

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

5170145011501-3
PB-AAH-309-21
FORM 504-147

PROJECT TITLE <p style="text-align: center;">Small Farm Agriculture and Livestock</p>	2. PROJECT NUMBER <p style="text-align: center;">517-0145-01</p>	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE <p style="text-align: center;">USAID/DR</p>
	4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number reported by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>80</u> B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>80</u> C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>80</u>	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ _____ B. U.S. \$ <u>110,000</u>	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) <u>Nov. 1979</u> To (month/yr.) <u>Oct. 1980</u> Date of Evaluation Review _____

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., telegram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Submit receipts to allow closing books on project.	D. Putman	Oct. 31, 1980
2. Complete in-depth evaluation.	D. Putman	Dec. 15, 1980

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____	10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____											
11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles) John H. Clary, Program Officer, USAID/DR Dean Putman, Peace Corps/DR Assistant Director (subs) AGR: Kellis <i>RE</i> MGT: RFascell <i>(draft)</i> PRG: AValdez <i>(draft)</i> CON: DLDolley <i>(draft)</i> CRD: CBlankstein <i>(draft)</i> AD: RFVenezia <i>(draft)</i>	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval Signature: <i>Philip R. Schwab</i> Typed Name: Philip R. Schwab Date: OCT. 28 1980												

13. SUMMARY

This project was framed as part of the response to the hurricane disaster. None of the parties to the project -- AID, Peace Corps, and public and private Dominican organizations -- had previous experience with the collaborative arrangement for implementation which was established. Nor did these parties have previous experience with the types of specific sub-projects which were developed. Time did not permit elaboration of a project paper or other documentation which normally characterize AID activities. The burden of normal business combined with other disaster recovery efforts, and the urgency of the situation, precluded a long planning cycle. Nevertheless, the project has been generally successful in meeting its objectives of increasing the availability of animal protein in rural communities, and providing training in improved husbandry practices.

The development of the project involved intensive short-term consultation with Peace Corps through which significant and pressing nutritional needs at the community level were identified. Some \$110,000 of the first allocations of disaster assistance funds were committed to the project. USAID staff followed the project more closely than other projects for which experienced supervisory services from the GODR or contractors were available. When it became apparent that the funds available would be less than anticipated, the project was scaled back by the USAID reflecting a prudent assessment of money and managerial resources available.

Seven production and training centers have been established, and all AID monies have been disbursed. All centers have established relationships with

public or private entities. Six communities (Padre Las Casas/SEA/INDESUR; Arroyo Caña/IAD; Jarabacoa/IAD; San José de Ocoa/Local Development Association; San Cristóbal/Local Protestant Group; and Baní/SEA/DDF) received AID funding ranging from \$10,000 to \$20,000. The seventh, Constanza/IAD, received about \$1,800. All projects have received initial counterpart support as promised. In the case of Padre Las Casas, SEA now plans to make that project a regional training center. Actual and promised GODR contributions will exceed \$40,000. The Jarabacoa project also has stimulated GODR contributions which will probably equal AID's inputs.

Because the extent of construction at Padre Las Casas is greater than originally expected, that project has not yet produced a cycle of chickens, but has rabbits and ducks. All of the other projects have been producing small animals as planned. Production includes chickens and other poultry, eggs, rabbits, and goats, depending on the individual site. Production is mainly for consumption although in some instances breeding stock is sold to campesinos. Each site has its own "personality". In San Cristóbal, where the project is located at an orphanage, most training is a continuous hands-on approach. All other sites follow this approach to a certain extent for interested members of the community. Also, all sites have short demonstration field days for groups of farmers.

In addition to training, production is adequate to provide important protein inputs for the communities they serve. There is sufficient local and government interest to insure the likelihood of continuation of most sub-projects after the departure of the PCV's. Two projects (Baní and Constanza) face greater difficulty in continuation. In Baní, the problem is lack of counterpart interest, while in Constanza, the problem is limited counterpart support.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The major reason for this evaluation is to measure project progress. A secondary reason is to gather information for a possible follow-on developmental project which would include PCV's. Major inputs for this informal evaluation come from the staff of USAID/DR, Peace Corps staff, PCV's, and discussion with field level counterparts. Information comes from brief oral and written reports, the Mission Controller's Office, and site visits. The Peace Corps plans to do a separate and deeper evaluation of the project at a later date.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

The six projects sub-projects which included construction of structures to house small animals, storage facilities, and training areas, all experienced occasional difficulty in obtaining materials and also found that costs of materials increased rapidly. This was caused by country-wide shortage of construction materials, inflation, and high demand following the hurricane disaster. There has also been a shortage of good quality baby chicks, resulting from high demand following the hurricane, and recently because of heat and drought in the U.S. which reduced the supply of imported chicks. General socio-economic conditions and host government priorities have not changed since the project was initiated.

