PD-AAB-334-D1

5260103 (10)

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
Small Farmer Livestock Production	526-0103 *	USAID/PARAGUAY 10p.

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) 79-3

☒ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES

A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent	B. Final Obligation Expected	C. Final Input Delivery
FY 75	FY 78	FY 79

6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING

A. Total $ 1,478,000

B. U.S. $ 988,000

7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION

From (month/yr.) March 1977

To (month/yr.) December 1978

Date of Evaluation Review March 1979

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

* Formerly 526-15-110-050.3

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify)
- ☐ Other (Specify)

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Larry K. Laird

Larry K. Laird

AID 1330-5 (3-76)

12. Mission/A.I.D/W Office Director Approval

Signature

Typed Name Abe M. Peña

Date 3/22/79

13. SUMMARY

Perhaps as much as any project, Small Farmer Livestock Production reflects A.I.D.'s transition from assisting large farmers to assisting small ones. New Mexico State University provided technical assistance for the project for almost fourteen years. During the period of NMSU's continuous assistance A.I.D. policy shifted dramatically toward greater assistance to helping the "poorest of the poor". Although the new direction of the Congressional Mandate to help the poor was promulgated in 1973 it took this project almost five years to successfully redirect its assistance to the smallest livestock producers. Late in 1977 and in 1978 the project achieved considerable success in reaching the new A.I.D. target group by using numerous pilot or demonstration subprojects.

This case illustrates that it takes much time to redirect programs in technical assistance and there is likely to be some confusion when projects are redirectedto goals unforeseen when they were originally initiated. Perhaps A.I.D. should investigate the establishment of formal procedures for reprogramming or redirecting projects when policies are changed dramatically by legislation or events in a host country.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This evaluation was performed in accordance with the Mission's Annual Evaluation Schedule and constitutes the final review of the project. In view of the early departure of the NMSU chief of party, collection and analysis of progress data took place in August 1978. The information gathered at that time was updated in December 1978. The evaluation work included a physical observation of the research trials performed at the Faculties of Agronomy and Veterinary Sciences based upon interviews held with key project officials, including extension personnel from SEAG. This evaluation has been reviewed by the Mission Director.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

The most critical external factor having a negative effect on the project has been the inadequate budget support from the GOP to the three principal project counterpart organizations.

The two key MAG counterpart offices, SEAG and PRONIEGA, received a considerable input from A.I.D. to cover salary supplements, gasoline and travel expenses, etc. until 1974. These costs have not been covered by the GOP in its regular budget. Moreover, the annual budget allocations have remained basically the same, with the exception of slight increases in the personnel budget which were unavoidable to keep pace with inflation. As a result, the participation of these institutions

in project implementation has been less than planned, and this constitutes the most important causal factor in the shortfalls in project accomplishments.

The assumption that all counterpart organizations would cooperate to coordinate their activities relating to the project in an efficient and effective manner has proved not to be true. While FCV and FIA have cooperated with SEAG and PRONIEGA, mainly facilitated by the fact that some key personnel in SEAG and PRONIEGA also taught in the faculties, cooperation between SEAG and PRONIEGA has been almost non-existent. This fact has seriously restrained normal project implementation.

16. INPUTS

USAID planned inputs were composed of the following:

(a) Technical advisory assistance through a contract with the New Mexico State University (NMSU) which included three long-term technical specialists in Animal Production, Livestock Extension and Agricultural Economics and 24 PM of TDY technicians in various specialties of livestock.

(b) Participant training for advanced degree work in the U.S.

(c) Commodities, mainly in the form of vehicles, laboratory equipment and printing materials, and

(d) Other costs to cover partially the expenses of a small farmer survey and local costs inherent in the operation of the research and extension activities.

The GOP counterpart contribution made by the Ministry of Agriculture and Faculties of Agronomy and Veterinary Science of the National University of Asunción, consisted of the assignment of personnel and provision of physical facilities and logistic support for the operation of research and demonstration facilities.

