PD-ABL-451
95319

# USAID/Bangladesh
# Project Assistance Completion Report

## I. Summary Data Sheet

Project Title: **FOOD FOR WORK III**
Project No. : 388-0061

1. Authorization Date: 04/05/1985

2. ProAg No. : A Limited Scope Grant Agreement, LSGA Signed on 08/26/1987 Applies
   No. of ProAg Amendments: 3 Amendments to LSGA

3. Grantee: CARE-Bangladesh

4. Implementing Agency: Ministry of Disaster Management & Relief (formerly Ministry of Relief)/Directorate of Relief and Rehabilitation).

5. Technical Assistance Contractor: No T.A. to Contractors. D.A. grant to CARE to provide Technical Assistance as a cooperating sponsor.
   Amount(s): $14,946,027 D.A. grant to CARE by USAID.

6. Final Evaluation (Date): No formal Evaluation was performed. Last in depth review held on 12/89.

7. PACD: Original: 06/30/1990 Final: 07/31/1994

8. Financial Status (through 07/01/1985-07/31/1994):

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Authorized | $ 17,224,000 |
| B. Obligated | $ 16,987,024 |
| C. Disbursed | $ 16,955,555 |
| D. Unliquidated | $ 31,469 |
| E. Deobligated | $ 127,000 |

9. BDG Contribution:

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Planned | $ 92,671,000 |
| B. Actual | $ 95,531,634* |

   (See Section VII for detail breakdown)

10. Other (including Donor) contributions: N/A. No other contribution.

*BDG contribution includes the BDG owned PL-480 Title III resources used to fund bridge construction.

11. Planned USAID Inputs: (Dollars)

| | (Original per Project Paper, FY 85 to FY 89) | (Revised FY 85 to FY 94) |
|---|---|---|
| A. Grant to CARE: | $ 6,962,000 | $14,946,027 |
| B. Procurement of services-Pscs, Eval,Conting.: | $ 2,391,000 | $ 2,087,973 |
| C. LSGA: | -0- | $ 0,190,000 |
| 1. T.A. | $ 0,140,000 | |
| 2. Commodities | $ 0,005,000 | |
| 3. Vehicles | $ 0,038,000 | |
| 4. Audit | $ 0,007,000 | |
| Sub-Total D.A. | $ 9,353,000 | $17,224,000 |
| D. TITLE II: | $129,240,000* | $232,632,000* |
| **TOTAL** | **$138,593,000** | **$249,856,000** |

Actual USAID Inputs:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Grant to CARE: | | $ 14,946,027 |
| B. Procurement of services Pscs, Evaluations etc.: | | $ 1,833,045 |
| C. LSGA: | | 176,483 |
| 1. T.A. | $133,593,000 | |
| 2. Commodities | $ 5,126,000 | |
| 3. Vehicles | $ 37,764,000 | |
| 4. Audit | -0- | |
| Sub-Total D.A. | | $ 16,955,555 |
| D. TITLE II Commodities: | | $113,270,832** |
| **TOTAL** | | **$130,226,387** |

12. Planned Outputs:
    A. Rehabilitation of 86,400 kilometers of rural earthen road.
    B. Construction of 9,593 bridges/culverts (up to 12.5 meters ) under CARE Management.
    C. Construction of 960 bridges/culverts (up to 107 meters) under Large Bridges and Culverts (LBC) Program.
    D. Training to 14,400 BDG Thana Officials and Union Representatives.

*Title II wheat @ $215/MT @120,000 MT annually.
**Detail information on shipment and reimbursement level is provided at Attachment No. 1.

Actual Outputs:

A. Rehabilitation of 96,882 kilometers of rural earthen roads.
B. Construction of 8,950 bridges/culverts (up to 12.5 meters) under CARE Management.
C. Construction of 960 bridges/culverts (up to 107 meters) under LBC Program.
D. Training to 14,000 BDG Thana Officials and Union Representatives. In addition, about 400 CARE staff were also trained.

