

ahr 14 16p 6640293-
DWB
JF
(3)
PD-AR-062-F1

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY

1. Mission or AID/W Office Name USAID/TUNISIA			2. Project Number <i>16p.</i> 664-0293	
3. Project Title Livestock Feed Production and Utilization				
4. Key Project Dates (Fiscal Years)			5. Total U.S. Funding	
a. Project Agreement Signed	b. Final Obligation	c. Final Input Delivered	Life of Project (\$000) \$1,608	
4/13/77	1980	1981		
6. Evaluation Number as listed in Eval. Schedule 78/1	7. Period covered by this evaluation From: 4/77 Month/Year To: 4/78 Month/Year		8. Date of this Evaluation Review <u>4/13/78</u> Month/Day/Year	
9. Action Decisions Reached at Evaluation Review, including items needing further study (Note--This list does not constitute an action request to AID/W. Use telegrams, airgrams, SPARS, etc., for action) Due to the delay by USDA/PASA in recruitment of full-time advisors, this project should be extended by 12 months. Recruitment of Sheep Production Advisor Two-year extension of irrigated lands agronomist position			10. Officer or Unit responsible for follow-up USAID-AID/W USDA-AID and USAID USDA-AID/W and USAID	11. Date Action to be completed December, 1978 October, 1978 October, 1978
12. Signatures:				
Signature	Project Officer <i>Douglas W. Butchart</i>	Signature	Mission or AID/W Office Director <i>Hermon S. Davis, Jr.</i>	
Typed Name	Douglas W. Butchart	Typed Name	Hermon S. Davis, Jr.	
Date		Date		

Clearances: Program Evaluation Officer: CRSadler *CRS*
Food & Agriculture Officer: CWFerguson *CWF*
Program Officer: RWBeckman *RWB*
Assistant Director: HOMarshall *HOM*

I. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Certain elements of the project are one year behind schedule because of delayed USDA/PASA recruitment of full-time advisors, though progress has proceeded as scheduled in some key segments. A description of the important delays and their impact appears in the accompanying narrative. The project goal and purpose as defined in the Project Paper (PP), still appear reasonable, but the time frame needs reconsideration. The project should be extended by 12 months.

The life-of-project was originally conceived to cover a four-year period. Given the fact that all of the originally proposed staff are now finally in place, although more than one year later than scheduled in the PTT network (which proved to be overly optimistic), it is expected that all scheduled outputs can be met by AID and GOT if a one-year extension of the project is granted.

In addition, due to drought conditions in Tunisia, the GOT wishes to give more emphasis to irrigated forage production than originally anticipated. Thus, it is requested that the Irrigated Lands Agronomist position be extended two additional years.

The Sheep Production Consultant sponsored by the project in May, 1977 recommended that a Sheep Production Advisor be added to the USDA/PASA project staff for a two-year tour. Recruitment of an expert to assist in that important segment of the livestock industry appears reasonable and logical.

Goal and Purpose as Follows:

Goal: To increase the production and income of the small farmer.

Purpose: To develop GOT capability to reach the small livestock farmer with modern technology in forage production, feed utilization and livestock management.

Assumptions:

The Project Paper lists the following assumptions for the goal and the purpose of the activity.

- a. Tunisian Government Policy will continue according high priority to agricultural development.
- b. There will be continued GOT emphasis on the small private farmer in the country's agricultural development.
- c. Adequate personnel available and assigned.
- d. GOT will supply required logistical support, i.e. transportation and support equipment.
- e. Adequate supplies of essential recommended inputs are available to the target group.
- f. Other GOT livestock programs and donor projects continue to meet goals, i.e. imported breed distribution, crossbreeding, bovine A.I., disease control, etc.

II. THE LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The Project Paper (PP) was reviewed and approved by AID/W in early June 1976. The first Project Agreement was signed on April 13, 1977; a second on December 27, 1977.

Using tested agronomic and livestock management technology developed in Tunisia during recent years, American project advisors and their Tunisian counterparts are establishing a network of on-farm demonstrations of both Autumn and Spring planted forages through the livestock raising regions of the country. Prime attention of project personnel is given to integrated crops/livestock systems and feed supply in extension activity with small farmers. Some 2000 farmers are directly involved. The target farmer operates more than half of all farms in Tunisia, farming a few hectares and raising less than 10 head of cattle and/or 40 head of sheep.

