



FINAL PROJECT REPORT
(NOVEMBER 2002 – APRIL 2003)

FOR THE

**WINTER ASSISTANCE II – URBAN
IN AFGHANISTAN**

SUBMITTED TO

U. S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Agreement: HDA-G-00-03-00011-00

SFL Project #2210

2002 / 2003

Afghanistan

Submitted in July 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. PROJECT DETAILS.....	3
B. PROJECT SUMMARY.....	4
1. Overview.....	4
2. Herat.....	4
3. Faizabad.....	4
4. Kunduz.....	5
5. Economic Impact.....	5
C. WINTERIZED LIVING SPACES.....	5
1. Objective.....	5
2. Target Population.....	6
3. Selection Criteria.....	7
4. Beneficiary Profile.....	7
5. Project Implementation.....	7
6. Seismic Mitigation Training.....	11
7. Problems Encountered.....	11
D. ECONOMIC IMPACT.....	12

APPENDIX

- 1. Beneficiary List - Herat**
- 2. Beneficiary List -Faizabad**
- 3. Beneficiary List - Kunduz**
- 4. Distribution List - Kunduz**
- 5. Total Assistance Given**
- 6. Total Families Assisted**
- 7. CTC Questionnaire**
- 8. Urban Questionnaire**

A. PROJECT DETAILS

1. Executing Agency	Shelter For Life International Headquarters: Norm Leatherwood, Executive Director 502 E. New York Ave Oshkosh, WI 54901 USA Phone: 920-426 1207 Fax: 920-426 4321 E-mail: norm@shelter.org
2. Project Title	Winterization Assistance II - Urban
3. Reference Number	USAID Grant Number: HDA-G-00-03-00011-00
4. Beneficiary Target	2,300 Vulnerable Families Located in Urban Areas
5. Project Dates	November 4, 2002 – April 4, 2003
6. Project Location	Herat City in the west Kunduz City and Faizabad City in the northeast
7. Reporting Period	November 4, 2002 – April 4, 2003
8. Report Date	July 2003
9. Major Donors	U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
10. Original Budget	\$608,614.00

B. PROJECT SUMMARY

1. Overview

The goal of this project was to avert sickness and potential loss of life among vulnerable returnees and IDPs in the non-Kabul urban areas of Afghanistan. The need for this project arose from the fact that while there was a coordinated winter task force established to identify winter vulnerability needs in Afghanistan and formulate a plan to meet those needs, no one came forth in the planning stages to address the needs of urban areas outside of Kabul. In response to this situation, Shelter For Life (SFL) approached USAID/OFDA to request funding to provide functional winter living space for **2,300** vulnerable families (an estimated 13,800 individuals) located in non-Kabul urban areas.

The project was based on the “one warm dry room” concept. Rooms in existing homes and buildings were to be modified as required to provide appropriate protection in winter and allow for necessary sanitation. This was not intended to be a traditional shelter construction/reconstruction project or shelter kit distribution project. Rather, it was to be a winterizing repair/provision project designed to quickly make existing vulnerable dwellings habitable for families during the winter.

SFL was able to exceed the project target by 127%. A total of **2,967** families were assisted, resulting in direct beneficial impact on **24,989** individuals. Following is the breakdown of beneficiary families by location and nature of assistance.

2. Herat – Assist 1,510 families in providing a winterized living space.

The proposal targeted **1,510** families. SFL provided assistance to a total of **1,956** families in Herat or **130%** of program objectives.

- Number of houses with weatherization improvements in Herat - 0.
- Number of houses with water supply improvements in Herat -0.
- Number of houses with toilet facility improvements in CTC Camp (see C.2) - **118**.
- Number of houses with bathing facility improvements in Herat - 0.
- Number of stoves distributed in Herat city - **1,838**.
- Number of kerosene heaters distributed in CTC Camp - **118**.
- Number of houses receiving fuel assistance in Herat - **1,956**.
- Number of houses receiving insulating materials in Herat - **1,956**.