13. Checklist:

A. All contract/assistance close-out activities have been completed (see Attachment 2)

B. All financial close-out activities have been completed (see Attachment 2)

C. Official project files have been checked for completeness and organization; those no longer required for implementation, evaluation and/or monitoring have been retired to storage.

PO:HSmith/PDE _____ Date: 6 Feb 1995

14. Drafted by: GKabir/SAmeen/HSmith:PDE Date:1/05/95
Reviewed by: GHaycock:PDE Date:1/18/95

15. Clearances:

A. PDE/RFanale: MCF for Date 6/12/95
B. CO/AReichert: No clearance Date: See Attachment 2
C. CONT/TWalsh: FEL Date 4/11/95
D. RLA/ANewton: [illegible] Date 4/12/95
E. PDE/MFoster: [illegible] Date 5/8/95
F. PRO&DD(A)/KSchwartz: [illegible] Date 14 June 95

16. Approved: _____ Date 20 June 1995

Name: Richard M. Brown
Mission Director
USAID/Dhaka

Distribution:

Project File
Mission Director
All Clearing Offices
USAID/W: PPC/CDIE
ANE/SA/B
ANE/SEA/IRM
RIG/A, Singapore

## Project Assistance Completion Report Narrative

### II. Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Project Purpose/Description

End of Project Status
- a) Current project status including status of completion of various project elements
- b) Progress towards achievement of project purpose

Accomplishment Versus Planned Outputs

Non-U.S. Contribution

Sustainability/Post Project Monitoring

Lessons Learned

Conclusions and Recommendations

Attachments:
1. Table on Recapitulation of Title II Wheat Shipment & Reimbursement
2. Note on Project Financial & Contract/Assistance Close-out Checklist

## III. Executive Summary

The Food for Work III project began in 1985 as the follow-on project of two previous Food for Work Projects, FFW I (1975-1979) and FFW II (1980-1984). All three FFW projects utilized P.L. 480 commodities imported by CARE, the projects' Title II Cooperating Sponsor. Title II wheat was distributed to under or unemployed rural people as in-kind wage payments in return for earthmoving activities (rural road construction, embankment raising, canal digging during the agricultural lean season). In contrast to FFW I which was begun strictly as a relief response to famine, FFW III attempted to reorient the FFW program toward a more developmental focus. The FFW III project goal was actually bifurcated between relief and development: to provide employment to the rural poor during periods of high seasonal unemployment, and to improve access and further development within the rural areas by improving rural roads. The FFW III project, originally planned for five years was extended four times and by the end of the project in July, 1994 had covered a span of nine years.

During the FFW III project 134.5 million person days of employment were generated[1] and 620,847 metric tons of P.L. 480 commodities (wheat) were distributed as in-kind wages directly benefitting annually 375,000 workers and their dependents. In total, 96,882 kilometers of rural earthen roads were rehabilitated, and 10,553 small and large bridges/culverts were constructed[2]. The project also helped to strengthen local institutional capabilities in rural infrastructure project implementation through on the job training of small and medium level construction contractors and local Architecture and Engineering firms. It has also provided training to 14,400 persons (BDG and local officials, and CARE staff) in implementation, monitoring and environmental awareness planning for rural infrastructure projects. The project also funded training of CARE staff in disaster preparedness and management of disaster response.

In spite of these significant accomplishments, the project's historical relief orientation hampered full realization of it's developmental potential. One reason for this may have been that the projects counterpart Ministry (the Relief Ministry) was not fully able to support the project's increasing developmental orientation. Although project reviews did demonstrate that properly sited and fully bridged rural roads can yield economic benefits to the local populace, many FFW III roads were poorly sited, poorly constructed, and lacked adequate or appropriate drainage structures, thereby creating water logging and disruption of normal fish migration patterns. FFW III earthen

[1] Against the planned 240 million.

