

<b>PROJECT TITLE</b>  <p style="text-align: center;">Emergency Agriculture Program (Food for Work)</p>	<b>2. PROJECT NUMBER</b> <p style="text-align: center;">517-0145.08 &amp; .09</p>	<b>3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE</b> <p style="text-align: center;">USAID/DR</p>							
<b>4. EVALUATION NUMBER</b> 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) <u>1</u>									
<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION									
<b>KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES</b> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY-<u>80</u></td> <td style="width: 33%;">B. Final Obligation Expected FY _____</td> <td style="width: 33%;">C. Final Input Delivery FY _____</td> </tr> </table>	First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY- <u>80</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY _____	C. Final Input Delivery FY _____	<b>6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING</b> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">A. CRS</td> <td style="width: 50%;">\$ <u>50,000</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. CARE</td> <td>\$ <u>16,726</u></td> </tr> </table>	A. CRS	\$ <u>50,000</u>	B. CARE	\$ <u>16,726</u>	<b>7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION</b> From (month/yr.) <u>December 1979</u> To (month/yr.) <u>March 1980</u> Date of Evaluation Review _____
First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY- <u>80</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY _____	C. Final Input Delivery FY _____							
A. CRS	\$ <u>50,000</u>								
B. CARE	\$ <u>16,726</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
None		

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

<b>9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS</b> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <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	_____	<b>10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT</b> 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	_____											

<b>11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)</b> John H. Clary, Program Officer (In Draft) Rose M. Veith, Deputy PRG (In Draft) Arthur E. Valdez, PRG Consultant (In Draft) Rudolph Fascell, Management Officer (In Draft) Darrrell L. Dolley, Controller (In Draft) Charles Blankstein, CRDO (In Draft)-Ronald Venezia, AD	<b>12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval</b> Signature _____ Typed Name <u>Philip R. Schwab</u> Date <u>NOV. - 4 1980</u>
--	---

### 13. SUMMARY

This project was undertaken in response to the critical food shortages that affected the Dominican Republic after hurricanes David and Frederick struck the island. Both CARE and Catholic Relief Services (CRS) were heavily involved in other disaster recovery efforts, primarily in the distribution of emergency food rations. Because of the urgency to move as much food as possible to the most seriously affected areas of the countryside, it was not possible to institute a long planning cycle. Initially, the first priorities were to assure the safe storage of PL-480 Title II commodities, and to cover the costs of their handling and transportation to the food for work sites.

Four warehouses were repaired with a cost breakdown as follows:

(a) CARE - two warehouses, total cost \$16,336.37; (b) CRS - two warehouses, total cost \$6,914.23.

The transportation and handling costs were as follows: (a) CARE - 931,000 pounds of food transported at a cost of \$390.42; (b) CRS - 4,441,832 pounds of food transported at a cost of \$43,085.77.

The funds provided by AID were a one time only grant with each of the two organizations agreeing to make every effort to obtain additional funds from the GODR. In the case of CARE, after originally requesting \$50,000 from AID, it was able to reduce the request to \$16,726.79 since the governmental and non-governmental agencies with which CARE worked either began to provide transportation or cover transportation costs. CRS, on the other hand, was dealing with a greater volume of food for work projects and had more difficulty in securing funds to transport commodities. For that reason, CRS used a greater portion (\$43,086) of its grant to cover transportation costs.

#### 14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The principal purpose of this evaluation is to provide a brief background, both financial and programatic, on how the emergency funds were utilized by CARE and CRS. Major inputs for this informal evaluation come from the staff of USAID/DR and discussions with representatives from CARE and CRS. Information comes from brief oral and written reports, the Mission Controller's office, and warehouse site visits.

#### 15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

The damage to the CARE and CRS warehouses was the direct result of hurricane winds (150 m.p.h. estimated) that hit Santo Domingo on August 31, 1979. Of CARE's six warehouses, two were rendered practically useless and the other four suffered extensive damage (estimated cost for the repair of all six was over \$50,000).

Damage to the CRS warehouses was less severe. Nevertheless, it was imperative that repairs be undertaken to insure the proper storage of large amounts of PL-480 Title II commodities.

With respect to transportation of commodities, the problem was more acute for CRS since increased assistance from the GODR was slow in materializing. CARITAS, the CRS counterpart, during the critical month of October 1979, calculated that for the succeeding six month (October-March) period of the emergency food program, transportation costs to deliver 11,663,800 pounds of commodities would run about \$145,800. Government support was eventually provided; however, the funds provided under this grant enabled CRS to continue its emergency food for work program without interruption.

#### 16. INPUTS

The general state of interrupted transportation services immediately following the hurricanes did cause some problems with respect to the timeliness of transporting commodities to the food for work sites. This situation gradually improved and did not compromise the overall implementation of the project.

Materials for the repair of the warehouses were readily available. Carpenters and workmen were employed for the repair work and the project was implemented without any delay.

#### 17. OUTPUTS

Principal outputs include: repair of four large warehouses and the transportation of approximately 4,442,763 pounds of food to project sites.

#### 18. PURPOSE

The purpose of this project was to assure safe storage of PL-480 Title II commodities, and to assist in meeting costs of transportation of these goods to food for work sites.

#### 19. GOAL

The Mission's goal during the hurricane emergency was to assist the GODR and the PVOs to provide a large segment of the rural poor in hurricane affected areas with food rations. These rations were needed to supplement diets of people in areas where damage to crops was heavy and widespread.

#### 20. BENEFICIARIES

Direct beneficiaries under the project are estimated at approximately 367,000 rural poor who participate in food for work programs. The indirect

beneficiaries are estimated at twice that number since many communities, through food for work activities, were able to repair and reconstruct roads, irrigation systems, and other services damaged by the hurricanes.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

There were no perceivable unplanned effects as a result of this project.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

Under normal circumstances, the USAID would not provide funds to cover the transportation costs of food for work projects; however, the critical need to alleviate human suffering required that the commodities be moved to the affected areas by the quickest means available. Given the emergency nature of the problem, and the lack of extra GODR resources in a timely manner, this approach was deemed appropriate on a one-time basis.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS

The total amount of these grants, \$66,727, is relatively small when compared with the total emergency funds, of approximately \$9.5 million, provided by the USAID for hurricane recovery projects; nevertheless, the ability of the Mission to respond to the request of the PVOs in a positive and timely manner insured the safe storage of PL-480 Title II commodities and also made it possible for important food for work activities to continue at a time of crisis. The two PVOs involved in this project were under considerable pressure, and they are to be commended for making every effort to overcome serious obstacles in order to provide, in part, the supplementary food rations of the rural poor.