

Country Name	The Project for the Capacity Development of Local Governments
Republic of Guatemala	

I. Project Outline

Background	<p>In Guatemala, in the early 2010s, more than half of the population lived in poverty and the majority of them lived in rural areas, and the government worked on the reduction of poverty. The central government transferred resources to the municipalities for implementation of development projects under decentralization through the system of development councils to be obligatorily established at national, departmental, municipal, and community levels. However, the municipal governments had the limited capacity to fully make use of the resources and given roles.</p>												
Objectives of the Project	<p>In the pilot municipalities in Guatemala, the project aimed at improvement of planning/budgeting/implementation/monitoring/evaluation for the social development projects by municipal governments, through institutionalization of the management framework of social development projects by municipalities* with Life Improvement Approach**, formulation of the project cycle management methodologies for social development projects, improvement of the knowledge of mayors/municipal council members/municipal officers on the management of social development projects, improvement in capacity of mayors/municipal council members/municipal officers in conducting the project management, improvement in understanding of the approaches in the social development projects by municipalities, and establishment and implementation of mechanism to share good practices and experiences in the project with other municipalities, thereby contributing to improvement of the condition of the life of the citizens.</p> <p>* Social development projects by municipalities are: (1) projects which are implemented with the initiative of the municipalities mainly by their own budget, and whose main components are provision of social services, awareness raising of the communities and technical support in order to improve the level of life and meet basic needs of the population living in poverty, (2) projects which include interventions of municipalities to promote small improvement in people's daily life with or without financial or material support, and (3) others which derived from the application of Life Improvement Approach (one of the approaches to plan and implement social development projects).</p> <p>** Life Improvement Approach is an approach or concept regarding rural development and poverty alleviation based on the Japanese experiences of rural development. In the project, it was supposed that community people, together with facilitators dispatched by municipalities, would find their own issues and implement activities to solve them by themselves.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Overall Goal: Condition of the life of the citizens in the pilot municipalities is improved. Project Purpose: Planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for the social development projects by municipal governments of the pilot municipalities are improved. 												
Activities of the Project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Project Site: Guatemala City and eight pilot municipalities* * Eight pilot municipalities: (Huehuetenango Department) San Mateo Ixtatan, Tectitan**, Union Cantinil, (Quiché Department) Canilla, San Bartolome Jocotenango, Uspantan, (San Marcos Department) Ixchiguan, Sibinal **Tectitan expressed its retreat from being a pilot municipality in May 2016 by the decision of the municipal authority. Main Activities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and evaluation of the project cycle management for social development projects with Life Improvement Approach, etc. Formulation of the guidebook and training materials, etc. Planning/implementation/monitoring of training with the project cycle management and Life Improvement Approach, Determination of institutions for training courses after the project completion, etc. Inclusion of social development projects in the Annual Operation Plan (POA) and the annual budget plan in pilot municipalities, Planning and implementation of activities of pilot social development projects, etc. Implementation of activities to raise awareness to communities on the social development, etc. Collection of information on good practice and sharing of good practice, etc. Inputs (to carry out above activities) <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Japanese Side</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Guatemalan Side</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1) Experts: (long-term) 2 persons, (short-term) 2 persons</td> <td>1) Staff allocated: 13 persons (cumulative total) In addition, 43 persons were assigned at the pilot municipalities.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Trainees received: 43 persons (in Japan), 25 persons (in third country: Mexico)</td> <td>2) Facilities: Office space and equipment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) Equipment: Computers and accessories, digital cameras, office equipment and furniture, etc.</td> <td>3) Local expenses: Vehicles and motorbikes for extension workers (by some municipal governments), and other expenses for project activities by some pilot municipalities</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4) Local expenses</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> 			Japanese Side	Guatemalan Side	1) Experts: (long-term) 2 persons, (short-term) 2 persons	1) Staff allocated: 13 persons (cumulative total) In addition, 43 persons were assigned at the pilot municipalities.	2) Trainees received: 43 persons (in Japan), 25 persons (in third country: Mexico)	2) Facilities: Office space and equipment	3) Equipment: Computers and accessories, digital cameras, office equipment and furniture, etc.	3) Local expenses: Vehicles and motorbikes for extension workers (by some municipal governments), and other expenses for project activities by some pilot municipalities	4) Local expenses	
Japanese Side	Guatemalan Side												
1) Experts: (long-term) 2 persons, (short-term) 2 persons	1) Staff allocated: 13 persons (cumulative total) In addition, 43 persons were assigned at the pilot municipalities.												
2) Trainees received: 43 persons (in Japan), 25 persons (in third country: Mexico)	2) Facilities: Office space and equipment												
3) Equipment: Computers and accessories, digital cameras, office equipment and furniture, etc.	3) Local expenses: Vehicles and motorbikes for extension workers (by some municipal governments), and other expenses for project activities by some pilot municipalities												
4) Local expenses													
Project Period	March 2013 – September 2016	Project Cost	(ex-ante) 350 million yen, (actual) 234 million yen										
Implementing Agency	Secretary of Planning and Programming of the Presidency (SEGEPLAN)												
Cooperation Agency in Japan	N/A												