[2] CARE managed the construction of small bridges and culverts, not exceeding 12.5 meter (40 feet) spans. USAID directly managed the construction of larger bridges upto 107 meter (350 feet) under the Large Structures Component of the project. Construction costs for both CARE and the Large Structures Component were funded using local currency generated from the sale of Title I/III commodities.

roads also lacked the very critical element, a provision for maintenance. Subject to seasonal monsoon rains, the earthen roads have a very short life span if not maintained.

## IV. Project Purpose/Description

The Project Purpose was to provide villages in 314 Upazilas (thanas) year round reliable vehicular access to district towns and markets by developing the capability of sub-district government units (at the thana and union level) to plan and implement a labor intensive public works (roads and appurtenant structures) program. The project provided employment to rural poor during periods of high seasonal unemployment. The project purpose also included establishing a system of rigorous accountability and the development of local institutional capability to make more effective use of resources at their disposal.

## V. End of Project Status

### a) Current project status including status of completion of various project elements:

The project ended on July 31, 1994. All USAID project funded activities except the on-going financial audit of the PL 480 Title III funds used by the DORR have been completed. The status of the project elements are as follows:

i) Development Assistance Grant to CARE: A Development Assistance Grant totaling $14,946,027 to finance the management-cum-monitoring activities of the Title II Cooperating Sponsor, CARE, was provided during the project LOP. The Development Assistance funds were used to procure technical assistance, equipment, training and vehicles. CARE FFW III project management activities involved 248 staff (20 at CARE's Dhaka headquarters and 228 in six sub-offices and three branch field offices located throughout the country.

ii) Procurement of Personnel Services, Evaluations: Over the LOP Development Assistance resources supported one Expatriate and three FSN engineers under Personnel Services Contracts. These USAID funded staff monitored construction under the Large Bridges and Culverts Program Component of the FFW III Project. The FFW III project also financed studies[3] focussing on the

[3]List of Studies/Evaluations:

i. Follow-up Study of the Development Impact of CARE's Food for Work Roads in Bangladesh - Abt Associates, 1986.

ii. Institutional Assessment of FFW and Feeder Road Programs - Management System International, 1987.

iii. Infrastructure and Development of the Rural Economy of Bangladesh - IFPRI, 1988.

iv. The Impact of CARE's Rural Roads and Bridges in Bangladesh - Abt Associates, 1989.

v. Environmental Assessment, KBN, 1991.

Developmental Impact, Institutional Capacity and Environment Impact of the project. No formal evaluation of the project was undertaken.

iii) Limited Scope Grant Agreement (LSGA): The BDG's counterpart agency for the FFW III project, the DORR of the Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief (formerly the Ministry of Relief), was provided a Development Assistance Grant to support ancillary cost involved in the FFW III Project. The LSGA provided funding for Technical Staff, Vehicles and Equipment. The DORR procured two field vehicles, survey equipment and services of four Bangladeshi engineers to supervise/manage the FFW III bridges and culverts construction activities.

**b) Progress towards achievement of project purpose:**

Although the project was not able to achieve the LOP target of 240 million person days of employment, during the LOP 134.5 million person days of employment were provided to the rural poor. The project also improved access for the rural poor through the rehabilitation of rural roads, actually exceeding the LOP target of 86,400 kilometers. The project was also successful in accomplishing the secondary purpose, establishing the rigorous system of accountability for project resources. CARE's monitoring and management system was very effective in accounting for project resources.

As a part of CARE's effort to protect the U.S. PL 480 Title II food resource, CARE developed a reimbursement system whereby the BDG used its own wheat resources to initially fund project activities and then seek reimbursement after project activities were approved by CARE. Ironically, once strong monitoring systems were in place the failure of the project in effecting improvement in local capacity to properly plan and effectively utilize resources in infrastructure construction was, unfortunately, highlighted. Poor implementation of project activities by responsible local officials led to reduced reimbursement of expended BDG resources by CARE. During the LOP the actual reimbursement level was only 66% of the expended BDG resources[4]. Some of the reasons for the low reimbursement level include:

- Rejection of the work because it was not in compliance with guidelines.