3. Faizabad – Assist 440 families in providing a winterized living space.

The proposal targeted **440** families. SFL provided assistance to a total of **560** families in Faizabad or **127%** of program objectives.

- Number of houses with weatherization improvements - **208**.
- Number of houses with water supply improvements – 0.
- Number of houses with toilet facility improvements - 0.
- Number of houses with bathing facility improvements – 0.
- Number of stoves distributed – **398**.
- Number of houses receiving fuel assistance – **560**.

- Number of houses receiving insulating materials - **560**.

4. Kunduz – Assist 350 families in providing a winterized living space.

The proposal targeted **350** families. SFL provided assistance to a total of **451** families in Kunduz or **129%** of program objectives.

- Number of houses with weatherization improvements - **436**.
- Number of houses with water supply improvements - **10**.
- Number of houses with toilet facility improvements - **0**.
- Number of houses with bathing facility improvements - **0**.
- Number of stoves distributed - **383**.
- Number of houses receiving fuel assistance - **451**.
- Number of houses receiving insulating materials - **451**.

5. Economic Impact

An additional benefit of this proposal was that it would provide a much needed economic boost to the target cities through the purchase of local materials (quilts, doors, windows, stoves and fuel), which would indirectly help even more people survive the winter. A total of **\$368,438** was spent on locally procured goods, representing **60.53%** of the total project budget.

City	Amount
Herat	\$235,709.91
Faizabad	\$ 79,723.45
Kunduz	\$ 53,005.00
Total	\$368,438.36

Other economic impact indicators:

In addition to the amount spent locally on materials, other impact indicators were also measured in an attempt to further quantify the economic impact such a project can have on the target population.

- Number of national staff employed for the entire project averaged **32** employees.
- Total amount of money paid to national staff employed for the entire project - **\$35,963**.
- Total amount of money paid to local hired workers - **\$2,224.39**.
- Total number of person-days of work the project generated - **741**.

C. WINTERIZED LIVING SPACES

1. Objective

In order to quantifiably contribute to the project goal, a specific objective was established of identifying **2,300** especially vulnerable families (**1,510** in Herat, **440** in Faizabad and **350** in Kunduz), and providing them with the materials they needed to enclose one room as a warm, dry living space.

In general, assistance consisted of making permanent improvements (new doors/windows, rehabilitated water or sanitation facilities) to the buildings where people were sheltered or providing winter warmth materials (quilts/blankets, heating stoves/heating fuel or some combination of these). While the winter warmth materials turned out to be an important component of the project, a total of **644** existing permanent homes received permanent improvements, thus contributing to the long-term improvement of the permanent housing stock in Afghan urban areas.

Usually, interventions fell into two general categories:

- 1) Making permanent improvements (new doors/windows, rehabilitated water or sanitation facilities) to the buildings where people were sheltered. A total of **644** families received these types of benefits.
- 2) Providing winter warmth materials (quilts/blankets, heating stoves/heating fuel or some combination of these). A total of **2,967** families received these types of benefits.

2. Target Population

SFL's proposal targeted vulnerable urban families in Herat City, Faizabad City and Kunduz City. Our basis for these targets was the UNAMA 2002-2003 Winter Preparedness Plan. SFL confirmed that there was winterization need in all three of these areas through our own assessments. Therefore, we made no changes to the proposed target urban areas.

All the beneficiaries in **Herat** city were selected in cooperation and coordination with the Mayor, UNHabitat and MUHD. After extensive interaction, it was decided SFL would provide assistance in Districts 5, 7, 9 and 10. In addition, assistance was provided to 118 families located in the City Transitional Center (CTC) in District 1.

After the withdrawal of the Taliban, drought-affected IDP families in Herat city were mostly repatriated to their homes, and camps were closed down. However, approximately 118 families remained for various reasons. First, these families were moved to the Moafaq Hotel. Later, they were forced to move to make-shift shanties on a small lot within the city. They were no longer recognized as IDPs, which made them "ineligible" for humanitarian food distributions designated for IDPs. They had few assets, if any, and little ability to generate an income. SFL, therefore, provided assistance to these 118 families also.

