the project ends this month? If the project were to continue, in what ways would you like the project to help you now? Why?

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

- The groups will be operating under a legal regime in the business sector?

- The groups will have the business tools for their daily operation and decision making (business plan, marketing plan, accounting tools), and will be implementing good business practices?

- The groups will have solid technical knowledge and abilities in their respective productive segment? What about adaptation practices for global climate change? – e.g., Soil conservation & watershed management practices?

- The groups will have a long-term vision for the consolidation of their businesses (strategic plan, brand development, strategic alliances with other producers)?

- The groups will have established long-term business relationships with national, regional or international buyers and will have sales-purchase contracts for at least \$50,000 (AGEXPORT Case) per year?

- The groups will be certified or in process of being certified, or that are applying selected good agriculture practices?

- The groups will have basic knowledge of environment risk management?

- The groups will have increased their possibilities to access formal credit?

- The groups will be integrated into a federation, association or chamber of commerce at national or regional level that will connect them to global market dynamics and accelerate the process of accessing international markets?

- The groups will have productive investments that multiply the value of its investments and reduces its environmental vulnerability (coffee processing wet mills, greenhouses, drip irrigation, others)?

- The groups will have the abilities and access to information and communication technologies?

PROJECT PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEW GUIDE

ADDENDUM: MELLOR HYPOTHESIS

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

Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

Site: FTF Departments: YES No

PART 4: USE OF INCREASED INCOME DERIVED FROM PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

1. Did your income increase as a result of participation in the project? YES No
2. If yes to question 1, on what did you spend the largest part of the additional income (INTERVIEWER SHOULD ASK RESPONDENTS TO CHOOSE ONLY ONE)?
 - a. Purchase of agricultural inputs
 - b. Education of children
 - i. (and if so, boys girls both ?)
 - c. Household animals – chickens, pigs, etc.
 - d. Household durables -- refrigerator, microwave, etc.
 - e. Vehicles -- pickup or motorcycle, etc.
 - f. Radio, television, other manufactured consumer products
 - g. House repair , upgrade
 - h. Other (please describe? _____)
3. If yes to question 1, on what did you spend the second largest part of the additional income (INTERVIEWER SHOULD ASK RESPONDENTS TO CHOOSE ONLY ONE)?
 - a. Purchase of agricultural inputs
 - b. Education of children
 - i. (and if so, boys girls both ?)
 - c. Household animals – chickens, pigs, etc.
 - d. Household durables -- refrigerator, microwave, etc.
 - e. Vehicles -- pickup or motorcycle, etc.
 - f. Radio, television, other manufactured consumer products
 - g. House repair , upgrade
 - h. Other (please describe? _____)
4. If yes to question 1, on what did you spend the third largest part of the additional income (INTERVIEWER SHOULD ASK RESPONDENTS TO CHOOSE ONLY ONE)?
 - a. Purchase of agricultural inputs
 - b. Education of children
 - i. (and if so, boys girls both ?)
 - c. Household animals – chickens, pigs, etc.
 - d. Household durables -- refrigerator, microwave, etc.
 - e. Vehicles -- pickup or motorcycle, etc.
 - f. Radio, television, other manufactured consumer products
 - g. House repair , upgrade
 - h. Other (please describe? _____)

Forestry Enterprises in Guatemala (Rainforest Alliance)

Implementing Partners Interview Guide (Project Directors, Technical and Field Staff and Consultants)

Entrevistador: _____

Fecha: _____

PART 1: RESPONDENT INFORMATION

Name:	Title/Function/Sex:
Organization:	Contact Info:
Relation (past/present)to the Project:	Period Project Involvement:

PART 2: PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT

1. What have been the principle achievements of the project that you have seen or experienced?
 - What evidence can you provide of improvements in:
 - Participants
 - Income
 - Employment
 - Participation of women in decision making
 - Household food security
 - Child nutrition
 - Improved or increased production or market arrangements that can be attributed to the Project?
 - Where they any unintended results?
 - a) Favorable:
 - b) Adverse:
 - Where has the Project fallen short of expectations in achieving its objectives? Why?
 - Where has the Project exceeded expectations? What unintended consequences or unexpected outcomes of project activities have occurred? Why?

2. Sustainability
 - ¿What has the project done to improve the long-term sustainability and what evidence & data can you provide?

- How do you consider the participants have been empowered in their enterprises? What evidence & data can you provide?
- How do you consider the participants link their family or community to their enterprises? What evidence & data can you provide?
- Which would be the basic next-steps to follow if the Project does not continue (exiting strategy)? What evidence & data can you provide? Have these actions begun?
- What do you think will happen in 5 years time? What evidence & data can you provide?
- Do you believe the Government will get involved to generate a replicable effect? How?
- Which do you consider will be the main impacts the Project activities will generate?
 - a) Negative
 - b) Positive

3. For implementing project components, activities, interventions

- Which components, activities or interventions have fallen short of expectations? What weakness can you identify with evidence?
- Which components, activities or interventions have reached high expectations? What strengths can you identify with evidence?
- What percentage of the activities/successes are attributed as Project initiatives? (excluding any leverage or support to initiatives in process).
- What was the most relevant factor of the internal implementation strategy of the Project (with the internal team) and what evidence can you provide?
- Which was the external implementation strategy (with USAID and other agencies or programs) and what evidence can you provide?

- Which was the local implementation strategy (with local key stakeholders)? What evidence can you provide?
- What lessons have been learned during project implementation for improved future project design/implementation?

4. Institutional Capacity Building

- What evidence is there of improved organizational capacity among participating local groups and institutions that can be attributable to project activities?
- Has the project contributed to reduce the informal/illegal local activities among the sectors the project is supporting?
- Has the quality of the products improved? What evidence can you provide?

5. Gender and Underrepresented populations

- What specific actions did the Project undertake to address gender issues (sub-contracts, experts, training, studies, etc.)? What evidence can you provide?
- Did the project receive additional financing or Resources (from USAID or other) to include objectives related to gender? What evidence can you provide?
- What gender/underrepresented populations indicators are included in the PMP, quarter and annual reports?
- What lessons learned have you obtained from them?
- What was the long-term strategy? How is this reflected in the activities? How did it promote the participation of women?

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE

(RESPONDENTS FAMILIAR WITH THE PROJECT)

Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

PART 1: RESPONDENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name:	Title/Function/Sex:
Organization:	Contact Info:
Relation (past/present)to the Project:	Period Project Involvement:

PART 2: PROJECT PERFORMANCE

1. Do you or have you any knowledge of the Project and it's objectives?
2. What are the main outcomes of the Project that you have seen or experienced?

Results: what evidence have you seen in the improvement of the participating organizations in:

- Household income:
- Employment:
- Participation of women in decision-making:
- Food security:
- Child nutrition:
- Production or sales attributed to the Project management?

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 & Communication: Good Regular Bad
- Do you consider there has been transparency in the implementation of Project activities?
- Do you know if the Project established alliances with GOG institutions to engage their participation during project implementation?

- Has the Private Sector / local communities participated in Project implementation?
- Do you consider the Project has been successful at obtaining new revenues from member beneficiaries supported by the project?
- Do you think the Project or activities similar to the ones the Project has implemented should continue? Expand in the region? Yes No Why?

4. For Project results and objectives

- Do/did you know the Project objectives?
- Where has the project 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?

5. Sustainability

- What evidence do you see that the project has improved the long-term sustainability of participating local organizations (solid organizations, stable markets & 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
- Transparency
- Commitments with GOG organizations / Private sector / communities
- Do you have another financing source (beneficiary members, other donors)?