[4]A total of 81,971 metric tons of Title II wheat that remained as accumulated credit due CARE by the BDG under the FFW III project, has been carried over to be utilized in the follow-on IFFD project. Under the FFW III LOP a total of 702,818 MT of wheat was delivered to the BDG. CARE authorized 620,847 MT as being properly utilized. Attachment No. 1 provides detail information on PL 480 Title II wheat available and reimbursement levels under the FFW III project.

- Work start-up was late or work progress was interrupted by monsoon so work was not acceptably completed.

- Unauthorized expenditures such as extra payments to workers for carrying dirt greater than approved distances resolving of land disputes using FFW proceeds, legitimate expenditure but late reporting.

The institutional capability of the participating thanas regarding reasonable and realizable annual plans also was not satisfactory. Evidence of poor planning could be witnessed at locations where structures were built in inaccessible areas due to unbridged gaps in the road alignments, interrupted discontinuous road alignments were constructed, superfluous roads that lacked economic viability were rehabilitated.

**VI. Accomplishments Versus Planned Outputs (Project accomplishments to date, including conditions at the outset and changes in the project environment and/or design during implementation):**

The original planned output for the five year LOP per Project Paper follows:

(a) Each year one thousand farm to market roads, representing approximately 9,600 kilometers of roadway, were to be upgraded. Over the five year life of project 5,000 roads representing about 48,000 kilometers of road were to be upgraded. The project expected to build from 750 to 3,300 bridges each year.

(b) In-service, two-day training course to 1600 Sub-District officers offered each year. [The trainees were to be field personnel involved in the planning and implementation of the project.]

Accomplishment over nine years LOP:

(a) 13,061 roads and other schemes representing about 96,882 kilometers (averaged approx. 10,765 kilometers annually) were rehabilitated and 9,910 bridges/culverts (approximately 1,100 annually) were constructed.

(b) 14,000 BDG Thana officials and Union Representatives received training in scheme preparation, implementation, monitoring, disaster management and environmental orientation.

During the project implementation period, an environmental assessment in 1991 revealed that FFW road rehabilitation had caused water logging, possibly disrupted fish migration patterns, and had other negative impacts on the environment. Under the FFW III in 1993 training of CARE and BDG staff in Environmental

Examination (IEE), was initiated. An Environmental Management Unit was established in late 1991 by CARE under the project to ensure the negative environmental impacts of project activities were mitigated.

In 1992, the project authorization was amended to support the creation of a Disaster Preparedness Unit within CARE. The Unit has developed disaster manuals, computerized disaster supplies inventory system, identified potential NGO partners, conducted disaster risk analysis in vulnerable thanas provided training to CARE staff on disaster management and response.

**VII. Non-U.S. Contributions (BDG/Donors/Participants) State what BDG and other donors have contributed to the project. Compare planned versus actual inputs:**

The project had contributions from BDG. No non-U.S. donor/ participant contribution was made. A grant by GOB of $1,841,000 of direct program costs to CARE plus an estimated $25,860,000 in indirect services such as inland transportation and handling from FY 1985 to FY 1990 was considered in the initial PP. The revised BDG contribution from FY 1985 to FY 1994 was $92,671,000 comprised of $2,321,000 as direct grant to CARE and $90,350,000 as support to project including transport, storage and handling of the Title II commodities, BDG supervising personnel administrative expenses, training, structure cost contribution by participating Thanas and the BDG owned Title III resources for the construction of bridges and culverts. The actual BDG contribution over LOP was $95,532,000 which is $2,861,000 higher than the revised LOP level.