Faizabad city, the capital of Badkshsh Province in Northeastern Afghanistan, was never under the control of the Taliban, and as a result, there are essentially no IDPs or refugees in Faizabad. Nonetheless, the city and surrounding area is one of the poorest and most isolated in Afghanistan, and has received little or no foreign aid assistance. The local leaders in Faizabad welcomed our offer of help, but did not want us to help anyone unless we were able to help all those needing winterization assistance. After SFL first conducted our own assessment to determine how many families were genuinely in need, we discovered that we would be able to assist the needy families in all districts of Faizabad.

As in Faizabad, there are few, if any, refugees or IDPs in **Kunduz** city; but there was still apparent need for winterization assistance. Again, the local leaders were concerned that we not

create problems by helping some but not all of those with winterization needs. After determining who was genuinely in need, SFL agreed to help all 451 families.

3. Selection Criteria

The following criteria were used to determine general beneficiary eligibility:

- Families living in a shelter situation inadequate for winter survival.
- Families not able to afford needed winterization improvements on their own.
- Families not receiving winterization assistance from other agencies.

Priority was then given in the selection process to those who also were:

- Refugees recently returned from Iran or Pakistan.
- Internally displaced persons (IDPs).
- Female-headed households.
- Families with a disabled head of household.
- Households with no income.

4. Beneficiary Profile

While all beneficiaries met the selection criteria, below is a chart detailing some of those found to be particularly vulnerable among the total target population receiving assistance.

Winter Assistance II – Urban – Herat, Faizabad, Kunduz Afghanistan - Table of Vulnerability									
District	Total	IDP	Returnee Families	FHH (W)	Disab (H)	Elderly	No Econ Resources	Sum of Previous 6 Columns	% of Total
Herat	1,956	316	215	68	119	N / A	260	978	40%
Faizabad	560	26	0	85	317	39	N / A	467	83%
Kunduz	451	N / A	N / A	54	N / A	N / A	N / A	54	12%
Total	2,967	342	215	207	436	39	260	1,499	50%

5. Project Implementation

In all target areas (Herat, Faizabad and Kunduz), it quickly became apparent that the winter task force data was a rough estimate of possible need and not substantiated by reliable data. It, therefore, became necessary for SFL to conduct a detailed assessment in each target area before the project implementation could be started in earnest.

All implementation was performed in close coordination with local authorities, who in each case had strong opinions about what should or should not be done. Of primary concern seemed to be that all of those who were truly in need in a particular area (city, and in some cases, district of a city) be helped and not just some of them. SFL strove to carefully work with and involve local

authorities and coordinating bodies in the program, but at the same time, to see that this was not a benefit program for the relatives and political friends of local authorities.

Herat

Assessment, beneficiary selection and implementation were performed in close coordination with the Ministry of Refugees (MoR), the Herat City Mayor, the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (MUHD) and UNHabitat. After much discussion and coordination with these parties, it was agreed that SFL would provide assistance in Districts 7, 9 and 10. Later, District 5 was added. The assessment forms included in Appendix 8 were agreed upon by all parties for use. The Mayor's office, UNHabitat and MUHD jointly prepared the initial beneficiary list. SFL then sent a surveying team house to house to verify vulnerability and determine the needs of each prospective beneficiary family. A representative from the Mayor's office, UNHabitat and MUHD were present to monitor SFL activities (survey, purchasing and distribution).

After the first district survey (District 7), a meeting was held with the Mayor, MUDH and UNHabitat to discuss the initial findings. The survey indicated that about 95% of the assessed vulnerable families were living in rented houses, with the landlords reluctant to exchange repairs by the families for free rent (the landlords apparently had a greater need for cash). It, therefore, became apparent that the best way to help would be to provide the following types of items, which were in short supply:

- Kerosene stoves
- Kerosene fuel and storage barrels
- Blankets
- Carpets

Providing kerosene heating fuel was particularly important, since having fuel given to them would enable families to have more money with which to pay rent. For safety considerations, the fuel was supplied in two distributions.