6. Institutional Capacity Building

- 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

7. Gender and Underrepresented populations

- How many and what is the percentage of women participation in the organizations? How are profits distributed? Are there any special arrangements to promote the participation of women?
- Do you consider there have been guidelines or training in order to incorporate women in the project activities?
- Do you consider women participate in the production, planning, processing and marketing phases? Whether paid or not, is it considered family labor or related to her husband's work? Has the Project promoted any change lately?
- Do you think the organizations are aware of women's participation? Are they interested in this issue?
- During the meetings, are women present? What do they do? Do they participate and give their opinions?

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 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

Name:	Sex:
Organization:	Contact Info:
Relation (past/present)to the Project:	Period Project Involvement:

PART 2: RESPONDENT'S EXPERIENCE WITH THE PROJECT

1. What participation – e.g., producer group member, training course participant, other - have you had in the project?
2. Have you been involved in the organization before?
3. What motivated you to participate or become a member of the organization?
4. How has this participation benefited you – e.g. in employment, incomes, food security, empowerment, other?
5. What have been the principle achievements of the project that you have seen or experienced in other participants?
6. What have you heard other participants say about the project? Others who have NOT participated in the project?
7. Has the project improved the organization in which you are a member?
In what aspects?
Or how?
8. Have you had a leadership role in the organization in which you are a member?

9. In what ways would you like the project to help you now? Why?

10. If the Project ends, do you think the organization will continue?

11. Do you think there could be more organizations like yours in other communities of the department?

12. Specific questions for women:

- When did you join the Group and why?
- What type of work do you do as a producer?
- What are the main problems you encounter? (credit, seeds, transport, taking care of the children)?
- Do you know the process of the organization?
- How do you obtain the food for your family? (Market, produced at home, at the local store)
- How do you decide what to buy? Do you buy together or does your husband purchase on his own?
- Has anything changed since you work/participate in the organization?
- What happens with the women who still don't participate in the organization?
- Why don't they?
- How do you send your children to school or to the doctor?
- If you don't work in the organization, what work do you do? Do you work on the lot (land)? Do you get paid?

PART 3: RESPONDENT EVALUATION

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

LIST OF PROJECT'S IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS AND STAKEHOLDERS

Other implementing partners and stakeholders	Brief description of activities under project's support
SUB-AWARDS	
Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)	<p>This sub-award allowed WCS to work with Rainforest Alliance and USAID to strengthen the forest protection and biodiversity conservation capacity of CONAP, the Guatemalan Fire Prevention System (SIPECIF), and local communities. WCS worked to conserve forest and biodiversity stocks within certified forest concessions in the eastern Maya Biosphere Reserve (MBR). The sub-award focused on the components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest Protection, strengthening field presence to reduce deforestation, fires, illegal extraction of timber and nontimber resources, and poaching. • Biological Monitoring, facilitating an annual evaluation of the ecological integrity of the MBR, including measuring key indicators.
Cluster Forestal	<p>Rainforest Alliance signed a subaward with the Forestry Cluster, focused on improving SME competitiveness, generating jobs, and establishing long-term commercial alliances. In addition, CAFTA-DR/Environment supported training SMEs, especially in Petén, and beneficiaries included forestry cluster members seeking to increase their capabilities and exports to CAFTA/DR countries, such as the US and the Dominican Republic.</p>
Empresa Forestal Comunitaria de Servicios del Bosque (FORESCOM)	<p>Project supported this community forestry enterprise by strengthening its organizational structure, diversifying its products, structuring its administrative and accounting systems, and capacity-building for processing, providing value added processing, access to working capital and marketing abilities.</p>
Asociación de Reforestadores de Peten (ARP)	<p>Rainforest Alliance coordinated with ARP to strengthen their silviculture system, which has been successful on recovering degraded ecosystems through forest plantations and increasing the supply of</p>

	sustainable forest products, out of protected areas.
Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Peten (ACOFOP)	The subaward signed with ACOFOP allowed this NGO to provide support to consolidate a solid supply of timber and NTFP's from RBM community forestry concessions, through its communication unit; as a strong social stakeholder to keep motivation for the members of FORESCOM.
Fundación Naturaleza para la Vida (NPV)	This NGO will provide training on forest management and certification issues for SMEs in Petén focused in the new areas to be certified for timber and non timber forest products. NPV will work to prepare the communities for the certification assessment.
Second level and Community-Based Organizations	
FEDECOVERA, ASILCOM and Cooperativa Integral Samac	Working in the Verapaces region, Rainforest Alliance supported these second level organizations and its members focusing on: harvesting, primary processing, organizing the wood supply to primary industry, maintaining the forest, certification, expanding the certified area, and encouraging chain-of-custody certification.
Asociación 48 Cantones	Rainforest Alliance provided support to the Asociación 48 Cantones in expanding its reforestation capacity and promoting its organizational platform. Access to local existing financial mechanism was supported to take advantages of programs such as PINFOR and PINPEP. The 48 Cantones Committee of Totonicapán is a good example of the “strengthening of local community based groups” approach. Totonicapan is considered to have high food insecurity and natural resource degradation, especially within forests. The Committee is promoting the conservation of the remnants of community and municipal forests, but its capacities were limited because it lacked a mechanism to generate sustainable resources.
GoG Institutions	
CONAP	Rainforest Alliance worked in close collaboration with CONAP in four main areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure timely approval of annual operating and harvest plans which affect species and volumes uptake by the SMEs to fulfill purchase orders with buyers.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy strengthening for NTFPs. The program supported CONAP on implementing a participatory process for developing a xate strategy for sustainable marketing and incorporate xate intermediaries into the value chain for managing, harvesting and selling certified xate produced in accordance with long term management plans approved by CONAP. • Compliance with CITES in relation to the national inventory for mahogany, cedar and rosewood to avoid sanctions and possible interruptions in harvesting, processing and exports. • The project worked closely with CONAP and other partners on the forest carbon project in certified concessions in the Maya Biosphere Reserve to support project development and operation of the Forest Carbon Trust Fund created to represent the interests of the various stakeholders or owners of the forest carbon credits being developed in the Multiple Use Zone in the Petén that will be offered in voluntary markets.
INAB	<p>Coordination and leveraging funds from the PINFOR program (Forestry Incentive Program), which is INAB’s main policy instrument to promote reforestation and natural forest management and protection.</p> <p>The project worked with INAB and NGO partners such as IUCN in Laguna Lachuá National Park to leverage funding to improve community efforts to work toward certification of their forest management plans for timber and non-timber products, and to support the development of a pilot REDD+ project.</p>
MARN	<p>Rainforest Alliance closely coordinated with MARN as the lead government agency for the National Strategy on Climate Change to support efforts to develop a National Strategy on Climate Change. The strategy is focused on climate change mitigation and adaptation and will facilitate the process of developing, certifying, registering, and marketing carbon projects.</p>
MINECO	<p>MINECO is a source of leverage for financing training on business skills development and promotion of the SME sector.</p>

AGEXPORT	Rainforest Alliance coordinated with AGEXPORT in developing value chains, improving business tools, linking with markets, and developing forest carbon initiatives. After project's end, the alliance will continue to be implemented through the value chain program funded by the Danish government.
Other stakeholders	
Asociación de Reservas Naturales Privadas de Guatemala (ARNPG)	ARNPG is focused on the creation of privately owned protected areas to improve the economic benefits from protected forests. The project provided assistance to ARNPG in order to create capacity to expand its current membership and area under protection.
PRONACOM – Guatemalan National Competitiveness Program	Project coordinated activities with PRONACOM who provided funding to improve competitiveness of FORESCOM and the communities involved in the NTFP (xate) work.
Selected group of private companies	Rainforest Alliance established commercial alliances and business partnerships with private companies, both national and international, as a key strategy of the project.