**VIII. Sustainability/Post Project Monitoring:**

**a. Statement on borrower/grantee continuing responsibilities monitoring and initiatives to further project goals. How will project benefits continue after USAID funding stops? Identify local capacities, resources and leadership to ensure that appropriate "benefit streams" continue. Are the effects of the project likely to have sustainable development impacts?**

A primary project goal was creation of seasonal employment for the rural poor. The project clearly accomplished this goal. However, arguably little sustainable impact was accomplished. Through rural road improvement it was expected that access to district towns and markets would improve and provide sustainable benefits. There is evidence that (to a certain extent) the improved roads did accomplish this[5]. However, road construction plans were not made with sufficient consideration for future

[5]See Abt Study "The Impact of CARE's Rural Roads and Bridges in Bangladesh".

needed maintenance or the potential negative environmental effects of road construction.

**At the completion of USAID funding the project will contribute benefit in the following areas:**

- The economically viable and environmentally sound roads rehabilitated under the project will continue to benefit the rural economy.

- Improved institutional capability at local level participation through experience gained from working with FFW planning and implementation will continue to have a positive developmental impact.

- Acquired efficiency of quality work, timely completion, and better management by a large number of private construction and consulting firms will continue long term benefits through the firms' future participation in developmental activities.

- BDG central and local officials, local governments representatives, and CARE staff trained in FFW implementation and environmental awareness and disaster preparedness will provide a cadre of experienced personnel for future developmental and disaster preparedness activities.

**b. Description of continuing and/or post-project USAID/B monitoring responsibilities, including timing and resources:**

Although the FFW III project is completed, and there are no follow-up USAID responsibilities[6] the Integrated Food For Development (IFFD) project, a follow-on to FFW III project has been designed to address some concerns about FFW III sustainability.

- The new IFFD project undertakes sustainable poverty alleviation by setting a new standard for the productive use of Title II food aid through rigorously programmed infrastructure and disaster preparedness activities. Although its roots are found in the previous FFW projects which were relief oriented, IFFD is a development project designed for sustainable poverty alleviation rather than short term relief. CARE continues as the Title II cooperating sponsor and will clearly benefit from their experience with FFW.

[6]With the exception of the audit of the DORR discussed in Paragraph V.a.

**Under IFFD the following improvements were made upon the FFW III project:**

- The project implementing agency has shifted from the DORR to the Local Government Engineering Department to achieve sustainable development goal.

- A continuous road alignment strategy is considered which will construct a productive continuously passable, economically viable and environmentally sound road.

- A merging of the project with CIDA-funded CARE-implemented Rural Maintenance Program (RMP) will allow regular maintenance of the roads under the IFFD program to provide longer life in the upgraded roads.

## IX. Lessons Learned

**a. Assessment of appropriateness of any unmet conditions and covenants and grantee reporting requirements:** No conditions, covenants or reporting requirements remain incomplete.

**b. Description and assessment of prior planned evaluation:** No evaluation was planned/performed during the LOP. However, the environmental study (see note 3) on the project revealed that many of the roads had negative environmental effects. It was recommended that an environmental assessment be conducted prior to implementing any road/bridge scheme. Consequently the new follow-on project (Integrated Food For Development) included planning and monitoring safeguards to address these environmental issues fully.

**c. Summary of lessons learned from the project that might be relevant to programming design and implementation of other activities:** The following lessons might help in designing, programming and implementation of other projects, particularly food assisted projects designed to assist target populations to progress along the relief - development continuum:

i) The project created environmental problems by constructing numerous roads on the Bangladesh deltaic flood plain where heavy monsoon rains cause frequent floods. The roads interrupted the normal drainage patterns and created water logging and other problems. During implementation some trees were cut for widening roads, adjacent fields were used as borrow pits which removed fertile top soil. A related problem was that some farmers with land adjacent to the roads lost land and were uncompensated.