There have been significant shortcomings and problems in the delivery of technical assistance inputs by all parties concerned. To implement this project the Mission retained the same team of NMSU technicians which was contracted under the predecessor project, Livestock Development. The main focus of that project had been to increase beef production of the large Paraguayan rancher. The NMSU personnel had no previous experience in working with small farmer projects and found it difficult to adapt themselves to the new objectives, making the transition process slower than anticipated.

There has also been a continuous lack of cooperation by some project counterpart offices of the MAG, especially PRONIEGA (the National Research and Extension Office for Livestock), which was

established under the predecessor project to work with large ranchers. This lack of cooperation was due in part to the unwillingness of the staff to reorient the activities of these offices and in part to the serious funding problems faced by all MAG Offices.

The direct effect of all these problems was a delay of approximately one year in starting project implementation and a reduction in the amount of the planned technical assistance. The NMSU Animal Production Specialist who was Chief of Party departed in August 1976 and was not replaced. In his place, NMSU appointed the Extension Advisor as Chief of Party. Since the Agricultural Economist devoted full time to the Small Farmer Survey, the Chief of Party carried the full responsibility for implementing project activities. At this stage, the project started making progress, but the scope of planned activities was too broad to be implemented by only one technical advisor. Other factors that hampered project activities have been the inadequate communication between the NMSU campus coordinator and the NMSU and USAID staffs in Paraguay, as well as the inability of NMSU to provide some key short term technical assistance planned in the PROP. A direct result of the latter has been a shortfall in several training activities planned for field extensionists and home extension agents of SEAG.

The project also experienced problems in the area of participant training. The PROP called for a total of 10 participants for advanced degree work in the United States. This training was never carried out. Instead project funds were used mainly to finance the completion of training of some MS level technicians sent under the former project, including two long term technicians for the MAG's Planning Office (not directly related to this project). There are various reasons why the planned training was never carried out. First, the project was never able to come up with an acceptable training plan identifying needs, courses or candidates; second, given the funding constraints at the GOP counterpart offices, there was concern as to whether the participants would be retained at the project; and third, during previous evaluations of the project serious concerns were expressed as to the real need for advanced degree training in this type of project.

As a result of these discussions the training component of the project was revised and the long term courses in the U.S. were replaced by short term practical courses in third countries. Here again, no immediate action was taken because no adequate courses could be found quickly. As a consequence, training activities were confined to a few short term training courses in the various animal specialties and to short observation trips to neighboring countries.

The actual commodity input has been minimal and project personnel have been slow to initiate procurement actions. As a result most critical commodities, mainly printing materials and equipment, did not arrive on

time, and the production of project publications (extension bulletins, reports on research studies, etc.) was significantly delayed.

17. OUTPUTS

The logical framework includes five project outputs. The first two, trained personnel to the MS level and a total of 44 research projects, are carryovers from the former beef project, and activities consisted in the completion of the research program on beef cattle. (In later Project Agreements, however, the Mission planned for research studies more specifically related to small farmer needs; they consisted of a total of eleven applied research studies on poultry, swine, and dual purpose dairy cows.)

These first two outputs were expected to contribute to the achievement of the purpose of ensuring an adequate and permanent capability within the MAG to fulfill the country's research and extension requirements for beef cattle. thereby consolidating the progress achieved under the previous project. Little progress was made towards this target. Due to the financial weakness of the key counterpart institution PRONIEGA, several of the returned participants left the project and most research studies either were not completed or the results of completed research trials were never published. This institution has also been quite unwilling to readapt part of its research program to meet small farmer needs. Nor have completed research studies on beef cattle provided the interesting data concerning small farmers that was originally envisioned.

Because PRONIEGA was established to promote the production of beef for export, traditionally one of the principal export items of Paraguay, it was unrealistic for the Mission to expect that it would turn its attention to small farmers producing 2-3 cows for their own use.

The project has been partly successful in carrying out the research studies specific to small farmers. These studies were carried out in cooperation with the Faculties of Agronomy and Veterinary Science and with some local farmer organizations. Unfortunately, due to inadequate planning at the early stages of the project most research projects were not begun until late 1976, leaving little time for an orderly completion of the trials, analysis of data and dissemination of results. Of the eleven projects planned, only four were duly completed with results printed and distributed. Another five are still in operation with some preliminary results already published, but it appears doubtful that much additional progress will be achieved after the completion date of the projects. One research project was discontinued shortly after its starting date because of the failure of the cooperating organization, the Agricultural School Carlos Pfannl, to comply with their agreed contribution. Another of the research projects was not initiated at all because no agreement could be reached with the Faculty of Veterinary on research plans.

The Project has performed fairly well in producing the outputs specifically planned for the Small Farmers. These outputs are the preparation of research bulletins, education leaflets, field demonstrations and short courses for extension agents. Although applied research trials have not provided a great deal of information, the project has taken advantage of the knowledge of project technical personnel to develop approximately 300 extension bulletins in language appropriate for small farmers. In addition, a series of publications was prepared for use by field agents.

The project has exceeded the 40 field demonstrations planned by carrying out a total of 69 pilot projects with small farmers to demonstrate new production practices and stimulate their adoption. The pilot projects were successfully implemented by the SEAG extension agents and were accepted with enthusiasm by the small farmers involved.

One significant shortfall in project accomplishment has been the inability to plan and carry out formal training courses in accordance with the PROP and Project Agreement. The PROP called for a total of 15 short courses for extension personnel to be carried out by local and foreign specialists. With the exception of a presentation made to new Peace Corps Volunteers on poultry, swine, and dairy production, and 3 day training of 8 Veterinarians incorporated by SEAG, no other formal training activities for extension personnel were carried out.

18. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Project was: to enable the MAG and Faculties of Agronomy and Veterinary Science to broaden their activities so as to place increasing emphasis on livestock, including swine, poultry and dairy cattle of importance to small farmers; 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.

Although a detailed implementation plan was never prepared for the project, the PROP indicated that the work should have concentrated on an orderly phasing down of the old project both by consolidating and reorienting the research and extension activities so far undertaken for the beef producers and by initiating at the same time a new adaptive research program to develop a capability to disseminate information to the new target group.

Because of inadequate planning and continuous funding problems, the project has never been able to achieve any meaningful progress either in reorienting or in consolidating the activities carried out with the former counterpart institution PRONIEGA. It has been able on the other hand, to motivate the interest of SEAG to expand its assistance, traditionally confined to crops, to include the dissemination among small farmers of livestock production practices as an integral part of the regular activities of most of its extension workers. The project has been able

also to encourage the involvement of the Faculties of Agronomy and Veterinary Science in research projects focused on small farmer needs and has initiated a permanent relationship between these institutions and SEAG.

Specific progress towards EOPS conditions as listed in the PROP has been as follows:

EOPS No. 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 agents' use in transmission to the small farmer."

This is the area where the most project progress was achieved. Unfortunately because of the late start of research activities, little data on tested production practices was available. The effect of this shortcoming, however, was alleviated by including materials based on the knowledge of contract personnel, TDY Technicians and host country specialists. Most of the information produced was for the direct use of small farmers although some of it was written for the use of extension agents. Information for agents was provided in the form of a livestock Field Manual.

Practically no formal courses for extension agents were carried out and little progress was achieved in the preparation of materials for such courses, as were called for under this EOPS.

EOPS No. 2 - "PRONIEGA will have demonstrated its capacity to continue carrying out research projects and backstopping SEAG without external technical or financial assistance".

The Programa Nacional de Investigación y Extensión Ganadera (PRONIEGA) was established in 1968 under the auspices of the former Livestock Development Project (050.3) to carry out research and extension programs on beef cattle of the medium and large producer. Under the present project it was planned to utilize this organization to continue collecting and disseminating research data and modern technology oriented toward the practical needs of the small farmer.

In addition to the technical assistance inputs provided under the contract with NMSU, the Mission provided PRONIEGA a considerable contribution in the form of MS level training for its staff, and equipment and local currency funds to cover most of the operational expenses, including salary supplements for its personnel.

However, since 1974 when USAID/P inputs were terminated, PRONIEGA's operations were severely curtailed because the costs formerly financed by AID were never absorbed by the GOP.

From the 44 research trials on beef cattle initiated, PRONIEGA completed 18, but the results were never disseminated adequately. Extension activities by PRONIEGA's technicians were gradually reduced by about 50%,

and publication of research results was confined to summaries included in the Annual Reports which had a limited distribution.

It was expected that PRONIEGA technicians would devote time and effort to initiate a new series of research trials on small animals specifically directed to small farmer needs, with publication of results. Although it has always been accepted by PRONIEGA technicians that cattle production practices for large producers or small farmers are basically the same, PRONIEGA has never contributed to the development of the new project, in spite of all the pressure and efforts devoted by the Mission and the NMSU contract team to this end.

EOPS No. 3 - "Production packages for beef cattle are being transmitted to cattle producers through Fondo Ganadero technicians and other sources".

For the reasons described above PRONIEGA has failed to achieve this target. Some of the key technicians left the organization at the time salary supplements were terminated, and the remaining staff has shown no interest at all in working towards this objective.

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL

The goal of this project is to increase livestock production and to improve income levels and nutrition of the target group producers and their families. The achievement of this goal was to be measured by the increases in income improvements in the quality of livestock and poultry products consumed by the farmer and the average increase in the yield of animal products per unit of input. No numerical targets were planned for these indicators due to the lack of sufficient information. Baseline data was to have been provided by a survey of the small farms in CY 1975, which at the same time should have provided information to establish economic guidelines for a sound implementation strategy. A follow-up study was to have been performed in 1978 to measure the rate and degree of change.

The Mission undertook the first baseline survey as planned. However, because of difficulties with computer processing and inadequate analysis, the work had not been completed as of the date of this writing.

20. BENEFICIARIES

The intended primary beneficiary of this project is the small farmer with less than 20 hectares who, as a side activity, has chickens, pigs and other animals on his farm. Most small farms in Paraguay rely on oxen to till their fields and oxen and horses to transport produce to

market. Most farms have a few head of cattle which furnish milk for home consumption and provide some cash from the sale of steers.

An intended secondary beneficiary of this project is the medium and large sized beef producer who was to benefit from the continuation of research and extension activities initiated under the predecessor project. The assistance to this group under the present project was planned to terminate with FY 1976 funding.

As indicated above there are no data available to demonstrate the extent to which benefits were obtained.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

This project has provided several lessons that might be especially relevant to personnel charged with the responsibility of designing projects along similar lines and/or conditions.

The most important lesson learned is that it is extremely difficult to change the direction of a project, especially if former activities extended for long periods of time as was the case here. Likewise it is unrealistic to expect that an organization will turn its attention to new programs not seen originally as related to its own objectives. Any effort to effect such a turn around may result in inadequate planning and continuous shortfalls. Any new activity requires a new plan and appropriate inputs. If technical personnel are to be retained from a different project, their qualifications should be reviewed and their willingness or enthusiasm to work under the new activities should be explored to the greatest possible extent.

It was a long time after starting to implement the revised project that project personnel discovered that livestock activities in small farms are mostly undertaken by the housewife and not by the farmer. This fact forced the revised project to introduce several changes in operations. A lesson learned here is that any new activity should be preceded by an adequate social background analysis to determine the most efficient strategy to follow.

Another lesson learned is that before sponsoring long term academic training to the MS level project designers should determine whether such training is really required for the type of work expected from the individual upon his return and whether those to be trained have a serious interest in the activity. Participants returning with MS degrees showed little interest in working in small farmer projects. They preferred to work with large farmers or to take jobs outside the project where they were offered better opportunities.

Finally, one should not budget salary supplements without GOP agreement to continue them at the conclusion of the project.