Community Tourism Alliance (Counterpart International)

- 1. Document review check list**
- 2. Implementing Partner Interview Guide**
- 3. Key Informant Interview Guide**
- 4. Project Beneficiary Interview Guide**

Document review check list

Note: The following questions are designed to guide evaluators through the process of examining the volume of print and electronic documents generated in the course of project implementation either by project representatives themselves, by external third parties or researchers and analysts examining the issues relevant to the areas of intervention by the projects in Guatemala. See Annex C for a list of the basic preliminary list of documents proposed for review by the evaluation.

For Project (annual and other reports), contracts and agreements, deliverables such as training materials, studies, etc.):

1. Was the document easily accessible in the project implementers files or in the files of the USAID technical office?
2. To whom was the document shared beyond USAID? Implementing contractor or grantee staff? Implementing contractors' or grantees' stakeholder partners?

For other written documents:

1. How is the document relevant to project design and/or implementation

For statistical data:

1. Are statistical data clearly defined and systematically presented?
2. Is the statistical data complete in coverage over relevant study areas and time?
3. Is information available on the methods use to collect, tabulate and summarize the data?

Implementing Partners Interview Guide (Project Directors, Technical and Field Staff and Consultants)

Interviewer: _____

Date: _____

PART 1: RESPONDENT INFORMATION

Name:	Title/Function/Sex:
Organization:	Contact Info:
Relation (past/present) to the Project:	Period Project Involvement:

PART 2: PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT

<p>1. What have been the <u>principle achievements</u> of the project that you have seen or experienced?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence can you provide of improvements in: participants’ incomes, employment, gender participation, household food security, child nutrition, production or marketing practices that you can attribute to the project? What were any unintended results – favorable or adverse? What was the M&E system used? How were beneficiaries chosen? • How did project address Feed the Future Initiative particularly as it relates to incorporating ‘vulnerable populations’. • Where has the project (or its partners) fallen short of expectations in achieving its objectives or results targets? Where has the project (or its partners) exceeded expectations? What unintended consequences or unexpected outcomes of project activities have occurred? Were there changes in project design in course of implementation including changes in external conditions.
<p>2. <u>Sustainability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has the project done to improve the long-term sustainability of participating local organizations at the community and enterprise (marketing, production, services) levels? • What evidence can you provide to show 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? With community organizations? Obtaining operating revenues from member beneficiaries or donors other than USAID or the USG.

- Is there evidence of spill-over impact (or multiplier effect) to non-participants of the project

3. For implementing project components, activities, interventions

- Where has implementation fallen short of expectations? Exceeded expectations? Where are its weaknesses still? Strengths? What corrections have (or need to be) made for?
- Implementation internally involving coordination and communications among project partners?
- Implementation externally in coordination and communications with USAID and other USG agencies and programs?
- What lessons have been learned or best practices identified during project implementation for improved future project design/implementation?

4. 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?
- What results were obtained from engaging local institutions?
- What were results of projects on the internal management of tourism providers?

5. Gender and Underrepresented populations

- How has the project addressed the issue of equitable gender participation and empowerment of women?
- Have project staff had gender training? Who and what kind of training?
- What resources did USAID provide to help you incorporate gender assessment recommendations into your work plans and implementation?
- 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?
- What special measures did the project take to promote viable women's producer groups?

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

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE

(RESPONDENTS FAMILIAR WITH THE PROJECT)

Talking points:

- The US Government wants to learn how it can improve the effectiveness of its programs in Guatemala that support the GOG in reducing poverty, improving food security and ameliorating global climate change, particularly in the western highlands of Guatemala.
- To inform future planning we are evaluating ways that the _____ project has:
 - Raised small rural producers' incomes
 - Increased access to markets, product design and financial services to SMEs
 - Increased community-based and SME tourism enterprises
 - Increased international tourism and domestic tourism in NCTN sites
 - Strengthened capacity of national/regional/local tourism associations and organizations
 - Improved capacity of local communities and other stakeholders to co-manage and conserve natural and cultural resources through tourism
 - Improve local support for and participation in the conservation of biological diversity in regions around key tourism sites.
 - Strategically use public-private alliances
 - Generated employment in agricultural, forestry, **tourism** and other rural enterprises
 - Increased the role of women in these rural enterprises as decision makers, users of credits and participants in rural incomes.
- We welcome suggestions about where else to look and whom else to contact for information about how the benefits of the _____ Project to date.

Interviewer: _____

Date: _____

PART 1: RESPONDENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name:	Title/Function/Sex:
Organization:	Contact Info:
Relation (past/present)to the Project:	Period Project Involvement:

PART 2: PROJECT PERFORMANCE

1. 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? Raised small rural producers' incomes
- Increased access to markets, product design and financial services to SMEs
- Increased community-based and SME tourism enterprises
- Increased international tourism and domestic tourism in NCTN sites

- Did they create widespread employment/types of jobs created sustainable?

Was there a difference between level of success when working at different levels (that is, they target SMEs and Community Organizations that already have some potential for success, what about with vulnerable populations or under-represented?)

- **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?
 - Strengthened capacity of national/regional/local tourism associations and organizations
 - Improved capacity of local communities and other stakeholders to co-manage and conserve natural and cultural resources through tourism
 - Improve local support for and participation in the conservation of biological diversity in regions around key tourism sites.

2. 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?

Has tourism revenue increased? Where are they arising from? Where are they going (What can be attributable to CPI?) Are there more now than before? Are they using newly established routes that CPI helped to create/market? Are the tourists using the services/products that CPI supported? Has more investment come to the area as a result of CPIs assistance in improving the tourism product/services? Is the tourism product viable? are the services/products offered improved from before CPI intervention? any spin-offs/multiplier effects? Look at value chain. what makes it so uniquely successful?

3. 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

<p>organizations? Obtaining operating revenues from member beneficiaries or donors other than USAID or the USG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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?
<p>4. <u>Institutional Capacity Building</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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?
<p>5. TBD</p>

PART 3: RESPONDENT EVALUATION

<p><u>Respondent assessment:</u> Cooperative and helpful = y/n/so-so; Informed and knowledgeable = y/n/so-so</p>
<p><u>Continuation space</u> for added questions relevant to the respondent population</p> <p>Observations for evidence of Sustainable Tourism</p> <p>Is there an administrative unit in place to continue the activity/management plan?</p> <p>Are there tourism regulations/codes/administrative decrees visible/in place/being followed</p> <p>Is there a plan for biodiversity conservation/cultural heritage?</p> <p>Are there mitigation measures in place for tourism impacts? (trash, management of numbers, trails)</p> <p>Where do Park fees go? Are they up or down?</p> <p>What are visitation numbers and what kinds of tourists are arriving/for how long/when? (backpackers versus family, local/foreign)</p> <p>Does the tourism site have integrity? Do the pamphlets/press match what you are seeing?</p> <p>**Has the community/organization/association taken ownership of the site? Do they participate in management decisions?</p>

PROJECT PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEW GUIDE

Note: These questions may 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

Name:	Sex:
Organization:	Contact Info:
Relation (past/present)to the Project:	Period Project Involvement:

PART 2: RESPONDENT'S EXPERIENCE WITH THE PROJECT

1. What participation – e.g., producer group member, training course participant, other - have you had in the project?
2. How has this participation benefited you – e.g. in employment, incomes, food security, empowerment, other?
3. What have been the principle achievements of the project that you have seen or experienced in other participants? What have you heard other participants say about the project? Others who have NOT participated in the project?

4. Has the project improved the organization in which you are a member? How? Have you had a leadership role in the organization in which you are a member?

5. What will happen when the project ends this month? If the project were to continue, In what ways would you like the project to help you now? Why?