ii) In Bangladesh, studies have shown that durable earthen roads connecting important points can be expected to yield poverty alleviation and economic growth benefits. One

technical challenge in FFW earthen road rehabilitation is the difficulty in producing a durable road. A road compaction pilot has proven that attaining desired compaction standard and constant field quality control tests are not cost effective for large scale rural road construction scattered all over the country. On the other hand construction of a road in a rudimentary manner by dumping dirt with minimal or no compaction results not only in washouts during the monsoon but also results in road side slope erosion which damages road side crops. In order to address this problem turfing and vegetation should be included as an element in road rehabilitation.

iii) The wheat distributed to the poor laborers has yielded some relief benefit, including temporary employment and providing some nutritional and income benefit to rural poor. However questions have been raised as to whether FFW was an optimal relief program. These questions are centered on the target beneficiaries and the duration of FFW activity. It is a well-established concept that the most vulnerable poor are the women of child bearing age and children five and under. The FFW III project comprises only two percent female workers in the earth moving activity. In addition, during the pre-harvest months of July through October the need for food supplement is greatest. The FFW work activities were conducted during the dry season (December through April) and not during the time of most acute need.

iv) The BDG counterpart and implementing ministry for the FFW III project was the Ministry of Relief. The predominate institutional focus of that ministry was the provision of relief. This clearly had a negative impact upon the accomplishment of the more developmental goals of the FFW III project. Food Aid in Bangladesh has historically been associated with and imported for relief and as such the institutional locus for the FFW III project was in the Relief Ministry. However, food aid donors and the BDG have realized the shortcomings of the Relief Ministry as the institutional home for food assisted development projects and most of the food assisted development programs of the World Food Program and other donors have migrated away from the Relief Ministry to BDG Institutions with developmental mandates, e.g. the Ministry for Local Government and the Water Development Board.

v) The IFFD project incorporates light maintenance on the roads through integration with the CIDA funded RMP program. However, the provision for maintenance and repair of infrastructure is a critical sustainability issue. Under IFFD CARE plans to "undertake action research" pilots to among other things find appropriate and effective ways for local government to raise revenues to repair and upgrade rural infrastructure.

## X. Conclusions and recommendations (Statement on the impact of the project and a listing of recommendations for follow-on, future activities, etc.)

The FFW III project provided millions of days of employment to unemployed rural workers delivering a significant amount of food to the rural poor during the nine years LOP period. Although not optimal, the project has also made a substantive contribution to the improvement of accessibility and communication in the rural areas. Many studies have demonstrated that in Bangladesh poverty alleviation and economic growth are directly linked with improvement of rural infrastructure, particularly roads which improve the condition of the poor by providing access to markets, schools, health centers and other human development services. Through the utilization of a number of Bangladeshi Architect and Engineering firms (carrying out topographical survey, soil investigations, structural designs and construction supervision) and construction firms the project has also enhanced the technical capability of many Bangladeshi construction and engineering firms.

The follow-on IFFD project which started immediately after the PACD of FFW III project is a five year project combining 400,000 metric tons of P.L. 480 wheat and $24.5 million in Development Assistance to provide the poor of Bangladesh improved, year round access to markets and basic human development services. The Rural Roads Network Component of IFFD is designed to capitalize on the demonstrated importance the improvement of infrastructure has on socio-economic development in rural Bangladesh. The Rural Roads Network Component is once again implemented by CARE-International working with it's local counterpart, the Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) of the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives (MLGRD&C).

During its five year span the Rural Road Network Component plans to improve over 13,000 kilometers of rural roads, rendering them economically viable and environmentally sound. Roads will be selected for improvement based upon their potential economic benefit. Local currency generated from the sale of P.L. 480 wheat is being used to fund the construction of small bridges and culverts to fill existing gaps in the roads and to provide necessary drainage to mitigate adverse environmental impacts of the roads. Each year, over 75,000 earthwork laborers will receive wheat as in-kind wages for required earthmoving and revegetation, directly benefitting these workers and their 375,000 dependents. In addition, over 12,500 skilled structures laborers will receive cash wages directly benefitting their 62,500 dependents.