16. INPUTS

As mentioned above, external factors caused shortages of some inputs, and prices rose steadily during the disbursement period. Nevertheless, inputs were generally adequate, delay in implementation has not been excessive, and funds

were adequate to complete the sub-projects. The PCV's were encouraged to develop ambitious plans, which they did. Most plans were in the range of \$20,000 to \$25,000 which exceeded AID's funding availabilities. However, the PCV's were able to re-plan their sub-projects to fit within AID's funds. GODR inputs were most important in the successful completion of construction and were generally timely.

17. OUTPUTS

Principal outputs include: construction of 17 animal shelters with storage, water, and classroom facilities as needed; 6 incubators, 5 brooders, 60 rabbit cages; and stocks of animals and foodstuffs. Outputs have seldom been more than six weeks behind schedule.

18. PURPOSE

The purpose of the project is improve the diets and increase the incomes of small farm families as soon as possible after the disaster. Although EOPS were not formally stated, there was general recognition that by the end of the project, the following conditions would exist:

- a. Seven production and training centers operating and self-sufficient, or subsidized by a Dominican organization.
- b. A number of small farmers receiving training in improved husbandry practices.
- c. Meat, poultry, and eggs available for sale for prices at or below current prices within the area served.
- d. Improved breeding stock available for sale at or below current local prices.

Although data is not presently available to allow quantification of achievement of EOPS indicators, field observation indicate that they have all been achieved. Such data will be expected from the follow-on Peace Corps evaluation.

19. GOAL

The Mission's long-range goal is to improve the living standards of the poor majority in the Dominican Republic. This project contributes to our long-range goal, and to our short-term goal of prompt economic reconstruction in rural communities following the hurricanes. Again, we await the Peace Corps evaluation.

20. BENEFICIARIES

Direct beneficiaries under the project number approximately 2 000 poor families in the area affected by the hurricanes. As sub-project activities continue, their impact should extend to thousands of families. These families were poor before the disaster, and in most instances suffered losses which sharply reduced their abilities to buy or produce food. The project benefits these poor families through provision of animal protein at reasonable prices and through training in improved husbandry. The latter contributes to increase in small-farm labor intensive agricultural productivity.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

The major positive unplanned effect was that two sub-projects proved to be catalysts in attracting GODR financial support which matched or exceeded AID's contribution. The GODR has long-term interest in the sub-projects in Padre Las Casas and Jarabacoa. Apparently, the GODR wishes to reinforce success in those areas.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

Project management could have been improved through better coordination among USAID/DR, Peace Corps staff, and PCV's. Detail in planning should have been more formal, written field reports should have been more firmly required, and rendering of accounts for monies expended should have been more timely. As of the date of this evaluation, receipts for about \$24,000 (22% of USAID/DR's grant) have not been presented by the Peace Corps to the Controller's Office to allow closing the books on the project. A more efficient accounting mechanism should have been established for the project. However, the system was sufficient to provide basic financial control, and too great an emphasis on accountability at the beginning might have caused delays in project start-up.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS

If this project is to serve as a model for possible additional grant funding for a developmental project, with heavy Peace Corps involvement, the following steps should be followed:

- a. A GODR-Peace Corps-USAID/DR committee should be established to frame the limits, particularly budgetary, of projects to be considered and establish a mechanism for project approval.
- b. Responsibilities and procedures should be developed for project implementation and reporting thereon.
- c. Procedures for accounting should be developed and followed.

SMALL FARM AGRICULTURE AND LIVESTOCK

Project No. 517-0145.01

<u>Location</u>	<u>Peace Corps Volunteer</u>	<u>Counterpart Agency</u>	<u>Estimated Families Benefitting</u>
Padre Las Casas	Robert Schmelzer	Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura	500
San José de Ocoa	David Willmot	Asociación de Desarrollo de San José de Ocoa	300
Arroyo Caña (Rancho Arriba)	Charles Benz	Instituto Agrario Dominicano	200
Jarabacoa	Jennifer Allen	Instituto Agrario Dominicano	300
San Cristóbal	Shushan Vetzmadian	Hogar del Niño Huérfano	200
Banf	Tony Falcone	Fundación Dominicana de Desarrollo	100
Constanza	Steve Merritt	Instituto Agrario Dominicano	<u>125</u>
		TOTAL	2,025

September 1980.