II. Result of the Evaluation

<Special Perspectives Considered in the Ex-Post Evaluation>

- As Tectitan participated in the Project until May 2016, just four months before the project completion, achievement of the Project Purpose expected to be made by Tectitan by the end of project completion was assessed in this ex-post evaluation. However, in the assessment of the continuation of the Project Purpose and achievement of Overall Goal, Tectitan was not included.
- Regarding the Indicator 2 of the Project Purpose, as it was difficult to get the data to calculate the percentage of the members of Community Development Council (COCODE) due to limitation of survey period and resources, qualitative information on improvement of project management was collected to make assessment. The achievement at the project completion was assessed based on the rate of municipalities which improved their project management through qualitative information at community level, while the continuation status at the time of ex-post evaluation was assessed based on the rate of municipalities which improved their project management through qualitative information at municipal level.

1 Relevance

<Consistency with the Development Policy of Guatemala at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation and Project Completion>

At the time of the ex-ante evaluation and at the time of the project completion, in the Guatemalan policy, “Plan de Gobierno, Agenda del Cambio (Government Plan, Agenda for Change) 2012-2016”, released as the election pledge of the ruling Patriotic Party, one of the five pillars was social inclusion and priority was placed on eradication of hunger (“Hambre Cero”). In the policy “Hambre Cero”, community participation and monitoring/evaluation system were listed as cross-sectional issues.

<Consistency with the Development Needs of Guatemala at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation and Project Completion>

It was considered that, at the municipal governments, the capacity in planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects should be further strengthened. No change in the needs was observed at the time of project completion.

<Consistency with Japan’s ODA Policy at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation>

In Japanese assistance policy toward Guatemala, the priority was sustainable development and one of two key issues was reduction of regional inequality¹.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, the relevance of the project is high.

2 Effectiveness/Impact

<Status of Achievement of the Project Purpose at the time of Project Completion>

The Project Purpose was achieved by the project completion. The number of projects with Life Improvement Approach incorporated in POA as municipal projects was increased. In 75% of pilot municipalities (six out of eight), improvement in the capacity of implementation of social development projects was recognized through qualitative information, although the data based on assessment by COCODE members was not collected.

<Continuation Status of Project Effects at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

The project effects have partially continued to the time of ex-post evaluation. Out of seven municipalities surveyed, the number of projects with Life Improvement Approach incorporated in POA has been clearly increasing in three municipalities and remained the same in one municipality, compared to the number in 2015. No projects with Life Improve Approach have been incorporated in POA since 2018 in three municipalities. The reason is lack of interest and coordination of municipality authorities in Canilla, and in San Mateo Ixtatan, municipality extension workers were fired. Out of seven municipalities surveyed, project management by municipalities has been maintained or improved in four pilot municipalities and project management by communities has been maintained or improved in six. For example, a productivity and social coordination table created in Ixchiguan has been sustainably operated, and community members are able to prioritize their social development projects in Sibinal. It should be noted that, after the election for the term of 2016-2020, in municipalities of Ixchiguan, Sibinal, Uspantan, San Mateo and Ixtatan, the mayor has been changed, while in Canilla and San Bartolomé Jocotenango, the same mayor during the project are still in office. Therefore, it can be said that even the mayor is changed, the social development projects continue to be implemented, and the number of the project is remarkably increased in some cities, because the authorities understood the importance of implementation of this kind of projects involving the work of communitarians, forming self-managed people of their own development.