The IFFD Rural Road Component Network design also addresses a serious problem that consistently plagues rural road improvement projects: maintenance. The Rural Roads Component is formally linked with CARE's Canadian CIDA funded Rural Maintenance Program (RMP). Through the RMP program destitute rural women are paid to

perform light maintenance on rural roads country-wide. The IFFD Rural Road Component will only improve roads that are guaranteed the services of the RMP. The light maintenance provided by the RMP is expected to increase the serviceability of the improved roads markedly.

After the selected network roads have been improved, significant developmental impacts are anticipated. Currently, a monitoring and evaluation system is being established by CARE to assess, among other indicators, the impact the improvement of the roads have on rural incomes, agricultural production, and household consumption.

ATTACHMENT No. 1

RECAPITULATION OF TITLE II WHEAT SHIPMENT AND REIMBURSEMENT
(FOOD FOR WORK III PROJECT)

| U.S. FISCAL YEAR | APPROVED PROGRAMMING LEVEL (MT) | TOTAL VALUE OF WHEAT (US $) | AMOUNT SPENT BY BDG (MT) | BILLS OF LADING AMOUNT (MT) | C&F VALUE (US $) | TOTAL RECEIPT * AMOUNT (MT) | TOTAL AVAILABLE FOR FFW | TOTAL VALUE OF WHEAT AVAILABLE (US$) | REIMBURSE-MENT TO BDG (MT) | TOTAL VALUE OF WHEAT REIMBURSED($) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CARRY OVER (PRIOR YEARS SHIPMENT) | | | | | | | 65,993 | 12,820,260 | | |
| FY-1985 | 134,426 | 26,390,555 | 121,421 | 70,000 | 13,742,422 | 70,600 | 49,473 | 9,712,555 | 91,388 | 17,941,321 |
| FY-1986 | 115,158 | 18,400,504 | 106,048 | 102,660 | 16,403,513 | 102,966 | 102,966 | 16,452,407 | 77,923 | 12,450,915 |
| FY-1987 | 127,036 | 16,712,283 | 117,690 | 71,323 | 9,382,932 | 71,342 | 71,342 | 9,385,432 | 91,858 | 12,084,424 |
| FY-1988 | 138,312 | 21,920,803 | 113,507 | 92,110 | 14,598,337 | 92,594 | 56,899 | 9,017,813 | 74,650 | 11,831,135 |
| FY-1989 | 136,863 | 29,649,701 | 123,558 | 89,736 | 19,440,211 | 90,333 | 90,333 | 19,569,544 | 77,503 | 16,790,081 |
| FY-1990 | 118,233 | 22,466,448 | 106,826 | 94,470 | 17,951,040 | 95,207 | 95,207 | 18,091,084 | 65,595 | 12,464,258 |
| FY-1991 | 99,363 | 20,730,420 | 90,686 | 66,877 | 13,952,762 | 67,576 | 67,602 | 14,104,021 | 52,472 | 10,947,401 |
| FY-1992 | 88,391 | 20,762,199 | 77,036 | 64,999 | 15,267,642 | 65,003 | 65,003 | 15,268,582 | 45,429 | 10,670,837 |
| FY-1993 | 85,978 | 15,798,716 | 77,201 | 38,005 | 6,983,533 | 38,000 | 38,000 | 6,982,614 | 44,029 | 8,090,461 |
| TOTAL: | 1,043,760 | 192,831,628 | 933,973 | 690,180 | 127,722,392 | 693,621 | 702,818 | 131,404,311 | 620,847 | 113,270,832 |

* Total receipt figure represents the adjustments of short/excess landings.