With the cooperation and assistance of MUHD, UNHabitat and Mayor, SFL made a contract with the Ministry of Energy (MoE) for 280,000 liters of kerosene and 1,400 fuel storage barrels. Contracts were also made with local suppliers for 7,000 blankets, 1,400 stoves and 56,000 square meters of carpet.

SFL rented centrally-located warehouse space for the storage and distribution of materials near the targeted districts, which greatly reduced the transportation costs associated with materials procurement. Materials were also purchased locally to maximize the benefit of the project to the target areas. This turned out to slow down the project implementation, however, as most suppliers had capacity limitations. The municipality, MUHD and UNHabitat monitored the distribution for quality and quantity of the materials

In addition to the districts mentioned above, SFL met with the MoR to discuss the families living in the City Transitional Center (CTC) located in District 1. It was agreed that SFL would assess those families and help with their winterization needs, including that related to sanitation and water. The MoR provided a list of the families in the camp to SFL. Using the form in Appendix 7, SFL surveyed each household to verify vulnerability and determine needs. In addition to assisting individual households, SFL arranged for the urgently needed cleaning out of the latrine septic tanks for the camp.

Provision of winterization items in Herat city by district were as follows:

<u>District</u>	<u>Families</u>	<u>Stoves</u>	<u>Fuel (L)</u>	<u>Barrels*</u>	<u>Blankets</u>	<u>Plastic</u>	<u>Carpets</u>
1 (CTC)	118	118	24,780	118	708	118	0
5	220	220	44,000	220	1,100	0	2,640
7	601	601	120,200	601	3,005	0	3,005
9	497	497	99,400	497	2,485	0	5,964
10	520	520	104,000	520	2,600	0	6,240
Total	1,956	1,956	392,380	1,956	9,898	118	17,849

* For fuel

Faizabad

In **Faizabad** city, the local Mullahs provided SFL staff with a list of the neediest families. SFL staff then conducted personal interviews with the families. It was determined that there were a total of 560 families at risk in the city. The local authorities were particularly concerned that everyone in need be helped so as to avoid strife and conflict in the community. SFL, therefore, formulated a plan to help all 560 families.

Materials were purchased from local business people in the market through contracts and a local Women's Volunteer Association. SFL made every effort to spend money locally as much as possible.

Materials for weatherization activities were provided by SFL and installed by the beneficiary families. The local government provided two guards to assist in crowd control during material distributions. UNAMA, MRRD, UNHabitat and even a local TV station were present at some of the distributions. The kerosene was distributed at two separate times for safety consideration and to discourage the families from selling some of the fuel.

One of the problems we encountered on this project was transferring money to this office. The program was implemented during the changeover from the old currency to the new, which may have caused some concern within the business community and created some reluctance to move money.

Kunduz

In **Kunduz** city, the project went relatively smoothly with the population and all government agencies involved working well together. There were, however, some issues that came up that had to be dealt with.

Initially, our staff was received warmly by the local authorities in each village. The leadership, almost without exception in these local zones in Kunduz, is comprised of the wealthier segment of the population. We went to these leaders for assistance in screening the population in favor of the poorest families. Generally, we found that the lists of prospective beneficiaries obtained from these men tended to be loaded with their relatives and gave no concession to the level of poverty. Our staff screened out the relatively wealthy people. In some cases, the lists were so heavy with people who did not need assistance that they had to be abandoned altogether. In any case, the method was the same for ensuring that the poorest of the town residents was reached. Our monitor would park outside the village and walk in not telling anyone that he was a representative of an NGO. He sought out one or two poor families and they introduced him to more. In his words, "poor people know other poor people".