<Status of Achievement for Overall Goal at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

The Overall Goal has been partially achieved. A variety of examples of positive changes in the communities have been observed regarding social development projects with Life Improvement Approach in all the pilot municipalities surveyed, for example, improvement in sanitation and enhancement of community participation. Out of seven municipalities, the number of communities where social development projects with Life Improvement Approach are implemented has been increased by three or more in three municipalities. In another municipality, it has been increased by two, which means the project effects have been recognized although the increase is slightly below the target. For the other three municipalities, the major reasons of not increasing in the number of communities are the lack of interest of authorities as well as communities and the lack of budget.

<Other Impacts at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

Other positive impacts are observed at the time of the ex-post evaluation. In all municipalities, the participation of women has been enhanced mainly in making decision at the Municipal Development Council (COMUDE), as well as in planning and execution of projects at the community level. Also, a visible change of women has been observed in training participation and education processes as well as improvement in self-esteem, because the number of women who participate increased from 3 to 20 approximately and the women are participating actively in promoting and appropriating the execution of their projects. In addition, in Ixchiguan, document management, one of the products of the project’s intervention, was efficiently applied, improving their position in Municipal Management Ranking 2016. No negative impact has been observed.

<Evaluation Result>

Therefore, the effectiveness/impact of the project is fair.

¹ ODA Country Data Book (2012)

Achievement of Project Purpose and Overall Goal

Aim	Indicators	Results																																																																		
(Project Purpose) Planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for the social development projects by municipal governments of the pilot municipalities are improved.	(Indicator 1) In the municipal budget of 2016, compared with the previous year, greater number of projects with Life Improvement Approach which have been formulated according to the process and procedure of guidelines prepared by the Project are included.	Status of the Achievement: achieved (partially continued) (Project Completion) • The number of projects with Life Improvement Approach incorporated in POA as municipal projects was: 0 before 2015, 11 in 2015, and 12 in 2016. (Ex-post Evaluation) <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Pilot municipality (Department)*</th> <th colspan="5" style="text-align: center;">No. of projects with Life Improvement Approach in POA²</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">2015</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2016</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2017</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2018</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2019</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Canilla (Q)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>San Bartolome Jocotenango (Q)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Uspantan (Q)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ixchiguan (S)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">56</td> <td style="text-align: center;">58</td> <td style="text-align: center;">51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sibinal (S)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>San Mateo Ixtatan (H)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Union Cantinil (H)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tectitan (H)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">N/A</td> <td style="text-align: center;">N/A</td> <td style="text-align: center;">N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td style="text-align: center;">80</td> <td style="text-align: center;">75</td> <td style="text-align: center;">79</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Q: Quiche, S: San Marcos, H: Huehuetenango</p>	Pilot municipality (Department)*	No. of projects with Life Improvement Approach in POA ²						2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Canilla (Q)	2	1	6	0	0	San Bartolome Jocotenango (Q)	2	1	6	1	2	Uspantan (Q)	4	4	5	12	20	Ixchiguan (S)	1	1	56	58	51	Sibinal (S)	1	1	2	4	6	San Mateo Ixtatan (H)	0	0	2	0	0	Union Cantinil (H)	1	1	3	0	0	Tectitan (H)	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	Total	11	12	80	75	79
	Pilot municipality (Department)*	No. of projects with Life Improvement Approach in POA ²																																																																		
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019																																																															
Canilla (Q)	2	1	6	0	0																																																															
San Bartolome Jocotenango (Q)	2	1	6	1	2																																																															
Uspantan (Q)	4	4	5	12	20																																																															
Ixchiguan (S)	1	1	56	58	51																																																															
Sibinal (S)	1	1	2	4	6																																																															
San Mateo Ixtatan (H)	0	0	2	0	0																																																															
Union Cantinil (H)	1	1	3	0	0																																																															
Tectitan (H)	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A																																																															
Total	11	12	80	75	79																																																															
	(Indicator 2) By the end of the Project, more than 80% of the members of COCODE of communities that have implemented social development projects with Life Improvement Approach, affirm the improvement of their project management.	Status of the Achievement: achieved (continued) (Project Completion) • Out of the eight pilot municipalities, in six municipalities (except Tectitan and San Mateo Ixtatan), the framework to implement social development projects was appropriately functioning with proper application of the Life Improvement Approach, which means the improvement of their project management in 75% of communities, although the data based on assessment by COCODE was not collected. (Ex-post Evaluation) • According to the seven (7) pilot municipalities surveyed: The number of municipalities whose project management is improved or maintained: 4 The number of municipalities where project management in communities is improved: 6																																																																		
(Overall Goal) Condition of the life of the citizens in the pilot municipalities is improved.	(Indicator 1) The municipalities observe positive changes in the communities which implement social development projects with the Life Improvement Approach in each pilot municipality of Quiche, San Marcos and Huehuetenango.	(Ex-post evaluation) achieved • Positive changes have been observed in all the pilot municipalities surveyed, such as: Reduction of gastrointestinal and respiratory diseases through improvements in household practices and food preparation as well as use of latrines, Reduction of the malnutrition rate, Improvement of basic sanitation in school, Community self-management with sustainability to create projects for the benefit of the community, Improvement in agricultural and livestock production for consumption, Improvement of quality road infrastructure through local resources carried out by the community, Use of abandoned land																																																																		
	(Indicator 2) Social Development projects with the Life Improvement Approach are implemented in three more communities after the completion of the project in each pilot municipality of Quiché, San Marcos and Huehuetenango.	(Ex-post evaluation) partially achieved • The number of communities where social development projects with Life Improvement Approach are implemented changed as follows (comparison between 2016 and 2019): - Increased by three or more in 3 municipalities (Uspantan (Q), Ixchiguan (S), Sibinal (S)) - Increased but by less than three in 1 municipality (San Bartolome Jocotenango (Q)) - Remained the same in 1 municipality (Canilla (Q)) - Decreased in 2 municipalities (San Mateo Ixtatan (H), Union Cantinil (H))																																																																		