The U.S. inputs consist of technical and training assistance and provision of certain commodities. The technical services include five full-time technicians plus short-term consultants under a PASA agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The full-time PASA team consists of the following five advisors:

<u>Specialty</u>	<u>Date of Arrival at Post for Assignment</u>
1. Farm Management Economist	January 21, 1977
2. Forage Production Agronomist (Irrigated)	March 23, 1977
3. Forage Seed Production Specialist	June 7, 1977
4. Livestock Production Advisor	November 21, 1977
5. Forage Production Agronomist (Dryland)	February 19, 1978

In addition to the above full-time PASA team, consultants, under the USDA/PASA agreement, have prepared the following reports:

1. A Study of Milk Production in Tunisia (April, 1977)
2. A Study of Sheep Production in Tunisia (May, 1977)
3. Feedgrain Production and Potential in Tunisia (August, 1977)

There are three Tunisians in the USA being trained to the M.S. level under the project. Four additional M S. participants have been nominated by the GOT and are presently enrolled in intensive English training in Tunisia. A total of nine Tunisians will be trained to the M.S. level in the USA during the life of the project. Ten Tunisians have received short-term training in the USA to-date and an additional 25 extension agents and technical assistants are scheduled for short-term U.S. training during the life of the project.

A small amount of commodities have been and will continue to be imported from the USA to be used in support of on-farm demonstrations and to initiate the expanded forage seed production program.

Tunisian Perspectives

The Tunisian Government has remained very supportive of the project which it views as having coinciding policy priorities of both the GOT and AID of addressing agriculture extension in the context of the needs of small farmers.

The GOT counterpart organization in which ^{the} AID assisted project activity is structured is the National Office of Livestock Production. This organization has the responsibility for planning and implementation of livestock development activity, including forage and forage seed production. It is responsible for performing two main series of actions at the regional level: (1) activities of a purely technical character aimed at improving livestock

production systems; and (2) activities of a technical-commercial character consisting of organizing an effort to provide livestock farmers with the extension services and inputs they need, such as forage seeds and others related to livestock breeding and marketing.

Regional project offices have been established in 14 of the 18 provinces in Tunisia. Each of the 14 regional offices has the responsibility of conducting production education demonstrations of forage production and feed utilization on farmers' own land throughout a defined region. The technical backstopping and coordination of the overall effort is provided by the headquarters staff located in Tunis. The area for establishment of each regional office was selected on the basis of technical judgement, the need for forage production and feeding technology and the number of small livestock farmers available to respond to and use the technology presented through the demonstration effort.

USAID Perspectives

The Livestock Feed Production and Utilization Project is a follow-up to the USAID assisted Accelerated Livestock Production Project which was initiated in 1971 aimed at increasing meat production. That initial project, which phased out in FY 1976, induced American and Tunisian project design experts to conclude that forage production and its proper utilization were the constraints most critical to improved livestock production which were not already being addressed by other foreign assistance donors. At the same time, coinciding policy priorities of both the GOT and AID determined that these problems be addressed in the context of the needs of small farmers. The shift from the broader scope of the first USAID

assisted project in livestock development to the narrower focus of the ongoing project was not an abrupt change. It was gradual and based upon both a sharper perception of needs and the step-by-step completion of a series of essential preliminary actions. Thus, neither forage production nor attention to the requirements of small farmers commenced with the ongoing project. It is the emphasis on these two aspects of livestock production which constitutes the distinguishing characteristics of the Livestock Feed Production and Utilization Project.

The specific major accomplishments of the initial AID assisted project which led up to the present ongoing project are as follows:

1. Established the basic framework of a livestock production education delivery system.
2. Established the small livestock farmer's receptivity to improved technology and willingness to change traditional methodology.
3. Identified forage production as a solution to the principal constraint to livestock production.
4. Developed a package of technology addressing forage production and feed utilization that is adapted to the needs of the small farmer.

