

AIRGRAM

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

6080078-13

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

PD-AAA-177-F2

For each address check one ACTION | INFO

TO - AID/W TOAID A-27 X

AAG/TANGIER USAIDA01

1971 FEB 6 X AM

DATE REC'D.
608-078

37

A.I.D.
COMM BR

DATE SENT
2/1/71

FROM - RABAT

SUBJECT - PROP:LIVESTOCK AND RANGELAND IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

REFERENCE - (A) TANGIER TOAID A-12; (B) RABAT A-193 (CY 70)

DISTRIBUTION
ACTION
INFO.
APR
OR
ACONT
TAB
TAD

1. The purpose of this AIRGRAM is to assist AID/W in considering the

approval of the Revised PROP in view of recommendation No. 3 contained in the Audit Report transmitted with Ref (A) by placing the report in its proper perspective to the project. USAID does not intend this to be a rebuttal of the audit report but simply a clarification of our current views on the project.

2. The comments which follow pertain solely to the portion of the audit dealing with the Livestock and Rangeland Improvement Project (078) and in particular with Recommendation No. 3 quoted as follows:
QUOTE That APR/NA take the foregoing comments into account prior to approving the revised PROP constituting authorization of the duration of the project (reference M.O. 1025.1 UNQUOTE

3. In essence Recommendation No. 3 calls for suspending approval of the Revised PROP on the basis of findings and problems relating to the old project recognized a year ago when the Revised PROP was prepared. The original approach to project implementation was suspended in December 1969 and since early 1970 the course set forth in the revised PROP has been pursued. This change unfortunately appears to have been given little recognition in the audit.

4. The following comments are made in reference to specific findings or comments in the audit report.

a. Page 1-I. Purpose and Scope - Para 3.

There were no discussions of the Livestock and Rangeland Improvement project (078) operations with the Project

PAGE 1 OF PAGES

DRAFTED BY <i>[Signature]</i>	OFFICE P&A	PHONE NO. 66	DATE 1/29/71	APPROVED BY: Donald S. Brown Director
----------------------------------	---------------	-----------------	-----------------	---

AID AND OTHER CLEARANCES
P&A: C. Ferguson
DBAR: J. James

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

(Do not type below this line)

Manager or the Food & Agriculture Officer during the audit nor to our knowledge were any visits made to the project sites.

b. Page 1 - II - Background

The alleged reticence of GOM to furnish data and authorize visits to livestock stations, etc., applies to the Livestock Breed Improvement Project as far as we are aware rather than 078.

c. Pages 10 & 11- 2. Moroccan Participant Training (078)

It should be noted that the participant training referred to in this section took place from 28 March through 17 August, 1968 prior to the arrival of USAID project technicians and constituted the first action under the project.

d. Pages 11-13-(Project Appraisal Reports (PARs).

In reference to the finding bottom page 11 QUOTE We reviewed these PARs to evaluate the progress achieved during the past twelve months; they report the following weaknesses and achievements: UNQUOTE, it should be noted that the PAR and the Audit do not cover the same period. The PAR covers FY 1969 and not FY 1970 the year being evaluated. It should be further noted that the audit report cites only project weaknesses without reference to any accomplishments.

Concerning the finding on Page 12 (under, 2. Rangeland Improvement) QUOTE In his PAR dated August 24, 1969, the U.S. Advisor stated that, during the past eighteen months the program was behind schedule due to many problems encountered:UNQUOTE, we are unable to find this statement in the PAR. The project had only been in field operation one year at the time the PAR was prepared.

In reference to the four "Weaknesses" which immediately follow, the first three are ~~quotes~~ quotes from Page 4 of the Revised PROP(TOAID A-127) and not from the PAR as stated. The fourth listed "weakness" also appears to be from another source other than the PAR.

e. Pages 13 - 15h Proposed Remedial Action

The comments and findings in this section reflect a serious lack of understanding of the project now under implementation compounded by misinterpretations and incomplete analysis of available data. The text infers in Para I that there has been little change in the approach to project implementation other than a reduction in scale and the establishment of two small pilot plots. This, of course, is not the case as has been previously pointed out.

In reference to the conclusion QUOTE Based upon our review of AID's comments on the Mission-issued PROP and the latter's response (Ref TOAID A-193) we feel that additional economic and technical study should be made to determine whether the project can achieve planned objectives UNQUOTE USAID fails to find anything in the referenced correspondence that would justify such an additional study nor is anything additional advanced in the text which follows except QUOTE The most serious hinderance and one which should, even under the reduced concept for the project, be viewed as a condition for the future progress is that of having the willing cooperation of the people expected to benefit from it UNQUOTE.

USAID is well aware of the importance of the people's cooperation. This has been emphasized in the Revised PROP which clearly states on Page 17-C Strategy QUOTE To successfully achieve project objectives, requires the cooperation of the people, an effective administrative organization and a sound acceptable management program UNQUOTE.

More importantly our efforts under the revised project have resulted in a steady improvement in the cooperation of the people during the past eight months - a fact ignored in the audit report. Cooperation of the local people is now considered to be very good for this stage of development.

For example, in contrast to strong objections registered by the people at Midelt in 1969 to the reseeded trails involving fewer than 50 hectares, there have been no objections registered to the reseeded of more than 200 hectares in the same area during the past few months.

Another example at Midelt involves the Base Line study being conducted to determine current production of flocks under traditional management for eventual comparison with flocks under improved management in the pilot areas. Under the study the sheep of the cooperators are ear tagged and detailed records maintained regularly showing birth of lambs, deaths, sales, etc. The cooperators are not given remuneration of any kind for their cooperation. Recently, however, three livestock operators owning more than 600 sheep contacted project personnel on their own initiative and asked that their flocks be included in the study along with their neighbors.

The audit ~~report~~ report in support of its conclusion concerning the necessity for an additional economic study states QUOTE In their semi-annual report of 1970, IVS told that neither they nor their Moroccan counterparts were able to persuade any significant number of tribal people to participate in the project UNQUOTE.

In order to place the above finding in its proper perspective it first should be noted that the IVS report was released on 20 February 1970 and was intended to cover the six month period beginning 7/1/69.

Secondly, the statement quoted relates exclusively to the old project approach which was found not to be practical necessitating the re-direction of the project as provided in the Revised PROP. For example, the management plan prepared in mid-69 for the Midelt area proposed that by 1/1/70 the number of livestock operators using the area would be reduced from 1200 operators grazing 48,000 sheep to 196 operators grazing 10,000 sheep. (The latter based on year long grazing in the perimeter compared to mostly seasonal use in the past.) In addition, our examination of the proposed allocation of grazing privileges by COM officials revealed that one tribal group that traditionally used about 15 percent of the area were to be allocated over 50 percent of the grazing privileges. There is little wonder that resistance to the project developed. As a result of a review of this adjudication of grazing privileges; COM upon the recommendation of the project manager, suspended implementation of the proposed grazing controls and development plans.

Thirdly, both the IVS Volunteers and their counterparts failed to develop a working dialog at the project sites with the people that would lead to mutual understanding and confidence. Therefore, even had the approach been without fault it is quite unlikely that they would have been effective as persuaders of the pastoral people.

Following the resignation of the IVS Volunteers, a USAID local hire Moroccan was made available in May 1970 for the project and was promptly given the assignment of initiating range use-sociological studies and information programs at each perimeter. Working through local officials, more than 100 scheduled meetings have been held to explain the project and collect data. In Midelt alone more than 600 local people were contacted in a period of a few weeks. Representatives of each administrative sub-division (Douar) were accompanied on tours of their areas to obtain their views as to the need for additional water supplies and other improvements. The sites for 20 wells have been tentatively located by these groups. As a result of the above efforts the attitude of the people towards the project has substantially changed for the better from what it was a year ago.

The audit report next comments on the Economic Justification Section in the revised PROP beginning of bottom of Page 13 as follows: QUOTE Accordingly, if this participation is minimal, and certainly this is hardly a disputable fact on the basis of our review, then in our opinion the principal economic justification advanced for the project in the PROP is not much better. It discusses in some detail the treatment of a parasite causing a weight loss in sheep and consequently market value of animals affected. The PROP expresses the hope, and only that, that improved practices for treating this being followed at demonstration areas may "spill over" and be carried on outside of the areas. It follows that if this is not the case one can expect little if any economic benefit from this source. But, in a spirit of fairness, let us assume considerable spill over will occur. What real economic effect will this have when we consider that the two demonstration plots (6,000 hectares) only constitute about 0.1% of collective range lands UNQUOTE.

* Meaning local people.

UNCLASSIFIED

Admittedly the narrative portion of the Economic Justification in the PROP could be more clear and better organized, nevertheless the section does contain a cost-benefit analysis consisting of 2-1/2 pages of data carefully prepared to show the anticipated costs and benefits of the project as accurately and unbiased as available data would permit.

As the quotation from the audit report above shows, the cost-benefit analysis is completely ignored. In its place the intended example of benefits which could accrue from just one aspect of the project (control of parasites) is indicated as the principal economic justification for the project. As to comments concerning QUOTE But in a spirit of fairness, let us assume a considerable spill-over will occur. What real economic effect will this have when we consider that the two demonstration plots (6,000 hectares)* only constitute about 0.1% of collective range lands. UNQUOTE. It is clear that the audit report considers that extension of the livestock and rangeland improvement activities must be necessarily limited to the immediate areas surrounding the present two demonstration perimeters. We must re-emphasize that this is a pilot project and one of its major objectives is to train people to appreciate and recognize the economic benefits of range and livestock improvement. We foresee the development within the GOM of an organizational base for a country-wide program.

Already project practices are spreading to other areas. For example, provincial authorities of Safi Province upon learning of the revegetation work at our project sites, requested in October 1970 that range reseeding trials be established in a very important range area in the Safi Province. This request was met in December 1970 when reseeding trials consisting of 65 different varieties and species of range grasses and legumes were planted by project technicians in cooperation with provincial authorities at their site some 400 miles from the nearest O78 project area (Midelt). We have already had reports from Safi that a number of the varieties have germinated and are doing well. This could very well mark the beginning of a rangeland management and livestock improvement program in Safi Province which has large areas of depleted range of greater potential than the present project sites.

Similar range reseeding trials also have been established during the past three months in three other areas outside the project perimeters in collaboration with GOM agencies. The project range reseeding trials established during the past four months in fact involve nearly 150 different varieties and species of grass and legumes as well as various techniques of seed bed preparation, sowing and time of planting, etc., making it undoubtedly one of the most extensive range reseeding research efforts attempted in North Africa and possibly in all of Africa.

* The PROP actually was referring to the entire 70,000 hectares (154,000 acres).