Source: Terminal Evaluation Report, JICA documents, Questionnaire and interview to the Department Delegates of SEGEPLAN and pilot municipalities

3 Efficiency

Both the project cost and the project period were within the plan (ratio against the plan: 67% and 100%, respectively). The project cost was substantially lower than planned because the contract of five Guatemalan consultants was terminated in 2014, although they had been planned to be hired until the project completion. The Outputs of the Project were produced as planned. Therefore, the efficiency of the Project is high.

4 Sustainability

<Policy Aspect>

In the “Methodological Guide to Facilitate Processes of Municipal Development Plans and Territorial Planning³” (effective since 2018), four planning approaches to elaborate the Municipal Development Plan are listed, and one of them is Life Improvement Approach.

² In two cities, i.e., Uspantan and Ixchiguan, the number of the project with Life Improvement Approach in POA is far greater than the other cities and it may not be appropriate just to compare the total number of projects to grasp the situation of all the pilot municipalities. Therefore, assessment was made based on the number of municipalities where number of projects with Life Improvement has been increased.

³ Territorial Planning: methodology of regional planning in which active participation of actors concerned in the planning is promoted in the area where they have common issues regardless the area of administrative unit.

<Institutional Aspect>

The organizational structure has been well established from the central level (SEGEPLAN) to the municipal level with responsibilities of each organization clearly defined, and there is a coordination among relevant organizations and among municipalities and communities. The personnel have been allocated at each level, and the allocation is sufficient at the central level of SEGEPLAN but not sufficient at many of the Department Delegates of SEGEPLAN and municipalities.

Number of staff members allocated

Organization	No. of C/P* at project completion	No. of former C/P at ex-post evaluation	No. of total staff in organization
SEGEPLAN (Central)	6	6	53 **
Department Delegate (3 Departments)	1 for each department	1 for each department	3 for each department
Total	9	9	62

*Counterpart

**23 Planning Specialists and 30 External Consultants that give technical advice to the municipalities concerned (as of August 2019)

<Technical Aspect>

At SEGEPLAN, staff have been trained on Life Improvement Approach at the central level. At the Department Delegates, as the newly assigned staff need training on Life Improvement Approach and planning, the medium-term training of Life Improvement Approach is already planned. At the municipality level, the staff have sufficient skills and experience required for planning and coordination of projects in three municipalities (San Bartolome Jocotenango, Ixchiguan, Sibinal), while it is necessary to further train new staff in Uspantan. The manuals developed by the project are still used in the pilot municipalities except San Mateo Ixtatan, where no projects are currently being implemented. During the project, Da Vinci University was designated as a training provider of the diploma course on Life Improvement Approach, but the University has not provided a course after the project completion, although this does not significantly affect the overall technical sustainability. The University wants to secure the sufficient number of students but it has been difficult because the monthly tuition per study course is high.

<Financial Aspect>

Financial resources for social development projects are generated and managed directly by the municipalities. In some pilot municipalities, as there is not enough budget to develop projects and to hire extension workers functioning as a link between the municipality and communities, it is difficult to conduct follow-up on the planning, implementation and monitoring of the activities carried out by community members. SEGEPLAN (at the central and department levels), although not having budget directly allocated to social development projects, secures the budget to train all municipalities twice a year for good implementation of social development projects with Life Improvement Approach for the purpose of improving institutional competence. Each time the training is provided for the participants of 22 Chiefs of SEGEPLAN at department level and 44 Planning Specialists of SEGEPLAN as well as 340 Municipal Planning Directors and 340 Technicians of Municipal Planning Directions.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, some problems have been observed in terms of the institutional and financial aspects of the implementing agency. Therefore, the sustainability of the effectiveness through the project is fair.

5 Summary of the Evaluation

The project achieved the Project Purpose of the improvement of planning/budgeting/implementation/monitoring/evaluation for the social development projects by the pilot municipalities. At the time of the ex-post evaluation, the number of projects with Life Improvement Approach incorporated in POA has been increasing in three out of the seven pilot municipalities surveyed, but project management by municipalities and communities has been maintained or improved in the pilot municipalities. Therefore, the project effects have been partially continued. The Overall Goal of the improvement of condition of the life of the citizens in the pilot municipalities has been partially achieved as the number of communities where social development projects with Life Improvement Approach are implemented has been increasing in four municipalities out of seven and positive changes have been observed in communities. Sustainability is high in the policy and technical aspects but some problems have been observed in the institutional and financial aspects, because personnel and budget allocation is not sufficient, which affects implementation of social development projects. Considering all of the above points, this project is evaluated to be satisfactory.

III. Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Recommendations for Implementing Agency:

- It is necessary for SEGEPLAN to promote coordination with other institutions in social development projects through municipal technical meetings in which COMUDE, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food (MAGA), Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, and other actors related to rural development are committee members, because these organizations have extension workers under permanent contracts at the municipality level and it is effective to work with those extension workers in the projects with the Life Improvement Approach, because Segeplán hasn't technical staff at municipal level.
- It is recommended for SEGEPLAN to share the materials developed by the project with other institutions in the Municipal Commission of Food Security and Nutrition (COMUSAN) and COMUDE so that these other institutions can be trained by using the materials made by the project.
- Monitoring of social development projects by Department Delegates of SEGEPLAN should be constantly conducted. It is recommended that monitoring of social development projects be included in Terms of Reference for the Planning Specialists of SEGEPLAN so that the Planning Specialists of SEGEPLAN conduct monitoring in coordination with MAGA extension workers.
- It is recommended to utilize human resources trained and experienced in the project for training at municipalities. For example, as Ixchiguan has experience to elaborate Municipal Development Plans and Territorial Planning (PDM-OT), that experience can be shared with other municipalities.

Lessons learned for JICA:

- Sibinal and Ixchiguan have meetings constantly to exchange experience of social development projects after completion of the project. This has promoted learning among themselves. Ixchiguan, Sibinal and Tectitan were selected as pilot sites to work together as a group at the project formulation stage, and that worked only between Sibinal and Ixchiguan for the location, as Sibinal and

Ixchiguan are closely located while Tectian is quite far from the two cities. It is necessary to select appropriate sites for pilot projects, considering the proximity among them so that exchange of experience among municipalities can be promoted.

- At Da Vinci University, the Diploma course on Life Improvement Approach has not been continued because they cannot offer a course without profit. It is necessary to select an organization which has responsibility and sustainability, for example public university and institutes such as National Central School of Agriculture (ENCA) and Agricultural Training School (EFA).
- As to the Indicator 2 of the Project Purpose, the quantitative data was not collected not only during the ex-post evaluation but during the terminal evaluation as well. The collection of the data specified by the Indicator needs quite a large scale of survey, distributing questionnaires of all the members of COCODE, which was not feasible in ex-post evaluation and difficult even during the project period. To assess the achievement of the project effects, it is important to define appropriate indicators at the planning stage so that required data can be collected without a complicated survey on a large scale during the project as well as ex-post evaluation.



Interview with communitarians from Ixchiguan.



Interview with all technical officers in the Municipality of Ixchiguan.