III. PROJECT STATUS AND SPECIAL PROBLEMS

A complete team of five full-time advisors are now on the job. They are suitably qualified, effective technical advisors and are performing at very satisfactory levels. Certain elements of the project are up to one year behind schedule because of delayed USDA/PASA recruitment of full-time advisors, though progress had proceeded as scheduled in some key segments. In the initial PP implementation schedule, all USDA/PASA full-time technical

staff was assumed to be on-board in Tunisia shortly after the beginning of FY 1977. That assumption proved to be overly optimistic. In fact, a key position, that of the Drylands Forage Agronomist, was not filled until February 19, 1978 due to the inability of the USDA to fill the slot. However, the USDA provided four months of consultant services of a Forage Agronomist who partially fulfilled the scheduled outputs in that specialty. The other full-time project technicians arrived in a more timely manner but later than originally anticipated (see page 4 of this report).

USDA/PASA consultant services, as called for in the PP implementation schedule, i.e., Dairy Production, Sheep Production and Feedgrain Potential, arrived on time and performed at a very satisfactory level. All three of the consultant services reports were well-received by the Tunisian Government and have been highly praised by both the GOT and other foreign donor organizations in Tunisia.

Although inexperienced, a sufficient number of bright, energetic and enthusiastic young technicians were assigned to the project activity by the Tunisian Government in a timely manner. There are at present 64 professional GOT agricultural technicians assigned to the project. There are eleven Tunisians on the Central Headquarters staff working with the American team responsible for the technical backstopping and coordination of the overall effort and fifty-three Tunisian livestock extension agents assigned to the various 14 regional offices throughout the livestock raising regions of the country (see attachment #1).

The on-the-job training of the Tunisian project staff, forage planting demonstrations, irrigation utilization and expanded forage seed production

activities are all behind the PP implementation schedule due to the late arrival of the American Advisors as explained above. The number of farmers participating in improved cattle feeding techniques is on schedule as shown in the Project Paper implementation plan. This is because the Livestock Advisor assigned to the previous AID-assisted livestock development activity was carried over with assignment to this project until mid-July 1977. Thus, there has been a USDA/PASA Livestock Advisor carrying out that segment of the project implementation plan since its inception, except during those months from July until November 1977.

Both the academic and short-term participant training implementation plans are on schedule as is also the consultant and commodity procurement schedule.

The American consultant on "Sheep Production in Tunisia" completed his report in May, 1977 and concluded that an American sheep production advisor should be added to the USDA/PASA team for a two-year tour. The GOT plans to request that assistance for the important sheep production segment of the livestock industry.

During both the 1976-77 and the 1977-78 cropping years, Tunisia suffered a serious drought and as a result is giving additional emphasis to irrigation forage production than was originally designed into the PP. The original schedule called for one two-year tour for the irrigated lands forage production agronomist position, but the GOT now plans to request an additional two-year tour of duty for that American specialist.

The Project Paper (PP) calls for the establishment of an evaluation program as an integral part of the project. The system for evaluation has been developed by the USDA/PASA Farm Management Advisor and his Tunisian

counterpart and includes the following points: (a) evaluation of progress toward attainment of the objectives of the project; (b) identification and evaluation of problem areas or constraints which may inhibit such attainment; (c) assessment of how such information may be used to help overcome such problems in this project; and (d) evaluation, to the degree feasible, of the overall development impact of the project. (See attachment #2 for an outline of the evaluation system developed.)

Lessons Learned

A technical assistance project of this sort which requires the recruitment and assignment of an American team of various specialities requires a lead-in or "mobilization" period much longer than that foreseen when the project was designed and approved. It appears very difficult for the USDA to assist AID in the recruitment of competent agricultural specialists (e.g., a Drylands Forage Agronomist) in a timely fashion. The host country counterpart agency officials should not be given an unrealistic time-frame for arrival of the full-time American technical assistance team at the time the project is being designed and approved. The USAID credibility can be jeopardized with resultant loss of trust and confidence in U.S. assistance. In this case, the GOT counterpart agency had worked with the USAID during a previous successful project so the officials concerned had a unique base upon which their trust and confidence in U.S. assistance was maintained during our difficult period of technician recruitment.

