also 517014506 1501-6 517-0145.06
~~517014506 6801~~ PD-AAH-370-E1

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Symbol U-347

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
Emergency Electric Power Distribution	517-0145.06	USAID/DR

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)

☐ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 80	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 80	C. Final Input Delivery FY 80	A. Total $ 400,000 B. U.S. $ 400,000	From (month/yr.) 11/79 To (month/yr.) 11/80 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., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. One supplier has requested extension of delivery date for small amount of materials which would require PACD extension. Mission is currently considering request.	Merrill	11/22/80

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Allen K. Merrill, Dep. Cap. Dev. Officer

Rudolph Fascell, Management Officer

Clearances: CRDO: CSBlankstein AD: RFVenezia

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature

Typed Name: Philip R. Schwab

Date: OCT. 28 1980

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

PES - PART II

13. Summary

The electric distribution systems in Haina, San Cristobal, and Bani destroyed by Hurricane David are 95 percent restored. All materials procured under the project have arrived in country with the exception of $26,981 of fuses and arrestors.

14. Evaluation Methodology

The engineering firm Chas. T. Main was contracted by A.I.D. to perform periodic inspections and evaluations of project progress. The Final Evaluation Report prepared by Chas. T. Main is attached.

15. External Factors

Not pertinent.

16. Inputs

Delivery time for distribution materials was delayed from the original estimates of 6-8 weeks to 8-20 weeks.

17. Outputs

The electric distribution systems in Haina, San Cristóbal and Bani have been fully (95%) repaired.

18. Purpose

The purpose of repairing the electrical distribution systems destroyed by Hurricane David has been achieved. In some cases, A.I.D.-financed materials were used directly for this purpose. In other cases, CDE (Dominican Electricity Corporation) materials were diverted from other projects for this purpose and replaced by A.I.D. materials when they arrived.

19. Goal

The project goal of restoring electricity to hurricane victims for pumping water, refrigerating foods and medicines, operating health facilities, and other critical uses was achieved.

20. Beneficiaries

The project beneficiaries were the several hundred thousand persons in Haina, San Cristobal and Bani affected by Hurricane David. These people were benefitted through the restoration of electricity for health, welfare and productive purposes as outlined above.

21. Unplanned Effects

None.

22. Lessons Learned

It took CDE approximately 3 months from the time the Grant Agreement was signed to complete its formal solicitation of bids and another 2 months to review the bids and place orders with the selected suppliers. Thus orders for all materials were not placed until April, 1980. In future projects of this kind, a more streamlined solicitation/ordering procedure should be developed at the outset and adhered to.

Also, the estimates of delivery time for materials (6-8 weeks), which were among the criteria for supplier selection, were greatly underestimated. Penalties must be included for late shipment of materials or substantial delays can be expected.

23. Special Comments

None.