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

Annex C: Sources of Information

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PROJECT COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISES IN COFFEE – Reference Documents

- **ANACAFE**, Annual Reprot, Oct 2006 Sep 2007
- **ANACAFE**, Annual Report, Oct 2007 Sep 2008
- **ANACAFE**, Annual Report, Oct 2008 Sep 2009
- **ANACAFE**, Annual Report, Oct 2009 Sep 2010
- **ANACAFE**, Annual Report, Oct 2010 Sep 2011
- **ANACAFE**, Cooperative Agreement
- **ANACAFE**, Diagnóstico
- **ANACAFE**, Glosario de Genero Final
- **ANACAFE**, Indicadores de Genero Para Responder
- **ANACAFE**, Info final Género
- **ANACAFE**, Informe de Taller Incorporación de Genero
- **ANACAFE**, Informe Sobre los 7 Ítems de Género Requerido USAID
- **ANACAFE**, Manual Cerrando Brecha
- **ANACAFE**, Manual para la Incorporación del Enfoque de Genero
- **ANACAFE**, MOD #01 to MOD#11
- **ANACAFE**, Plan Operativo Oct 2007 Sep 2008
- **ANACAFE**, Plan Operativo Oct. 2011 Sep 2012
- **ANACAFE**, PMP FY 2012 Competitive Strengthening Enterprise
- **ANACAFE**, Referencias Bibliograficas
- **ANACAFE**, Resumen de Genero Leslie
- **ANACAFE**, Taller de Capacitación Especializada Para la Aplicación de la Herramienta Cerrando Brecha
- **ANACAFE**, Work Plan, Jul 2006 Sep 2007
- **ANACAFE**, Work Plan, Oct 2008 Sep 2009
- **ANACAFE**, Work Plan, Oct 2009 Sep 2010
- **ANACAFE**, Work Plan, Oct 2010 Sep 2011
- **ANACAFE**, Work Plan, Oct 2010 Sep 2011

PROJECT ACCES TO DYNAMIC MARKETS FOR RURAENTERPRISES – Reference Documents

- **AGEXPORT**, Cooperative Agreement
- **AGEXPORT**, Indicadores Empleos Rural
- **AGEXPORT**, Informe de Línea de Base Discusión AGEXPORT
- **AGEXPORT**, Informed Annual 2010-2011

- **AGEXPORT**, Informed annual Jul 2008 Sep 2010
- **AGEXPORT**, MOD #01 to MOD#12
- **AGEXPORT**, Performance Monitoring Plan AID 2012 Supply Chain Program for SMES
- **AGEXPORT**, Plan Operativo 2008 Encadenamientos Feb 2008
- **AGEXPORT**, Plan Operativo AID, Anexo I
- **AGEXPORT**, Plan Operativo ANIDA 2008, Anexo 2
- **AGEXPORT**, Plan Operativo FIDA 2008, Anexo 3
- **AGEXPORT**, Plan Operativo, Jul 2008 Sep 2009
- **AGEXPORT**, Taller de Indicadores de empleo
- **AGEXPORT**, Work Plan, 2007
- **AGEXPORT**, Work Plan, Apr 1 Dec 31
- **AGEXPORT**, Work Plan, Oct 15 2004, Dec 31 2005
- **AGEXPORT**, Work Plan, Oct 2009 Sep 2010
- **AGEXPORT**, Work Plan, Oct 2010 Sep 2011
- **AGEXPORT**, Work Plan, Oct 2011 Sep 2012

PROJECT FORESTY ENTERPRISES - Reference Documents

- **Rainforest Alliance**, Antecedentes de la Plataforma REA
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Argidius and FIDOSA Brief Profile
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Cooparative Agreement
- **Rainforest Alliance**, DCA, Brief Profile
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Desarrollo Empresarial, May 2012
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Dictamen Iniciativa 4139 Ley CC, 25Ago 2010
- **Rainforest Alliance**, EFG, Informed Annual Oct 2006 Sep 2007
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Estrategia de Genero PEFG Oct 2010
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Estrategia final de Xate
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Fact Sheet, Guatecarbon, English / Español Sep
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Final Report, CDI, Linea de Base
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Forestry Enterprises, 2011, Guatemala
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Informe Resultados Preliminares Inventario Fase I
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Informed Annual, Oct 2007 Sep 2008
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Informed Annual, Oct 2008 Sep 2009
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Informed Annual, Oct 2009 Sep 2010
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Informed Annual, Oct 2010 Sep 2011
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Líneas Estratégicas Mesa Cambio Climático, Mundo Maya
- **Rainforest Alliance**, MOD #01 to MOD#12
- **Rainforest Alliance**, PIN RBM
- **Rainforest Alliance**, PIN RBM, Minas
- **Rainforest Alliance**, PIN Sierra del Lacandon
- **Rainforest Alliance**, PIN, Lachua

- **Rainforest Alliance**, Plan de Inversión ASOCAV
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Plan de Inversión Fabrica de Muebles Todo de Madera
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Plan de Negocios Xate Final
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Plan Estratégico de la Red Cambio Climático, Las Verapaces
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Plan Estratégico de la Red sur Occidental de Cambio Climático
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Plan Estratégico de Mesa Nacional Cambio Climático
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Plan Operativo 2009, con Observaciones de USAID incorporadas
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Plataforma Reduzco2 Sep 2012
- **Rainforest Alliance**, POA, 2008 Correcciones 26 mar
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Política Nacional de Cambio Climático, Guatemala
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Presen Guatecarbon
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Presentacion EFG, Sep 2012
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Prod. 5 plan de Negocios Forescom
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Producto Financiero BID FIDOSA RA, Concesiones
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Producto Financiero Industria Forestal, BID FIDOSA RA
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Propuesta de Plan Estrategico Mesa de cambio Climático, Quiche
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report ,Apr-Jun 2007
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report ,Apr-Jun 2008
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report ,Apr-Jun 2009
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report ,Apr-Jun 2010
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report ,Apr-Jun 2011
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report ,Apr-Jun 2012
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Jan- Mar 2010
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Jan-Mar 2007
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Jan-Mar 2008
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Jan-Mar 2009
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Jan-Mar 2011
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Jan-Mar 2012
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Jul- Sep 2009
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Jul- Sep 2010
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Jul-Sep 2007
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Jul-Sep 2008
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Jul-Sep 2011 Incluido en informe Anual
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Oct- Dec 2011
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Oct-Dec 2006
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Oct-Dec 2007
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Oct-Dec 2009
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Oct-Dec 2010
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Quarterly Report, Oct-Dec 2008
- **Rainforest Alliance**, RA Xate NTFP Addendum Apr 2012, Guatemala
- **Rainforest Alliance**, R-pp Final, Guatemala

- **Rainforest Alliance**, Work Plan, 2010
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Work Plan, 2011
- **Rainforest Alliance**, Work Plan, Probed 2012
- **Rainforest Alliance**, WP, for Gua FY 07 (revised 15-dic-06)