The design of a project and approval of the Project Paper (PP) which includes consultant services should be elastic enough to make slight deviations in technical services, participant training and commodity lists if those changes are strongly recommended by the consultants better to attain the project goal and purpose. Both the host country and the USAID, of course, must be in complete agreement with the consultant recommendation before any such changes in the original project design are contemplated.

ATTACHMENT #1

"PROJET INTEGRE" STAFF, OFFICE OF LIVESTOCK AND PASTURES, MINISTRY OF
AGRICULTURE AND USAID/TUNIS STAFF, ASSIGNED TO "PROJET INTEGRE"

CENTRAL TEAM - TUNIS

Jabeur Ammar, ITE, Director (admin. & support
Douglas W. Butchart, USAID Co-Director staff not included)

ECONOMICS SECTION

Mustapha Guellouz, Ing. P.
William F. Litwiller,
USAID/PASA

IRRIGATED FORAGE SECTION

Ali M. Naoui, Ing. A.
Taoufik M. Belkhiria, ITE
George R. James, USAID/PASA

DRY FORAGE SECTION

Mohamed Souissi, ITE
Henry D. Galt, USAID/PASA

SHEEP SECTION

Mohamed Haddad, Ing. A.
Abdallah Smida, Agt. T.

LIVESTOCK SECTION (Bovine)

Salah Allalout, ITE
Mohamed Jenhani, Ing. A.
Mohamed Salah Barhoumi, Agt.T.
James R. Dickey, USAID/PASA

FORAGE SEED SECTION

Amor Slim, Ing. A.
DeReath N. Palmer,
USAID/PASA

REGIONAL STAFF

TUNIS/ZAGHOUAN

Ahmed Ben Ammar, Chef d'Agence
Samir Henia, Adj. T.
Habib Kachouti, Adj. T.
Habib Bejaoui, Adj. T.
M. Salah Baccouche, Adj. T.
M. Hechemi Akremi, Adj. T.
Nabil Bouajila, Agt. T.

BIZERTE/MATEUR

Mansour Taieb, Ing. P.
Mokhtar Ben Ahmed, Ing. A.
Ammar Dallagi, Ing. A.
Driss Kohli, Adj. T.
Tahar Yahyaoui, Adj. T.
Amor Zarguine, Adj. T.

NABEUL

Bechir Guellali, ITE
Chef d'Agence
Abdelkader Matmati, Ing. A.
Nejib Gmina, Adj. T.
Salem Ourane, Adj. T.
Fathi Ben Slama,
Chef Laitier

JENDOUBA

Tahar Ben Arif, ITE
Ahmed Selmi, Adj. T.
Belgacem Belhi, Adj. T.
Salem M'lik, Adj. T.
Younes Ouilani, Adj. T.
Krim Torkmani, Agt. T.

BEJA

Noureddine Jellouli, Ing. P.
Chef d'Agence
Hassen Ben Ameer, Adj. T.
Abdelaziz Arabi, Adj. T.
Mohamed Elloumi, Adj. T.

SILIANA

M. Salah Cherni, Ing. A.
Chef d'Agence
Mouldi Jaouadi, Adj. T.
Mouldi Bouzidi, Adj. T.

ATTACHMENT #1 (continued)

LE KEF

Mohamed Hfaiedh, Ing. A.
Chef d'Agence
M. Naceur Mehri, Adj. T.
Bechir Mokni, Adj. T.
Abdessalem Hajlaoui, Adj. T.

SOUSSE

Abdelbaki M'lika, ITE
Chef d'Agence
Sadok El Ghali, Chef des
Cultures

MONASTIR

Mohamed Maatoug, Ing. A.
Chef d'Agence

MAHDIA

Mezri J'Guirim, Ing. A.
Chef d'Agence
Mohamed Radouane, Adj. T.

KAIROUAN

Brahim Bouchaala, Ing. A.
Chef d'Agence
Abderrazak Fakraoui, Adj. T.
Salah Chihab, Adj. T.
Amor Ghedifi, Adj. T.
Najib Guizani, Ing. A.

GABES/MEJENINE

Chedli Slama, Adj. T.
Chef d'Agence
Salah Ouled Abdessalem,
Adj. T.
Ahmed Beltaief, Adj. T.