SFL staff did an excellent job in seeking out the poorest residents of these villages, but they did not have to do it alone. We coordinated with and received valuable assistance from several Afghan government agencies. The Kunduz Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD) headed by Engineer Lal Mohamad assisted by independently monitoring our distributions. Adul Qadir from the Afghan Refugee office was of great help in locating returned refugees in the communities where we were trying to offer assistance. A representative from the Kabul office of MRRD, Doctor Shafe, spent some time with our staff at the end of the project

and monitored two to three families in each village. Including these Afghan agencies in our program, in addition to providing us with an independent eye overseeing our efforts, increased the perception of the village populations that their government is working for their best interests. Besides the Afghan agencies, UNHabitat was also very helpful in monitoring our distribution operations.

To prevent unnecessary and counterproductive competition between different villages, we tried to be fair and equilateral in distributing aid. If a Tajik village was perceived to get more benefit from the assistance than an Uzbek village or a Pashtun group thought they were being denied the same help that a nearby Hazara or Turkmen community received, our jobs would be much harder, and there could be tension and animosity well after the project ended. A mix of ethnic groups was selected from the vicinity around Kunduz and we distributed equally to small numbers in each area.

The proposed plan was to help 350 needy families in Kunduz city. A total of 451 families were identified in our assessments as being in need of assistance. To satisfy the concerns of local authorities that all those in need be helped, we formulated a plan.

In addition to these 451 families, there were more indirect benefits. Of the total beneficiaries, 219 families were occupying houses that belonged to someone else. These houses were in poor repair and not habitable before the project. Owners agreed not to charge rent or evict the current tenants for one year in exchange for the repairs that were made to the property through this project.

6. Seismic Mitigation Training

As a capacity building initiative, SFL has trained the Tajik NGO “EURASIA” to conduct seismic awareness and preparedness training on SFL projects. Training was not restricted to beneficiary families. In Kunduz, Eurasia provided training in 19 locations, with a total of 2,371 families represented. In Faizabad, Eurasia provided training in 83 locations, with a total of 6,381 families represented. Community facilities, such as mosques, were used as locations for the training. Training topics included measures which individuals can take before, during and after an earthquake. Since Herat portions of the project turned out to be focused on providing winter warmth items, no seismic mitigation training was conducted there.

7. Problems Encountered

Herat

The late approval of this project was the biggest problem. The survey and assessments were conducted during relatively mild weather, but the distribution occurred during some of the worst weather of the winter.

There were problems with purchasing locally the large quantities of materials needed. The capacity of the local markets was not adequate to provide a supply of materials over a short period of time. This delayed the implementation of the project. The economic advantage outweighed the disadvantage, however. If local procurement is a project goal, more time for procurement and a longer implementation schedule is required.

The weather was also a problem, with cold temperatures and rain making it difficult to distribute materials.

Faizabad

The assessment through the distribution process went well with few problems. One difficulty was transferring money to this office. The program was implemented during the changeover from the old currency to the new, which may have caused some concern within the business community and created some reluctance to move money.

Kunduz

When it was discovered that the friends referred to us by the wealthy leaders were not receiving assistance, some of them reacted with hostility. In one village in particular, some individuals started rumors about our staff to take revenge. However, by this time, we had established a good reputation with the families we were helping so the damage was slight; but we did have to explain that the need to inspect the construction work was only to ensure the safety of their families.

The biggest challenge to this program was the weather. Any construction project begun in the middle of winter is bound to experience some weather related issues. As expected, the weather hampered our best efforts. In wet weather, some areas were inaccessible to our distribution teams. In all cases, rain frequently prevented construction and slowed NFI distribution. Our staff dealt with this by concentrating on the villages they could access when the weather prevented travel to less accessible areas. When the weather improved, priority shifted back to the less accessible communities.

D. ECONOMIC IMPACT

SFL purchased all of the materials distributed from local businesses, thus providing badly needed jobs and income, which helped many more people survive the winter in a country that still has very limited employment and income opportunities. The only exception to this was in Herat where the heating fuel was purchased from the MoE and even this was a benefit to the Afghan people.