DOC:U\PDEPUB|HCCL:GKABIR/PDE(12/1/94)

Attachment 2 to the PACR

Note on Item 13 A & B

Project Financial and Contract/Assistance Close-out Checklist will be processed for CONT and CO clearance after completion of the CARE/USAID Grant Agreement close-out. List of Project-supported awards and their status of close-out attached.

| Listing of 0061 project Awards | | Awards Close-out Status |
|---|---|---|
| Definitive Award Number...: | 388-0061-C-00-7034-00 | Complete |
| VVE VENDOR NAME: | INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INST. | |
| Date Signed Awarded.....: | 04/06/1987 | |
| Date Estimated Completion.: | 12/15/1987 | |
| Total of Commitment.....: | 49,748.00 | |
| Definitive Award Number...: | 388-0061-C-00-9110-00 | Complete |
| VVE VENDOR NAME: | PRICE WATERHOUSE | |
| Date Signed Awarded.....: | 07/27/1989 | |
| Date Estimated Completion.: | 10/04/1989 | |
| Total of Commitment.....: | 30,715.00 | |
| Definitive Award Number...: | 388-0061-G-SS-5029-00 | Awaiting determinatio of final overhead rat |
| VVE VENDOR NAME: | CARE INT'L | |
| Date Signed Awarded.....: | 06/17/1985 | |
| Date Estimated Completion.: | 06/30/1990 | |
| Total of Commitment.....: | 14,946,027.00 | |
| Definitive Award Number...: | 388-0061-S-00-0025-00 | Complete |
| VVE VENDOR NAME: | COSIO, JOSE H. | |
| Date Signed Awarded.....: | 05/06/1990 | |
| Date Estimated Completion.: | 04/30/1993 | |
| Total of Commitment.....: | 502,107.00 | |
| Definitive Award Number...: | 388-0061-S-00-2026-00 | Complete |
| VVE VENDOR NAME: | MICHAEL ROBIN HALDER | |
| Date Signed Awarded.....: | 07/23/1992 | |
| Date Estimated Completion.: | 09/30/1993 | |
| Total of Commitment.....: | 3,063.17 | |
| Definitive Award Number...: | 388-0061-S-00-2028-00 | Complete |
| VVE VENDOR NAME: | CAROLYN H. ALEXANDER | |
| Date Signed Awarded.....: | 07/12/1992 | |
| Date Estimated Completion.: | 09/30/1993 | |
| Total of Commitment.....: | 7,190.42 | |
| Definitive Award Number...: | 388-0061-S-00-2030-00 | Complete |
| VVE VENDOR NAME: | MD. SHAHAJAHAN KHAN | |
| Date Signed Awarded.....: | 07/23/1992 | |
| Date Estimated Completion.: | 09/30/1993 | |
| Total of Commitment.....: | 2,964.14 | |
| Definitive Award Number...: | 388-0061-S-00-4006-00 | Complete |
| VVE VENDOR NAME: | ALAM, A.K.M. MANJURAL | |
| Date Signed Awarded.....: | 12/26/1983 | |
| Date Estimated Completion.: | 08/25/1984 | |
| Total of Commitment.....: | 14,765.00 | |
| Definitive Award Number...: | 388-0061-S-00-4007-00 | Complete |
| VVE VENDOR NAME: | AMEEN, SYED SADRUL | |
| Date Signed Awarded.....: | 01/02/1984 | |
| Date Estimated Completion.: | 09/01/1984 | |
| Total of Commitment.....: | 38,065.00 | |

Listing of 0061 project Awards | Awards Close-out Status

Definitive Award Number...: 388-0061-S-00-5040-00
VVE VENDOR NAME: BASHIR, A. Z. M. — Complete
Date Signed Awarded.....: 09/25/1985
Date Estimated Completion.: 09/24/1986
Total of Commitment.....: 74,873.00

Definitive Award Number...: 388-0061-S-00-6028-00
VVE VENDOR NAME: ELDREDGE, LOUIS — Complete
Date Signed Awarded.....: 08/27/1986
Date Estimated Completion.: 09/20/1988
Total of Commitment.....: 295,528.00

Clearance: CO/DGregory: