

### **1.3 Evaluation Methods**

The evaluation was conducted by an evaluation team made up of four people and had the following objectives:

- To assess CRS, CARE and Oxfam GB's response to the emergency situation caused by Tropical Storm Stan in 2005 in Guatemala.
- To assess agency and ECB<sup>4</sup> coordination.
- To evaluate the impact of activities carried out by CRS, CARE and Oxfam GB.

The evaluation covers the period from when the emergency began, on October 5 2005, to February 20 2006. The methods used by the evaluators are described below.

#### **A. Document review of the ECB Working Group and the CRS, CARE and Oxfam GB emergency response**

Documents provided by the agencies were reviewed. This included project information, implementation plans, logical frameworks, follow-up reports, report support documents, drafts of final reports for completed projects and other documents that helped to provide a full understanding of the emergency response activities implemented by the agencies. Some of the documents were provided at the beginning of the consultancy and some during the last weeks of the evaluation.

Access was given to three of the seven projects that are being implemented by CARE (financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, IADB, DFID-UK, the Government of Norway, the Government of Guatemala, PSO – the Netherlands, CARE USA). Work plans were not provided.

A consolidated report (draft) of all activities carried out by CARE during this time period was provided, along with SITREPs, bulletins, their contingency plan, organizational charts, community agreements, CARE protocols and policies and food distribution charts.

CRS provided a Power Point presentation summarizing their projects, a project monitoring plan (San Marcos), information regarding their Southern Coast project, SITREPs, shelter and other manuals, educational materials and emergency organization information.

Oxfam GB provided a logical framework and draft report, draft project report, a timeline for a different project and a project summary report. Missing was information on productive projects and the respective progress reports. Other documents provided include their contingency plan, needs assessment reports and partial project reports.

Agency documentation was reviewed to identify proposed activities and activities that had been implemented up until the date the evaluation began (February 20, 2006).

#### **B. Interviews with key personnel that participated in the emergency response.**

Interviews were conducted with key personnel from different organizational levels. At country office level, personnel interviewed included agency directors, coordinators, Agency Representatives and support personnel. At the operations level, interviews were conducted with area coordinators, personnel implementing activities in the area and counterpart institutions. Personnel from other institutions that coordinated with the agencies were also interviewed.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Emergency Capacity Building (ECB) Project is a collaborative effort of the seven agencies of the Inter-agency Working Group on Emergency Capacity: CARE International, Catholic Relief Services, the International Rescue Committee, Mercy Corps, Oxfam GB, Save the Children US, and World Vision International. Over a two-year period from March 2005, these agencies and their partners are jointly addressing issues of staff capacity, accountability and impact measurement, risk reduction and the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in emergencies, with the objective of improving the speed, quality and effectiveness of emergency response. For further information, please visit [www.ecbproject.org](http://www.ecbproject.org)

Group interviews were conducted in the capital with country office teams: 8 people from CARE, 3 people from CRS and 2 people from Oxfam GB. Group interviews were also conducted with operations teams: 5 people from Oxfam GB in Panajachel-Sololá, 6 people from Oxfam GB's counterparts in Panabaj-Sololá, 6 people from the Community Health Services Coordinating Association (ACCSS) in Champerico in Retalhuleu and 4 people from CODECA in Rancho Alegre, also in the department of Retalhuleu.

8 people participated in the interview with CARE's operations team in San Marcos and 7 people participated in the interview with CARE's operations team in Sololá. The coordinator for this area was also interviewed.

12 people participated in the group interview of Caritas, CRS's counterpart, in San Marcos and 3 people participated in the group interview of Caritas in Retalhuleu. A personal interview was also held with a priest who coordinated the emergency response.

Individual interviews, both face-to-face and via telephone, were also conducted with international personnel that supported CARE and Oxfam GB during the emergency.

These interviews aided in the investigation of the emergency response of each agency, allowing response difficulties and achievements to be identified.

Among personnel from other institutions that were interviewed due to their involvement in the response were the UNDP information manager and representative, the Sololá Coordinator of the Joint United Nations Post-Stan Program, CONRED officials and the Doctors of the World Coordinator.

### **C. Interviews with personnel related to the ECB Working Group.**

Interviews were conducted with the ECB Disaster Risk Reduction Initiative Guatemala Manager, representatives from ECB agencies and international advisors.

Group interviews were conducted with country office teams in Guatemala City: 3 people participated in interviews from WV agencies, 6 people participated in interviews from SC/US and 3 people participated in interviews from Mercy Corps. An individual interview was also conducted with the Mercy Corps Director.

Questions related to ECB coordination were included in the group interviews held with country office and operations teams from CRS, CARE and Oxfam GB.

The interviewees were asked about emergency response coordination and their perception of the work of the ECB project.

### **D. Visits to the communities where the agencies carried out the emergency response**

The sites chosen to visit were where two or more agencies were implementing emergency response activities in a municipality. Communities visited were suggested by the agencies.

One of the purposes of these visits was to determine the level of coordination between agencies at the municipal level.

Municipal and community leaders were interviewed in order to learn about agency involvement in the activities implemented in the municipalities and the humanitarian aid that they provided.

Local agency personnel assisted in setting up appointments with the municipal and community leaders. The majority of the mayors were not present in the municipalities for the appointments and delegated one or more members of the municipal councils to participate in the interview.

Mayors from the municipalities of Santa Catarina, Ixtahuacán and San Juan La Laguna were interviewed in the department of Sololá and deputy mayors were interviewed in Santiago Atitlán, Nahualá and Santa Cruz La Laguna. A group interview was conducted with the COCODE in the Pajá community in Nahualá with 6 participants and an individual interview was conducted with the President of the Tzununá COCODE.

In the department of San Marcos, interviews were held with the Mayor and Deputy Mayor of Tejutla, two councilors from the Tajumulco municipality and the President of the San Isidro COCODE. 8 people including the Deputy Mayor were interviewed from the Boxoncán COCODE and 3 people including the Deputy Mayor were interviewed from the Bexoncán COCODE.

Focus groups were also conducted with beneficiaries of the emergency response in order to learn about their perception of the aid they received from the agencies and if the aid they received was sufficient to satisfy their needs during the emergency. Agency personnel organized the community focus groups.

Three focus groups were held in the department of Sololá, one in the municipality of San Marcos La Laguna with the participation of 15 women and one man who served as a translator, one in the Pacorral II community with 10 adult male participants and one in Xoljá with 8 adult male participants.

Field observations were made during the visits to local communities to determine the hygienic state of the shelters, latrines and services. Random individual interviews and home visits were also made.

In the department of Sololá, visits were made to the Pacorral II, Xoljá, Pajá and Panabaj communities. Two random single-family shelters were visited in each of the communities with the consent of their inhabitants.

Water intake systems were inspected in the Tzancotón, Xabaj 1 and Xabaj 2 communities.

Non-formal interviews were conducted with 2 people living in the Panabaj shelter, 1 in Xoljá, 1 in Pacorral II and 2 people living in the San Juan La Laguna shelter.

During the non-formal interviews, people were asked about what they thought would have happened if they hadn't received aid and their future plans.

In the department of San Marcos, single-family shelters were visited in Bexoncán (1) and Boxoncán (2). Non-formal, individual interviews were conducted with one person in Bexoncán and 2 people in Boxoncán.

Rehabilitated water distribution systems were visited in Bexoncán and Boxoncán.

One focus group was conducted in Cuchupán, located in the department of Retalhuleu. 32 people participated in the focus group, including 11 women.

An informal conversation was held in the Rancho Alegre community with a large group of women (approximately 50 that were participating in another activity). Non-formal, individual interviews were conducted with five women and home visits were made to two beneficiaries.

One individual interview and 3 home visits were made in the Las Cruces community. A visit was also made to the wells that are being rehabilitated.

## **E. Analysis and reports**

The activities implemented and coverage sections of this report were based on the documents provided by the agencies. It should be noted that many of the projects were being implemented when the evaluation took place. Field visits provided a good panorama of intervention quality.

The interventions implemented were analyzed to see if they met the following minimum Sphere Project indicators:

- Water and sanitation. 15 liters of water per person per day. 250 people per water faucet, bacteriological analysis indicating an absence of coliforms, 0.5mg residual chlorine per liter, a turbidity of less than 5 NTU, protected water sources, 20-liter water tanks with covers, at least 250 grams of soap per month per person, appropriate toilet installations (centrally located, separate toilets for men and women, privacy), a washbasin for 100 people. 1 latrine per 20 people or per 4 to 5 families, located no more than 50 meters from the living quarters and at least 30 meters from surface water sources, in good hygienic

conditions and with designs accepted by families. Distribute hygienic messages and conduct activities to promote good hygiene and organize users for maintenance issues.

- Food aid. 2,100 calories per person per day except when there are other sources of food, acceptance and familiarity with the foods provided, distribution to beneficiaries. For food security: primary production, seed distribution, tools and fertilizer.
- Health. Community education messages regarding the prevention of transmissible diseases, diagnosis and treatment of common diseases. Mental Health. Social and psychological interventions.
- Shelters. 3.5 m<sup>2</sup> of space per person. Adequate design for climatic conditions.
- Non-food items. Clothes, bedding, personal hygiene items and kitchen utensils.

The interviews held with agency country office and operations teams focused on the following points: response speed, the influence of prior agency presence in affected areas on the response, assessments of damage, human resources (number and their disaster preparedness), response of the organization and the influence of administrative, logistical and communication systems on the response.

Impact determination was based on the beneficiaries' perception of aid received and the sustainability potential of implemented activities.

During the interviews, special emphasis was placed on ECB agency coordination during the emergency response. In addition, and in response to a suggestion made by international ECB project advisors, the agencies were asked for their perceptions and suggestions of ECB coordination efforts. These results are included in the recommendations section.

Each of the consultants prepared reports corresponding to their areas of expertise. During the first two weeks, a water and sanitation specialist participated in the evaluation. The Team Leader took charge of that area of the evaluation during subsequent weeks.

The Team Leader was in charge of preparing the final report. A draft of the report was first prepared and commented on by phone by the ECB Disaster Risk Reduction Initiative Manager, ECB Accountability and Impact Measurement Manager and ECB advisors.

The main findings of the evaluation were presented during a joint meeting to the country directors of the agencies involved plus the ECB Project Manager for Guatemala and management as well as agency coordinators, Agency Representatives and support personnel.

Another draft of the final report was prepared that incorporated the suggestions provided by phone and during the presentation of the findings

Section 2 of this document presents an evaluation of the responses of CRS, CARE and Oxfam to the emergency. Section 3 evaluates the coordination between agencies and within the ECB Working Group. Section 4 lays out the key lessons learned, and Section 5 presents a summary of conclusions. Section 6 lists the recommendations of the evaluation team. Some of main findings are in italics.

***Where recommendations are put forward elsewhere in the text, they are highlighted in this way for easy reference.***