PROJECT COMMUNITY TOURISM – Reference Documents

- **Counterpart International**, 1st Quarterly Report, Community Tourism Alliance 2012
- **Counterpart International**, 2nd Quarterly Report Community Tourism Alliance 2012
- **Counterpart International**, 3rd Quarterly Report Community Tourism Alliance 2012
- **Counterpart International**, Cooperative Agreement
- **Counterpart International**, Annual Report CPI, Oct 2006 Sep 2007
- **Counterpart International**, Annual Report CPI, Oct 2007 Sep 2008
- **Counterpart International**, Annual Report CPI, Oct 2010 Sep 2011
- **Counterpart International**, Annual Report CPI, Oct 208 Sep 2009
- **Counterpart International**, Annual Report, Oct 2009 Sep 2010
- **Counterpart International**, Community Tourism Alliance PMP 2011
- **Counterpart International**, Compartiendo Buenas Noticias
- **Counterpart International**, El Sueño del Grupo Saquil
- **Counterpart International**, Annual Report CPI, May-Sep 2006
- **Counterpart International**, Informe Final CPI
- **Counterpart International**, La Historia de Café Barista y la Gente Final
- **Counterpart International**, Maria Pacheco, Simplify your Life, Sep 2010
- **Counterpart International**, MOD #01 to MOD#12
- **Counterpart International**, Presentation Group Saquil, Simplify your life
- **Counterpart International**, Quarterly Report CPI Apr-Jun 2007
- **Counterpart International**, Quarterly Report CPI Apr-Jun 2008
- **Counterpart International**, Quarterly Report CPI Apr-Jun 2009
- **Counterpart International**, Quarterly Report CPI Apr-Jun 2010
- **Counterpart International**, Quarterly Report CPI Apr-Jun 2011
- **Counterpart International**, Quarterly Report CPI Oct-Dec 2010
- **Counterpart International**, Quarterly Report CPI, May-Jun 2006
- **Counterpart International**, Quarterly Report CPI, Oct-Dec 2006
- **Counterpart International**, Quarterly Report CPI, Oct-Dec 2007
- **Counterpart International**, Quarterly Report CPI, Oct-Dec 2008
- **Counterpart International**, Quarterly Report CPI, Oct-Dec 2009

PROJECT GUATEMALA USAID- Reference Documents

- **FA**, Evaluations Glossary 25 Mar 2009
- **FA**, Evaluations Guidelines 25 Mar 2009

- **FTF**, Guide Indicator definitions
- **FTF**, Guide Jun 2010
- **Gender**, Mainstreaming Activities and Results
- **Gender**, Mainstreaming examples
- **Gender**, Manual de Genero Final
- **Kap**, Questionnaire DFID
- **Kap**, Questionnaire Life Style Study
- **Kap**, Study Methodology
- **Kap**, Study Questionnaire
- **Kap**, Survey Guide
- **Kap**, What is a Kap Study
- **Tips**, using Direct Observation Techniques 1996
- **Tips**, Conducting Key Informant Interviews 1996
- **Tips**, Conducting Mixed Methods Evaluations 2010
- **Tips**, Constructing an Evaluation Report 2010
- **Tips**, Preparing an Evaluation SOW 2010
- **Tips**, Using Direct Observe Techniques 1996
- **Tips**, Using Rapida Appraisal Methods 2010
- **USAID Dg**, Indicator Handbook FY 2008
- **USAID Eg**, Indicator Handbook FY 2008
- **USAID He**, Indicator Handbook FY 2008
- **USAID M&E**, Tips Profile Apr 2012
- **USAID New**, Indicator List 02 Oct 2011
- **USAID Tips**, Constructing an Evaluation Report
- **USAID Tips**, Preparing an Evaluation Report
- **USAID**, Check List for Performance Evaluation SOWs PNADU 534 Mar 2011
- **USAID**, Evaluation Policy FACs PNADU 535
- **USAID**, Evaluation Policy Jan 2011
- **USAID**, Evaluation Report Check List PNADU 533
- **USAID**, Guidance Final 15 Sep 2011
- **USAID**, Policy Framework 2011-15
- **Vanderbilt**, Dem Evaluation

LIST OF CONTACTS

EVALUATION OF USAID PROJECTS / ECONOMIC GROWTH PROJECTS EVALUATION

CUADRO DE INFORMANTES CLAVE / KEY INFORMANTS REGISTER

Prepared by: Phillip Church and JC Méndez, DevTech Systems

Virginita Lambert - for Gender Issues

(Favor colocar una X en todas las casillas que aplican)

No.	Name	Gender		Project / Activity				Fecha (Date)	TYPE OF ORG.				Organization (name)	Position the contact person has in the organization	Location		Notes & comments
		M	F	Anacafé	Ageport	Tourism	Forestry		Imp. Partner	Other local	Community	Benef. Ind.			Depto.	Municipio	
1	Alejandro Vitola	X		x				30-ago	X				ANACAFE	Marketing Dept	Guatemala		avitola@gmail.com
2	Arnoldo Melgar	x		x				30-ago	X				ANACAFE	Quality Coffee Project Director	Guatemala		arnoldm@anacafe.org
3	David Antonio Makepeace	x		x				25-sep	X				ANACAFE	Post Harvest Advisor	San Marcos	San Pablo	cel: 4211-2623
4	Domingo Perez (ing)	X		x				30-ago	X				ANACAFE	GPS Coordinator	Guatemala		
5	Jaime Lopez	x		x				24-sep	X				ANACAFE	Coordinator, Region 1, Zone 7	Coatepequez, San Marcos		cell: 5510-8437 email: jaimel@anacafe.org
6	Josue Alfredo Castro	x		x				25-sep	X				ANACAFE	Production Advisor	San Marcos	San Pablo	cel: 5304-3007
7	Juan Carlos Rios Recinos	x		x				24-sep	X				ANACAFE	Post Harvest Advisor	San Marcos	San Miguel I.	Cell: 5922-2247
8	Leslie Marroquin Miranda			x	x			21-sep	X				ANACAFE	Tecnico de genero y monitoreo	Guatemala	Guatemala	Purpose of interview: Gender issues
9	Selva Ramirez Guillen			x	x			25-sep	X				ANACAFE	Inst Strengthening Advisor	San Marcos	San Pablo	cel: 4676-8592
10	Selva Ramirez Guillen			x	x			25-sep	X				ANACAFE	Técnico de Fortalecimiento Org'l	San Marcos	San Pablo	Purpose of interview: Gender issues
11	Selvin Fuentes	x		x				24-sep	X				ANACAFE	Production Advisor	San Marcos	San Miguel I.	Cell: 5524-7056
12	Vilma Lucrecia Rodríguez Peñalba			x	x			30-ago	X				ANACAFE	Vice Gerente	Guat		lucreciar@anacafe.org
13	Alfonso Mejia Perez	x		x				24-sep					Asoc. De Caficultores San Miguelenses	Presidente de la unidad comunitaria - La Peña	San Marcos	San Miguel I.	Also, 24 male and female producer members
14	Angela Dilina Ajppopac			x	x			24-sep					Comunidad La Peña	community leader	San Marcos	San Miguel I.	Purpose of interview: Gender issues
15	Domingo Cac	x		x				10-sep			x		COOP SANTA MARIA CHIPUR, SANIMTACA. R.L	Presidente, CDA	Alta Verapaz	Coban	Also, 3 female and 4 male producer members
16	Hugo Caal Coc	x		x				11-sep			x		COOPERATIVA CHILTE. R.L	Presidente, CDA	Alta Verapaz	San Pedro Carcha	Also, 7 male producer members
17	Alfredo Paz			x				25-sep					Cooperativa Entre Rios	Presidente de a Junta Directiva	San Marcos	San Pablo	Also, 4 male aproducer members
18	Jorge Francisco de Leon			x				25-sep					Cooperativa La Igualdad	Presidente de a Junta Directiva	San Marcos	San Pablo	Also, 35 male and female producer members
19	Gonzalo Poou Yaxcal	x		x							x		COOPERATIVA OSTUA R.L	Presidente, CDA	Alta Verapaz	Coban	Also, 7 male producer members
20	Ermengildo Leal	x		X				11-sep	x	x			Fedecovera	Técnico de Campo	Alta Verapaz	Coban	Cel: 5788-9339
21	Juan Villatoro	x		x				11-sep	x	x			Fedecovera	Director de Asistencia Técnica	Alta Verapaz	Coban	Cel: 5304-7410
22	Luis Wohlers	x		x				03-sep					FUNCAFE	Medical Advisor, SAN	Guatemala		luis_gwv@funcafe.org
23	Mynor Maldonado (Ing.)	x		x				30-ago					FUNCAFE	Director	Guatemala		cell: 2311-1960 email: mynordmm@funcafe.org
24	Reydi Mejicanos	x		x				03-sep					FUNCAFE	SAN Promotor, Region 1	San Marcos	San Pablo	cell: 4802-1669
25	Rocio Avalos			x				20-sep					FUNCAFE	nutricionista	Guatemala	Guatemala	Purpose of interview: Gender issues
26	Santiago Giron de Leon (Ing. Agr.)	x		x				30-ago					FUNCAFE	SAN Coordinator	Guatemala		