Items	Amount Spent	% of Total Spent Locally	% of Total Budget
Project Materials	\$368,433.36	86.4%	60.5%
Office Operating Costs	\$4,442.38	1.0%	0.7%
Warehouse Operating Costs	\$1,545.63	0.4%	0.2%
National Staff Salaries	\$35,963.00	8.4%	5.9%
Locally Hired Labor	\$2,224.39	0.5%	5.9%
Local Services (Vehicle -Fuel)	\$13,591.21	3.1%	2.3%
Total	\$426,199.97*		75.5%

Appendix 7: CTC Questionnaire

**Shelter for Life International
Herat- Project 2210
CTC Questionnaire**

Date: / /

Name: _____ Father's Name: _____

Grand Father Name: _____ Age: _____ Nationality: _____

Present address:

Province: _____ District: _____ : Street: _____

House #: _____

Original address:

Province: _____ District: _____ : Street: _____

House #: _____

Family Composition:

No. males: _____ No. females: _____ Ethnicity: _____

No. <5: _____ No. 5-14: _____ No. 15-49: _____ No. 50+: _____

Current Family Income:

Occupation(s): _____ Daily wage(s): _____

Previous Family Income:

Occupation(s): _____ Daily wage(s): _____

No. of Months as IDP: _____

Resident, nomadic, semi-nomadic (circle one)

Reasons for migration: _____

Needs to return home: _____

Date of return: _____

Food Conditions:

Current typical meal: _____

Previous typical meal: _____

Food needs: _____

Health Conditions:

Current Illnesses: _____ Health Needs: _____

No. of deaths in family: _____ Age(s): _____

Cause of death: _____

No. Received health service: _____ Location: _____

Type of treatment: _____

Winter Needs Assessment:

Clothing: _____ Footwear: _____

Blankets: _____ Other needs: _____

Shelter Conditions:

Approx. Living Space: _____ Roof condition: _____

Area of the roof to be repaired: _____

Window to be repaired or replaced: (Size) _____

Doors to be replaced or repaired: (Size). _____

Latrine condition: Good, Bad

Type of Latrine: _____ Volume of work to be done: _____

Bath Condition: Good, Bad

Volume of work to be done: _____

Stove/fuel needs: _____

Other Needs: _____

Signatures:

District leader:

Members of Shora:

Appendix 8: Urban Questionnaire

**Shelter for Life International
Project 2210 - Herat
General Questionnaire
Date: / /**

Name: _____ Father's Name: _____

Grand Father Name: _____ Age: _____ Nationality: _____

Address:

	Present Address	Original Address
Province		
District		
Street		
House #		

Family Composition:

Ethnicity: _____
 Disabled Headed household: _____
 Female Headed Household: _____

	No.	Type
Persons with special needs: (i.e., ill, elderly, disabled)	_____	_____
	_____	_____

Age and Gender

	< 5 years	5-14	15-49	50+ years	TOTAL
No. of females					
No. of males					
TOTAL					

Family Income:

	Current	Previous
Occupation		
Daily wages		

Migration Status

Resident, IDP, Nomadic or Semi-nomadic (Circle One)

Returnee? Yes or no

If IDP or Returnee:

No. of Months as IDP or Returnee: _____

Reasons for migration: _____

Needs to return home: _____

Date of return: _____

Food Conditions:

Current typical meal: _____

Previous typical meal: _____

Food needs: _____

Health Conditions:

Current Illnesses: _____ Health Needs: _____

No. of deaths in family: _____ Age(s): _____

Cause of death: _____

No. Received health service: _____ Location: _____

Type of treatment: _____

Winter Needs Assessment:

Clothing: _____ Footwear: _____

Blankets: _____ Other needs: _____

Shelter Conditions:

Good, Fair or Bad (circle one)

Approx. Living Space: _____ Roof condition: _____

Area of the roof to be repaired: _____

Window to be repaired or replaced: (Size) _____

Doors to be replaced or repaired: (Size) _____

Latrine condition: Good, Bad

Type of Latrine: _____ Volume of work to be done: _____

Bath Condition: Good, Bad

Volume of work to be done: _____

Stove/fuel needs: _____

Other Needs: _____

Signatures:

District leader:

Members of Shora: