PD-AAB-334-A1

Strength

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

524003 - 7

PAGE 1

1. PROJECT NO.	2. DATE FOR REVIEW	3. COUNTRY	4. PAR SERIAL NO.
526-15-110-050.8	Nov. 1, 1975 to Aug. 31, 1977	PARAGUAY	75-1

5. PROJECT TITLE

SMALL FARMER LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT

6. PROJECT DURATION	7. DATE LATEST PAR	8. DATE NEXT PAR	9. DATE PRIOR PAR
Begin FY 1975 End FY 1978	May 1, 1975	-	-

10. U.S. FUNDING	11. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: $401,000	12. Current FY Estimated Budget: $ 346,000	13. Estimated Budget to completion after Current FY: $ 501,000

14. PAR REVIEW MEMBERS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)

15. NAME	16. Contr. Tech. Rep. OR Vol. Ag. Rep.
New Mexico State University	ATD/Jan.1975

17. RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED AND REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

18. REVIEW BY: USAID	GOVT	CONT	19. LIST OF ACTIONS	20. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
X			1. Continue to encourage the Ministry of Agriculture to extend its best efforts to obtain adequate budgetary support for PRONIEGA.	Open
X		X	2. Extract from the ongoing beef cattle research all data relevant to small farm operations and pass the information to the extension agents.	Open
X		X	3. Prepare a new extension program in conformity with the strategy outlined in the new PECP. The new program should be coordinated with the activities carried out under the Farm Management Project.	December 1975
X			4. Explore the possibility of utilizing short term third country training as an alternative to long term training in the U.S.	December 1975
X			5. Prepare a written participant training plan for the project.	December 1975
X		X	6. The NMSU team, together with their counterparts, should prepare a new overall research program focused on specific needs of the small farmer.	March 1976
X		X	7. Study the possibility of issuing a Technical Livestock Manual for extension workers.	December 1976
X		X	8. See that production packages for beef cattle ranchers are written and published by December 1976.	December 1976

21. REVIEWED BY: REVIEW OF PAR: ☐ USAID ☐ GOV ☐ CONT ☐ PROJ ☐ PROJ ☐ PROJ

22. DATE OF REVIEW: Aug. 8-10, 1975

PROJECT OFFICER: TYPED NAME, SIGNATURE AND DATE — Malcolm C. Burton

MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNATURE AND DATE — Donald D. Harriman

PVO INDEX NO.	PROJECT NO.	FOR PERIOD: 11/1/74 TO 6/31/75	COUNTRY	FOR PERIOD NO.
[illegible]	526-15-110-070.6		PARAGUAY	75-1

II. PERFORMANCE OF KEY INPUTS AND ACTION AGENTS

A. INPUT OR ACTION AGENT	B. PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN: MAJOR FACTORS					DEFICIENCIES			DEFICIENCY FACTORS				C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE (X)				
CONTRACTOR, PARTICIPATING AGENCY OR VOLUNTARY AGENCY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	LOW 1	2	MEDIUM 3	4	HIGH 5
1.				X													X
2.																	
3.																	

Comment on key factors determining rating

Notwithstanding the difficult conditions under which OCP institutions operate due to lack of adequate funding, the local MNEU team has been able to get good cooperation from their counterparts. Relationships with Paraguayan technicians were outstanding.

Delay in AID/W approval of the PROP and negotiation of the contract delayed programming and implementation of the project's reoriented activities. Major slippages, some of which were beyond the control of the contractor, have been the limited analysis and dissemination of ongoing research results and the implementation of a new extension program oriented towards small farmer needs.

4. PARTICIPANT TRAINING				X								X

Comment on key factors determining rating

Inadequate salary payments at PRONIEGA are endangering the optimum performance of returned participants in relation to the project.

Future short term third-country training should be studied as an alternative to long term given the new orientation of the project and the relatively short life of project.

5. COMMODITIES					X					X		

Comment on key factors determining rating

The limited commodity support (two vehicles and teaching aids), has been appropriate to the project needs and adequately utilized.

6. COOPERATING COUNTRY	a. PERSONNEL					X								X
	b. OTHER				X									X

Comment on key factors determining rating

Adequacy of counterpart funding to PRONIEGA is rated as negative. There has been no increase in the CY 1975 OCP budget for PRONIEGA and low salary payment of technicians is threatening the continuity of project key staff. As a palliative measure, the MAG has agreed that PRONIEGA sell some products from research projects and the income be distributed among the technicians as additional pay. However, the interest in undertaking income producing activities by PRONIEGA might be detrimental to the desired objectives of the research program.

OCP funding for the other two project counterpart organizations, the Extension Service of MAG and the Faculties of Agronomy and Veterinary, has increased in 1975 and is considered adequate.

7. OTHER DONORS				X							X	

(See Next Page for Comments on Other Donors)

[illegible]	PROJECT NO.	FAR FOR PERIOD	COUNTRY	FAR SERIAL NO.
PAGE 3 PAR	526-15-110-050.0	11/1/74 - 8/31/75	PARAGUAY	[illegible]

II. A. Continued: Comment on key factors determining rating of Other Donors

IDB : Under an IDB financed project (FIDAP) PRONIEGA is receiving machinery and other equipment needed for the research stations. The delay in obtaining GOP counterpart funds for the IDB project is now delaying purchases.

IBRD: The IBRD loan projects to the GOP are contributing to activation of interest of Paraguayan ranchers in adopting improved production practices which PRONIEGA might be able to offer. The project should increase its efforts in having PRONIEGA prepare and transmit to the IBRD counterpart office technicians production packages for beef cattle.

III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage Rate/Annual)					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY 76 TO DATE	CURRENT FY 76 TO END	FY 77	FY 78	END OF PROJECT
M.S. level personnel employed by PRONIEGA, FAV and SEAG	PLANNED	20		5	3	5	33
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	20	0				
	REPLANNED						
Number of adaptive research projects. (Beef cattle) Initiated/Completed	PLANNED			0/2	0/2	0/2	44/21
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	46/15	0/0				
	REPLANNED						
Publication and distribution of bulletins through extensionists to the small farmer Research Bulletins/Extension leaflets	PLANNED						20/68
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE		0/1 1/				
	REPLANNED						
Number of educational activities conducted for the target group Field demonstrations/short courses	PLANNED						40/15
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE		3/1 1/				
	REPLANNED						

B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS

1.

COMMENT:

1/ Cumulative since May 1975. Annual targets will be established on the basis of the new Research and Extension Programs to be prepared by the NMSU local team.

2.

COMMENT:

3.

COMMENT:

TO (INDICATOR)	PROJECT NO.	FOR FOR PERIOD	COUNTRY	FAR SERIAL NO.
PAGE 3 PAR	526-15-110-050.0	11/1/74 - 8/31/75	PARAGUAY	76-1

II. 7. Continued: Comment on key factors determining rating of Other Donors

III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage Date Amount)					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY 76 TO DATE	CURRENT FY 76 TO END	FY 77	FY 78	END OF PROJECT
Research studies on small farm animals Initiated/Completed	PLANNED						1/
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE		1/0				
	REPLANNED						
Education courses conducted to upgrade the technical knowledge of extension personnel No. of courses/participants	PLANNED						2/
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE		4/62				
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						

B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS

1.

COMMENT:

1/ Not targeted in PROP. The target number will be known after the Contractor submits the new long term research plan focused on small farmer needs. (Action No. 6)

2.

COMMENT:

2/ Not targeted in PROP. The number of courses will be established in the Extension Program to be prepared by the Contractor (see Action No. 3).

3.

COMMENT:

AID 1020-20 (10-70)	PROJECT NO.	FAR FOR PERIOD	COUNTRY	FAR SERIAL NO.
PAGE 4 FAR	526-15-110-050.8	11/1/74 - 8/31/75	PARAGUAY	76-1

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged.

2. Same as in PROP? ☒ YES ☐ NO

To enable FAV/MAG to broaden their activities to place increasing emphasis on livestock including swine, poultry, sheep and goats of importance to small farmers (target group); to strengthen the dissemination of research results which will benefit the target group; and to consolidate and take advantage of previous research in beef cattle production.

B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.
1. FAV/MAG will have formulated a system of improved production practices and these practices will have been embodied in course materials for extension agents and in materials for the agent's use in transmission to the small farmer.	1. The FAV has successfully cooperated in developing a set of informational materials on swine nutrition which were used in a course for extension agents from SEAG and other local organizations working with small farmers.
2. PRONIEGA will have demonstrated its capacity to continue carrying out research projects and backstopping SEAG without external technical or financial assistance.	2. Difficulties resulting from inadequate counterpart funding are delaying the analysis and publication of research results. Action is required to determine applicability of ongoing research to small farmer needs and developing a new research program specifically oriented to the new project activities.
3. Production packages for beef cattle are being transmitted to cattle producers through Fondo Ganadero technicians and other sources.	3. Dissemination of research data is being made to a limited extent. PRONIEGA should increase its efforts to disseminate research information to beef cattle producers.

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

To increase livestock production and to improve income levels and nutrition of the target group producer and family.

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.

Assistance to small farmers in livestock production was never given real emphasis by the GOP until the initiation of this project. The project has a significant potential impact upon a large target group. There is little baseline data available on economic production, costs, income, etc., related to the production of livestock at small farms. Therefore, priority should be given to the implementation of the planned survey which will provide sufficient information for defining the parameters of the project and permit establish most of quantitative goal targets.