EVALUATION OF USAID PROJECTS / ECONOMIC GROWTH PROJECTS EVALUATION

CUADRO DE INFORMANTES CLAVE / KEY INFORMANTS REGISTER

Prepared by Phillip E. Church, DevTech Systems

(Favor colocar una X en todas las casillas que aplican)

Virginia Lambert for Gender issues

No.	Name	Gender Project / Activity					Fecha (Date)	TYPE OF ORG.				Organization (name)	Position the contact person has in the organization	Location		Notes & comments
		M	F	Anacafé	Agexport	Tourism		Forestry	Imp. Partner	Other Local	Community			Benef. Ind.	Depto.	
1	Mario Rabinales	X			X		26-sep			X	X	ADADI	President of the brussel sprouts producer assoc	San Marcos	San Lorenzo	Also four other assoc members: Jose Luis Rabinales (Scy).
2	Alejandro Us	x			x		21-sep			x		ADIES	Presidente JD	Quiche	Zacapulas	Also 7 male producer members
3	Felipe Ixcoy	X			X		20-sep			X	X	ADINA	Association President	Totonicapan	Momomosten	Also 4 male Junta Members
4	Carlos Urizar	x			x		31-ago	x				AGEXPORT	Dynamic Markets Project Director	Guate		cell: 5460-9806 carlos.urizar@agexport.org.gt
5	Ivan Buitrón	x			x		31-ago	x				AGEXPORT	Director, Development	Guate		cell: 5966-3665 ivan.buitron@agexport.gt
6	Jose Cano	x			x		17-sep	x				AGEXPORT	National Coordinator	Guate		Cell: 5550-4555
7	Julio Dominguez	x			x		21-sep	x				Agexport	Asesor en Competitividad	Guate		Cell: 4768-8798
8	Ligia Rosales de Davila		x		x		20-sep	x				AGEXPORT	Especialista Programa de Encadenamientos	Guatemala	Guatemala	Purpose of interview: Gender issues
9	Carlos Albillo	X			X		17-sep	X				AGEXPORT Filial Xela	Business Services Specialist Altiplano	Xela, Toto and Quiche		
10	Esdras Cristostomo de Leon Cifuentes	X			X		17-sep	X				AGEXPORT Filial Xela	Business Services Specialist Altiplano	Xela, Toto and Quiche		cell: 5384-8184
11	Jose Antonio Hernandez	X			X		17-sep	X				AGEXPORT Filial Xela	Regional Coordinator - Altiplano	Xela, Toto and Quiche		cell: 5577-1680
12	Juan Tuy Chaclan	x			x		20-sep	x	x			Agexport/San Juan Agroexp.	Técnico de Campo	Totonicapan	Momomosten	
13	Miguel Lopez	X			X					X	X	AGRIUF	Association President	Totonicapan	Sta Lucia la Reforma	Also "Junta Members: Felipe Excoy; Julian Excoy; Luis Ixcoy, Romulo Afuera
14	Miguel Tojin	X			X		20-sep			X	X	AGRIUF	Association President	Totonicapan	Sta Lucia la Reforma	Also "Junta Members: Felipe Excoy; Julian Excoy; Luis Ixcoy, Romulo Afuera
15	Diego Bernal	x			x		21-sep			x		Agrosxlil	Representante de la Organización	Quiche	Nebaj	Cell: 4007-8187
16	Francisco Maquín	X			X		12-sep			X		Asociación CAAL CACAO	Productor Asociado	Alta Verapaz	San Pedro Carcha	Also 3 female and 17 male producer members
17	Germán Alvarez Tobar	X			X		12-sep			X		ASOINAPA	Productor Asociado	Baja Verapaz	Cubulco	Also 5 male producer members
18	Julio Matias	X			X		21-sep			X	X	ASOMAM	Gerente of producer cooperative	Huehuetenango	San Sebastian	Also five other members: Terersa Lopez, Quality Control Specialist; Dani Lorenzo, Field Technician, Jose Hernandez, Vice President; Catalina Mendoza, Administration
19	Tomas Figueroa	X			X		21-sep			X	X	Cooperative San Bartolo	Green beans cooperative president	Huehuetenango	San Bartolo	Also: Carmen Velasquez, Grading specialist; Sandra Figaroa Grading Specialist; Fausto Lopez, member; Marco Coj, member; Florenza Mendez, Vocal, Artemio Alba, member
20	Ana Victoria Román (Dra.)		x		x			x				INCAP	Institutional Coordinator, Chronic Diseases	Guate		cell: 4900-0545 aroman@incap.int
21	Carlos Guarcax	x			x		12-sep			x		San Juan Agroexport	Técnico de Campo	Baja Verapaz	Cubulco	
22	Connie Benítez de Paiz		x		x		06-sep	x				Vital Voices	Presidente JD	Guatemala	Guatemala	Purpose of interview: Gender issues
23	Daniela Martinez Moreno		x		x		06-sep	x				Vital Voices	Coordinadora de Proyectos	Guatemala	Guatemala	Purpose of interview: Gender issues
24	Dina de Dios		x		x		06-sep	x				Vital Voices	Directora Ejecutiva	Guatemala	Guatemala	Purpose of interview: Gender issues
25	María Pacheco		x		x		6-Sep; 21-Sep	x				Vital Voices	Founder; Board member	Guatemala	Guatemala	Purpose of interview: Gender issues

EVALUATION OF USAID PROJECTS / ECONOMIC GROWTH PROJECTS EVALUATION

CUADRO DE INFORMANTES CLAVE / KEY INFORMANTS REGISTER

Preparado por: Francisco López y Carlos Duarte

(Favor colocar una X en todas las casillas que aplican)

No.	Name	Gender		TYPE OF ORG.						Organization (name)	Position within the organization	Location		Notes & comments	Key Informant
		M	F	Forestry	Imp. Partner	Otra Local	Comunitaria	Benef. Ind.	Informante Clave			Depto.	Municipio		
1	Agustin Par Velásquez	x		x			x	x		48 cantones	Encargado del Vivero	Totonicapán	Totonicapán	Muy abierto y colaborador y satisfecho del apoyo financiero	
2	Santos Marco Antonio	x		x			x	x		48 cantones	Vicepresidente JD	Totonicapán	Totonicapán	cominidades mayas de origen quiché, actitud poco confiable	x
3	Santos Pascuala		x	x			x	x		48 cantones	Miembro JD	Totonicapán	Totonicapán	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	
4	Mario Rivas	x		x	x					ACOFOP	Coordinador Gestión Ambiental	Petén	Santa Elena	son socios con sub agreement, es investigación	xx
5	Nubia Sosa		x	x			x	x		AFISAP	Gerente	Petén	San Andrés	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	xx
6	Otto Pérez	x		x			x	x		Alimentos Naturales S.A.	Gerente	Petén	Flores	Muy abierto y colaborador y satisfecho del apoyo financiero	
7	Vivian Zavala		x	x			x	x		Alimentos Naturales S.A.	Secretaria	Petén	Flores	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	
8	Arturo Sánchez	x		x			x	x		Arbol Verde	Presidente y Representante Legal	Petén	San Andrés	Muy abierto y colaborador y satisfecho del apoyo financiero	x
9	Julio Penados Betancourt	x		x	x					ARP	Gerente	Petén	Santa Elena	son socios con sub agreement, es investigación	xx
10	Fernando García	x		x			x			Aserradero García	Dueño y empresario	Quetzatenango	Quetzaltenango	Ocupado, pero fue colaborador. Son empresarios con mas de 15 años de trabajo en la PYMES	
11	Zaqueo Pérez	x		x				x		Aserradero García	encargado de pedidos	Quetzatenango	Quetzaltenango	colaborador	
12	Antonio Ventura López	x		x			x			Carpintería y Ebanistería Ventura	Dueño	Quetzatenango	Quetzaltenango	Ocupado, pero fue colaborador. Son empresarios con mas de 10 años de trabajo en la PYMES	x
13	Julio Cesar Juárez	x		x				x		Carpintería y Ebanistería Ventura	Carpintero empleado	Quetzatenango	Quetzaltenango	Muy abierto y colaborador y satisfecho del apoyo financiero	
14	Mirna España		x	x				x		Comedor Uaxactún	Socia y dueña de comedor	Petén	Flores	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	
15	Rolman Hernández	x		x		x				CONAP	Director Regional	Petén	San Benito	Muy abierto y colaborador y satisfecho del apoyo financiero	xx
16	Carlos Archila	x		x					x	Consultor	Experto en la dinámica forestal de Cobán	Cobán	Cobán	conoce dinámica del sector forestal de las Verapaces y los procesos de la industria forestal	xx
17	Claudio Cabrera	x		x					x	Consultor	Especialista Forestal	Guatemala	Guatemala	conocedores del proceso de concesiones forestales en Petén y de la evolución. Además realizó evaluación de las concesiones en 2008	xx
18	Ana Centeno		x	x			x	x		Cooperativa Carmelita	Administración Proyecto Xate	Petén	San Andrés	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	xx
19	Rosa Moreno		x	x				x		Cooperativa Carmelita	Empleada Seleccionadora	Petén	San Andrés	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	

EVALUATION OF USAID PROJECTS / ECONOMIC GROWTH PROJECTS EVALUATION

CUADRO DE INFORMANTES CLAVE / KEY INFORMANTS REGISTER

Preparado por: Francisco López y Carlos Duarte

(Favor colocar una X en todos las casillas que aplican)

No.	Name	Gender		TYPE OF ORG.					Organization (name)	Position within the organization	Location		Notes & comments	Key Informant	
		M	F	Forestry	Imp. Partner	Otra Local	Comunitaria	Benef. Ind.			Informante Clave	Depto.			Municipio
20	Danilo Rodriguez	x		x			x	x		Cooperativa Los Unidos	Presidente y Representante Legal	Petén	Flores	Grupo pequeño en sus inicios de conducir un mercado más ordenado	
21	Javier Márquez	x		x					x	Coordinador Parque Nacional Lacandón	Defensores de la Naturaleza	Petén	Petén	conoce la dinámica del proyecto en Petén	
22	Hugo Morán	x		x					x	FEDECOVERA	Gerente	Cobán	Cobán	uno de los pymes mas grandes de la región	xx
23	Mario y Glyde Marquez	x		x				x		FORESCOM	Gerente General	Petén	San Benito	Muy abierto y colaborador y satisfecho del apoyo financiero	xx
24	Eugenio	x		x			x	x		Impulsores Suchitecos	Representante Legal	Petén	Melchor de Mencos	conocimiento completo de los antecedentes de la asociación	
25	Tomasita Gómez		x	x			x	x		Impulsores Suchitecos	Gerente Administrativa	Petén	Melchor de Mencos	Plano conocimiento de la organización	x
26	Ani Elizabeth Chajchal		x	x			x			Laboratorio de madera	Administradora / Dueña	Quetzaltenango	Quetzaltenango	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	xx
27	Angela Fajardo		x	x			x	x		OMYC	Vocal de la JD	Petén	Flores	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	
28	Floralidma Ac		x	x			x	x		OMYC	Comisión Fiscalización	Petén	Flores	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	x
29	Magdalena Peralta		x	x			x	x		OMYC	Tesorera JD	Petén	Flores	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	xx
30	María Aragón		x	x			x	x		OMYC	Comisión Turismo	Petén	Flores	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	
31	Marvin	x		x			x	x		OMYC	Trabajador en aserradero	Petén	Flores	Muy abierto y colaborador y satisfecho del apoyo financiero	
32	Reina Valenzuela		x	x			x	x		OMYC	Monitoreo y control de calidad Xate	Petén	Flores	Muy abierta y colaboradora y satisfecha del apoyo financiero	
33	Alejandro Santos	x		x	x					Rain Forest Alliance	coordinador Programa TREES	Guatemala	Guatemala	Acceso y colaboración en proveer información y contactos apoyo en la logística de visitas de campo	xx
34	Giuseppe Dal Bosco	x		x	x					Rain Forest Alliance	M&E	Guatemala	Guatemala	Acceso y colaboración en proveer información	xx
35	Gustavo Pinelo	x		x	x					Rain Forest Alliance	Coordinador FEG Peten	Petén	Petén	Acceso y colaboración en proveer información y contactos apoyo en la logística de visitas de campo	xx
36	José Román Carrera	x		x	x					Rain Forest Alliance	Coordinador FEG	Guatemala	Guatemala	Acceso y colaboración en proveer información y contactos	xx
37	Luis Efraín Arango	x		x	x					Rain Forest Alliance	Técnico Regional TREES	Quetzaltenango	Quetzaltenango	Acceso y colaboración en proveer información y contactos apoyo en la logística de visitas de campo	xx
38	Manuel Cruz	x		x			x	x		Sociedad Civil El Esfuerzo	Presidente y Representante Legal	Petén	Melchor de Mencos	Muy abierto y colaborador y satisfecho del apoyo financiero	
39	Erick Morales	x		x			x			Talleres Don Leo	Dueño	Quetzaltenango	Quetzaltenango	Ocupado, pero fue colaborador. Son empresarios con mas de 10 años de trabajo en la PYMES	x

EVALUATION OF USAID PROJECTS / ECONOMIC GROWTH PROJECTS EVALUATION

CUADRO DE INFORMANTES CLAVE / KEY INFORMANTS REGISTER

Preparado por: Francisco López y Carlos Duarte

(Favor colocar una X en todos las casillas que aplican)

No.	Name	Gender		TYPE OF ORG.					Organization (name)	Position within the organization	Location		Notes & comments	Key Informant
		M	F	Forestry	Imp. Partner	Otra Local	Comunitaria	Benef. Ind.			Informante Clave	Depto.		
40	Santiago Chajil	x		x				x	Talleres Don Leo	Carpintero empleado	Quetzaltenango	Quetzaltenango	colaborador	
41	Erick Ac	x		x				x	UICN	Tecnico UICN y trabajó FUNDALACHUA	Cobán	Cobán	conocimietno de antecedentes y relacionado con el proyecto de carbono de FUNDALACHUA	
42	Estuardo Roca	x		x				x	UICN	Especialista Forestal y financiero	Guatemala	Guatemala	conocimietno de antecedentes y relacionado con el proyecto de carbono de FUNDALACHUA	xx
43	Mario Escobedo	x		x				x	UICN	Coordinador	Guatemala	Guatemala	conocimietno de antecedentes y relacionado con el proyecto de carbono de FUNDALACHUA	
44	Juventino Gálvez	x		x				x	URL/IARNA	Coordinador	Guatemala	Guatemala	conocedores del proceso de concesiones forestales en Petén y de la evolución	xx
45	Raúl Maas	x		x				x	URL/IARNA	Especialista Forestal y ambiental	Guatemala	Guatemala	conocedores del proceso de concesiones forestales en Petén y de la evolución. Además realizó evaluación de las concesiones en 2008	xx
46	Teresa Robles		x	x				x	USAID	Oficial proyecto FEG	Guatemala	Guatemala	Acceso y colaboción en proveer información	xx
47	Gabriela Ponce		x	x	x				WCS	Coordinadora Técnica Investigación Ambiental	Petén	Santa Elena	son socios con sub agreement, es investigación	
48	Luis Romero	x		x	x				WCS	Coordinador Protección Ambiental	Petén	Santa Elena	son socios con sub agreement, es investigación	xx

EVALUATION OF USAID PROJECTS / ECONOMIC GROWTH PROJECTS EVALUATION

CUADRO DE INFORMANTES CLAVE / KEY INFORMANTS REGISTER

Prepared by: Robin Mason

r colocar una X en todos las casillas que aplique

No.	Name	Gender		Project / Activity				TYPE OF ORG.				Organization (name)	Position within the organization	Location		Notes & comments
		M	F	Anacafé	AgEXPORT	Turismo	Forestal	Imp. Partner	Otra Local	Comunitaria	Benef. Ind.			Depto.	Municipio	
1	Mario Rivas	x				x	x	x				ACOFOP	Coordinator Environment	Peten	Santa Elena	
1	Bernardino Coroxon	x				x		x				ADIGUA	Jefe Agencia	Solola	Solola	Microcredit
2	Esdras Vicente	x				x		x				ADIGUA	technician	Solola	Solola	Microcredit
3	Julio Saloj Yaxon	x				x		x				ADIGUA	Social Projects	Solola	Solola	Microcredit
4	Miriam Cutz		x			x		x				ADIGUA	accountant	Solola	Solola	Microcredit
5	Norbelto Sis	x				x		x				ADIGUA	General Manager	Solola	Solola	Microcredit
6	Victor Sacach	x				x		x				ADIGUA	Deputy Director	Solola	Solola	Microcredit
7	Maria Espana		x			x				x		Comedor Uaxcatun	Owner	Peten	Flores	
7	Antonio Alvarado	x				x				x		Community Association	Board Member	Totonicapan	Chahil Siwan	Community Forest
8	Community Association Maya Quechi (Pending Names)	x	x			x				x		Community Association	Members	Alta Verapaz	Candelaria/Raxruha	Community Association
9	Gabino Xol	x				x				x		Community Association		Alta Verapaz	Chisec/Lagunas de Sepalau	
10	Gonzalo Latz	x				x				x		Community Association		Alta Verapaz	Chisec/Lagunas de Sepalau	
11	Guarda Recursos (4) did not get names	x	x			x				x		Community Association	Guarda Recursos	Alta Verapaz	Chisec/Lagunas de Sepalau	
12	Juan Jose Chibalan	x				x					x	Community Association	Board Member	Totonicapan	Chahil Siwan	Community Forest
13	Marcos Xe	x				x				x		Community Association	President	Alta Verapaz	Chisec/Lagunas de Sepalau	
14	Peten Yaxcha National Park	x	x			x				x		Community Association		Petén	Yaxcha	
15	Santos Gutierrez	x				x				x		Community Association	Leader	Totonicapan	Chahil Siwan	Community Forest
16	Walter Alvarado	x				x				x		Community Association	Board Member	Totonicapan	Chahil Siwan	Community Forest
	Comunidades de la Tierra															
16	Mario Garcia	x				x					x	Comunidades de Tierra	technician	Totonicapan	Totonicapan	Handicrafts
17	Zully Polanco		x			x					x	Comunidades de Tierra	Director	Totonicapan	Totonicapan	Handicrafts
	Consejo Nacional de Areas Protegidas															
17	Ana Luisa de Leon		x			x		x				CONAP		Guatemala	Guatemala	Env Education
18	Fernando Castro	x				x		x				CONAP		Guatemala	Guatemala	Conservation
19	Marlen Garcia		x			x		x				CONAP		Guatemala	Guatemala	Ecotourism

EVALUATION OF USAID PROJECTS / ECONOMIC GROWTH PROJECTS EVALUATION

CUADRO DE INFORMANTES CLAVE / KEY INFORMANTS REGISTER

Prepared by: Robin Mason

Por favor colocar una X en todas las casillas que apliquen.

No.	Name	Gender		Project / Activity							TYPE OF ORG.	Organization (name)	Position within the organization	Location		Notes & comments
		M	F	Anacafé	Agexport	Turismo	Forestal	Imp. Partner	Otra Local	Comunitaria				Benef. Ind.	Depto.	
20	Rolman Hernandez	x				x		x				CONAP	Regional Director	Peten	San Benito	
21	Carlos Archila	x				x					x	Consultant	Expert Forestry Coban	Alta Verapaz	Coban	
22	Danilo Rodriguez	x				x						Cooperative	President	Peten	Flores	
22	Claudia Calderon		x			x		x				Counterpart International	Field Technician	Solola	Solola	
23	Elizabeth Pellecer		x			x		x				Counterpart International	Field Technician	Totonicapan	Chahil Siwan	
24	Pedro Merino	x				x		x				Counterpart International	Field Technician	Totonicapan	Totonicapan	
25	Ronald Mejia	x				x		x				Counterpart International	Country Director	Guatemala	Guatemala	
26	Sergio Aja	x				x		x				Counterpart International	Deputy Director	Guatemala	Guatemala	
27	Alejandro Arango	x				x				x		Grupo Gestores	General Manager	Quetzaltenango	Quetzaltenango	Microcredit
28	Patty Barrios		x			x				x		Helvetas	Field Technician	Totonicapan	Chahil Siwan	Community Forest
29	Victor Juarez	x				x				x		Helvetas	Field Technician	Totonicapan	Chahil Siwan	Community Forest
30	Dante Gonzales	x				x					x	LaFabrica	Trainer	Totonicapan	Chahil Siwan	Web Production
31	Paty Leon		x			x					x	LaFabrica	Trainer	Totonicapan	Chahil Siwan	Web Production
32	Javier Marquez	x				x					x	National Park Lacandon	Defensores de la Natureza	Peten	Flores	
33	Peten El Remate (Pending Names)	x	x			x					x	Private Sector				
	Pymes Handicrafts															
33	Eduardo Tax	x				x					x	SME/Handicrafts Prod Group	Leader	Totonicapan	Totonicapan	Handicrafts
34	Gladys Rodas		x			x					x	SME/Handicrafts Prod Group	Leader	Totonicapan	Totonicapan	Handicrafts
35	Irma Ralac		x			x					x	SME/Handicrafts Prod Group	Leader	Totonicapan	Totonicapan	Handicrafts
36	Marina Norato		x			x					x	SME/Handicrafts Prod Group	Leader	Totonicapan	Totonicapan	Handicrafts
37	Olegaria Xyc		x			x					x	SME/Handicrafts Prod Group	Leader	Totonicapan	Totonicapan	Handicrafts
38	Maria Pacheco		x			x					x	WAKAMI	General Manager	Totonicapan	Totonicapan	Handicrafts

Annex D: Statement of Any Unresolved Differences of Opinion

There were no outstanding or unresolved differences of opinion concerning the findings, analysis and recommendations in this report.

U.S. Agency for International Development

1300 Pennsylvania Ave., NW

Washington, D.C. 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

www.usaid.gov