

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

1. PROJECT TITLE Title II Commodity Warehousing	2. PROJECT NUMBER 632-0210	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE USAID/Lesotho
	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) 632-83-1	
<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION		

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>78</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>80</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>82</u>		A. Total \$ <u>495,000</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>Final Evaluation/</u>
			B. U.S. \$ <u>495,000</u>	To (month/yr.) <u>Project Completion</u>	
			Date of Evaluation Review <u>Report</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>All actions complete and accepted except:</p> <p>a) payment of M13,000 retained percentage due at end of correction of maintenance period items.</p> <p>b) final progress report due upon payment of retained percentage.</p> <p>No further reports or evaluations will be completed by USAID under this project.</p>	<p>CRS Director</p> <p>CRS Director</p>	<p>March 31, 1983</p> <p>March 31, 1983</p>
<p>N.B. The above actions have since been completed.</p>		
<p>E. A. Boorady 6-10-83</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	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	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"/> FIO/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	
Fred Zobrist, Chief Engineer, USAID/Lesotho Mulugeta Yohannes, Engineer, USAID/Lesotho		Signature <i>Edna A. Boorady</i>	
		Typed Name <u>Edna A. Boorady</u>	
		Date <u>June 10, 1983</u>	

PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION REPORT/FINAL EVALUATION
FOR TITLE II COMMODITY WAREHOUSING (632-0210)

(OPG Grant No. 78-632-28 to CRS)

1. Project Status

Five warehouses with a combined total floor area of 29,720 sq. feet have been constructed in five preselected areas of Lesotho with CRS acting as the implementing agency.

2. Summary of Contributions

A. USAID

Under the original OPG Grant No. 78-632-28 to CRS, USAID's contribution amounted to a total of \$250,000 for the construction of six warehouses in Lesotho, complete with scales and dunnage and for covering some CRS administrative costs (\$12,265). Through Amendment No. 1, an additional \$245,000 was made available to CRS to finalize the project.

B. GOL

GOL's contribution for this project was limited to the provision of the warehouse sites.

3. Project Accomplishments

The \$250,000 originally budgeted for the construction of six warehouses, having a combined total area of 29,720 square feet was, during actual construction, found not to be adequate, and could only cover costs of construction of three warehouses at Maseru, Leribe and Thaba Tseka, with a combined total floor area of 22,720 square feet. Thus three vital sites were left without any warehouse facilities.

To resolve this problem, the GOL agreed to construct the warehouse at Butha-Buthe, while additional funding was sought by CRS from USAID to cover the construction costs in the two remaining sites, namely Quthing and Qacha's Nek and having a combined floor area of 7,000 square feet. To this end Amendment No. 1 to the OPG increased the original grant of \$250,000 to \$495,000. The need and justification for this amendment was based on: a) dramatic increase in construction costs between project design and actual construction dates. Inflationary increase during this period amounted to 100% (originally, estimate had allowed for 11% inflation rate, while the prevailing inflation rate during construction was 23%); b) the loss due to the currency conversion rate. (rates of the Rand to the Dollar varied from 1.1535 to 1.35 during the period); c) construction boom in Lesotho resulting in higher bids by tenderers.

4. Resolution of Original Problem

The project at this stage, through the construction of these 5 vital warehouses, has averted any disruption in the CRS PL480 Title II supply programs. Additionally, CRS can now safely assure the storage of sufficient commodities to cope with any emergency situation. Hence the project has achieved the intended purpose, and is continuing to do so. CRS has at this stage the means to store some 3,300MT of commodities in the five constructed warehouses.

5. Final Adjustments to Project

The project as such does not require any adjustment or revision in the design. All conditions and covenants under the agreement have been fully met. However, USAID is awaiting final billing report from CRS.

6. Post Project Monitoring

Since the PL480 Title II project with CRS is still continuing, USAID will in the future have the opportunity to monitor the functions and usage of the warehouses with no additional resources required under this project.

7. Evaluations

The final evaluation has been incorporated with this report to take advantage of the concurrent preparation of the evaluation and the Project Assistance Completion Report. Although quantitative assessment of the impact of the warehouse project on the food management and distribution programs in Lesotho would now be a bit premature, positive qualitative impacts on the food programs of the country, especially as relates to the PL480 Title II programs have readily been noticed during site visits conducted by Mission staff to the project warehouse centers constructed around the country. These warehouses are characterized by well-designed solid structural steel frames, spacious floor areas, solid foundation and proper site drainage, properly aerated/ventilated space, and effective rodent/insect control devices. In short, adequate, safe, and proper food and storage facilities for Lesotho have been made possible through this OPG Grant to CRS.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Prepared by: Fred Zobrist/Mulugeta Yohannes

Date : January 20, 1983

Project : Title II Commodity Warehousing

Country : Lesotho

Cost : \$495,000

I. What constraint did the project attempt to relieve?

The project has attempted to avert disruptions in the PL480 Title II food supply program emanating from lack of proper and adequate warehouse facilities in the country.

II. What technology did the project promote to relieve this constraint?

In order to relive this constraint the project promoted the construction of 5 well-designed warehouses, that have the capacity to store some 3,300MT of commodities.

III. What technology did the project attempt to replace?

The project attempted to replace the use of storage facilities whose design and construction took little or no consideration to the requirement and need of a well-designed solid structural frames, spacious floor areas, solid foundations, proper site drainage, properly aerated/ventilated space and effective rodent/insect control devices.

IV. Why did project planners believe that intended beneficiaries would adopt the proposed technology?

The proposed technology is not totally different or new as compared to the one to be replaced. It simply takes a more systematic and scientific approach in its design and construction procedures. Thus, its adoption and usage has been easily perceived by the beneficiaries.

V. What characteristic did the intended beneficiaries exhibit that had relevance to their adopting the proposed technology?

Due to the simplicity of the proposed technology, no special characteristic was required of beneficiaries, for them to adopt the proposed technology.

VI. What adoption rate has this project achieved in transferring the proposed technology?

Although the rate cannot be assessed, the adoption exists, as manifested by the type of warehouses currently being constructed for similar purposes.

VII. Has the project set forces into motion that will induce further exploration of the constraint and improvements to the technical package proposed to overcome it?

Further exploration of the constraint and improvements to the technical package have not been perceived as yet.

VIII. Do private input suppliers have an incentive to examine constraint addressed by the project and to come up with the solutions?

The incentive exists but no such action has been perceived yet.

IX. What delivery system did the project employ to transfer technology to intended beneficiaries?

No special delivery system was employed to transfer the technology. People have been learning through visual impression or actual usage of the completed warehouse facilities.

X. What training techniques did the project use to develop the delivery system?

No special training technologies were used by Project (refer IX).

XI. What effect did the transferred technology have upon those impacted by it?

Adequate, safe and proper food aid storage facilities have been made possible, to avert program disruption that culminate in food aid shortages.

5