

CLASSIFICATION  
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE  <b>Fertilizer Storage Construction</b>			2. PROJECT NUMBER <b>388-0030</b>	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE <b>USAID/Bangladesh</b>
			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <b>81-2</b>	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>76</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>76</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>81</u>	A. Total \$ <u>5,250,000</u>	
			B. U.S. \$ <u>5,250,000</u>	
			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
			From (month/yr.) <u>12/76</u>	
			To (month/yr.) <u>9/80</u>	
			Date of Evaluation Review <u>12/80</u>	

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
<p>This is the final evaluation for this completed project. There are no decisions to take and there are no unresolved issues.</p>		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT		
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change		
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <u>None</u>		B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or		
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan		
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P		C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project		

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)		12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval	
FSAGR/Dean Alter <u>L.L.</u>	PRO:L.Crandall <u>[Signature]</u>	Signature	<u>[Signature]</u>
FSAGR/Phillip Church <u>[Signature]</u>	DD:RLPodol <u>[Signature]</u>	Typed Name	<b>Frank B. Kimball</b>
PRO/M.Sullivan <u>[Signature]</u>		Date	<b>January 14, 1981</b>
RDE/C.Groceman <u>[Signature]</u>			

13. Summary

This is the final project evaluation. The project is found to have been successfully completed on the levels of inputs and outputs. Purpose and goal achievement appear favorable so far but data is not yet available to fully assess them since the major effects of the completed warehouses in helping increase fertilizer availability will be seen in future years.

14. Evaluation Methodology

Data and analysis used in this evaluation have been collected and prepared by USAID staff from project files, BADC records, and other records.

15. External Factors

Major assumptions all held on input, output, purpose and goal levels.

16. Inputs

The USAID funded inputs were Fixed Amount Reimbursement (FAR) payments for completed construction plus cost reimbursement for A&E consulting services.

17. Outputs

Project outputs were 27 completed warehouses with rated storage capacity totaling 27,000 tons. Full details of the completed warehouses are contained in the Annam and Whitney "Final Completion Report."

18. Purpose

The purpose of the project was to increase small farmer agricultural production.

The indicators listed on the purpose level in the logical framework were:

A. Increased and appropriate use of fertilizer by small farmers

The first warehouse under this project was completed in April 1978 and the last one in September 1980. Therefore, while use of the warehouses was partial and had some effect in 1979-80, all warehouses were not in use until 1980-81. Fertilizer sales increased approximately 15 percent during 1979-80, whereas the increase for 1980-81 is not yet known.

All warehouses were placed in use immediately as each became available. There was and still remains a serious shortage of adequate quality storage space. Prior to the beginning of the project, BADC good quality storage space totaled approximately only 150,000 tons capacity. This was very inadequate to hold the approximately 350,000 tons of fertilizer which BADC was maintaining in Bangladesh.

B. Increased production of major crops by small farmers

Total foodgrain production in 1979-80 was 13,349,000 tons, an increase of 217,000 tons (1.6 percent) over 1978-79 production. The major effect of the warehouses in helping increase fertilizer availability will be seen in future years. Therefore, data are not yet available to fully answer this question.

C. Private dealers have inventories on hand to meet full demand at peak seasons, and

D. Black market in fertilizer substantially eliminated

Because BADC did maintain a large fertilizer stock in country, dealer inventories have been adequate and the black market in fertilizer has been substantially reduced as evidenced by village market surveys conducted by USAID and IFDC.

19. Goal

The project goal was to increase small farmer income through increased production on land cultivated by small farmers.

As mentioned above, foodgrain production increased 1.6 percent in 1979-80. Also farm-gate prices increased 8 percent in 1979-80. Small farmers defined as those farmers who cultivate 2.0 acres or less cultivate an estimated 45 percent of the total cropped acres in Bangladesh. It is therefore considered likely they are among the beneficiaries of the increased income resulting from increased production and rising farm-gate prices.

20. Beneficiaries

The major beneficiaries of the project are the fertilizer dealers, the farmers (large and small) and their families in the areas served by the 27 new warehouses. These warehouses are widely spread among eight districts of Bangladesh and their combined service areas cover a total population estimated at approximately 12.0 million persons. USAID-funded surveys indicate that 63 percent of all farmers use fertilizer. Therefore, it is believed that the benefits of the project are reaching a large number of beneficiaries, possibly in the neighborhood of  $0.63 \times 12.0 \text{ million} = 7.6 \text{ million beneficiaries}$ .

21. Unplanned Effects

None

22. Lessons Learned

This project followed upon previous less than successful USAID attempts at construction projects in Bangladesh.

The major change incorporated into this project was the requirement for a U.S. A & E firm. However, as the project was originally designed, the Consultant was only responsible for design and inspection of construction. The responsibility for supervision of construction was vested in the Bangladeshi implementing agency.

During the course of the project, serious construction difficulties relating to both quality control and rate of construction were experienced. As a result, it was necessary for USAID to request the implementing agency to modify the Consultant's contract to vest sole authority and responsibility for supervision of construction and certification of work for final payment in the Consultant. This resulted on a marked improvement in the quality and the pace of the work.

Another lesson learned was that the average Bangladeshi construction firm selected under this project was less than adequately qualified due to lack of experience, lack of qualified labor, lack of materials and/or inadequate finances. The conclusion reached was that a vigorous pre-qualification process resulting in a carefully selected and small number of pre-qualified firms is of high importance for any construction services in Bangladesh.

23. Special Comments or Remarks

None