GAFSA/SIDI BOU ZID

Mustapha Neifar, Ing. A.
Chef d'Agence
Abdessalah Abdeljelil,
Adj. T.
Brahim Omri, Adj. T.
Boujomas, Slimani, Adj. T.

SFAX

Mahmoud Bouzid, ITE,
Chef d'Agence
Nouri Ammar, Adj. T.
Hamadi Ben Mahfoud, Agt. T.

ATTACHMENT #2

REPORTING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS OF THE LIVESTOCK FEED PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION PROJECT NO. 664-0293

SOURCES OF DATA	DATE IMPLEMENTED OR SCHEDULED	METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND TYPE OF INFORMATION TO BE STUDIED	GOAL OR TASK ADDRESSED	GOALS & EVALUATION TASKS
I. Project reporting system for Regional and Central Staff.		Determine the following: - how field staff are spending their time;	I; A, B, C, O, E, F, K	I. PROJECT GOAL - To Increase the production and income of the small farmer.
A. Monthly Reports - A new standardized form for field extension agents.	January '78	- problem areas and bottlenecks;	II; A, B, C, D	Factors that contribute to this goal are as follows: A. Availability and appropriateness of inputs such as seed, fertilizer, insecticides, irrigation water, credit, and machinery.
B. Biannual Reports - A revised narrative and statistical format.	January '78	- progress to quantitative goals;		B. Cost/rice relationships that favor increased production and income.
C. Annual Reports - A revised summary of the two biannual reports.		- impact on individual farmers Study reports for ways to improve programs.		C. Project impact on individual farmers.
II. PASA Staff Monthly Training Reports	March '78	Determine the following: - Man days of training provided to each staff member, noting persons not being involved; - Number of seminars held, bulletins prepared and other educational work	I; G, H, I, J II; A	D. Number of farmers contacted. E. Number of demonstrations conducted. F. Amount of forage seed produced. G. Central staff specialists trained and assisted in programs.
III. COST OF PRODUCTION SURVEYS	June '77	Determine the following: - costs of producing	I; B, C, II; B, C	H. "Chefs d'Agence" in 14 regional offices trained and assisted.

ATTACHMENT #2 (continued)

SOURCES OF DATA	DATE IMPLEMENTED OR SCHEDULED	METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND TYPE OF INFORMATION TO BE STUDIED	GOAL OR TASK ADDRESSED	GOALS & EVALUATION TASKS
A. Milk		milk, forage and other		I. Extension agents trained on the job and assisted.
B. Forage		feed-stuffs;		
C. Other		- division of cost between feed labor, and other expenses in milk production;		J. A Project Handbook prepared, published and used by staff.
		- technical and economic data;		K. A Project Report - Evaluation system in operation.
		- division of costs between seed, fertilizer, and other expenses in growing forage		II. EVALUATION TASKS
				A. Determine Progress made to quantative goals as follows:
				1) 8,000 metric tons of forage seed produced;
			I; B, C, D, E	2) 100 extension agents trained;
			II; A, B, C, D	3) 14 chefs d'agence trained;
				4) Central staff specialists trained.
IV. ANALYSES OF FORAGE PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION DEMONSTRATIONS	June '77	Determine the following:		B. Identify problem areas or constraints that may inhibit the achievement of goals.
(nine different types of demonstrations involving growing and fattening of calves, milk production, and sheep production)		- Increase in production of milk and red meat.		C. Assessment of how such information may be used to overcome problems or improve programs.
		- Increase in small farmers' incomes.		
		- Technical and economic data.		
		- Input/output and cost/price data and relationships		

ATTACHMENT #2 (continued)

SOURCES OF DATA	DATE IMPLEMENTED OR SCHEDULED	METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND TYPE OF INFORMATION TO BE STUDIED	GOAL OR TASK ADDRESSED	GOALS & EVALUATION TASKS
V. FARM RECORD BOOKS	September '77	An analysis and study of each farm record to determine returns to labor, capital, management.	I; B, C	D. Evaluation to degree possible of the overall development impact of the project.
A. Pilot farms (small)			II: B, C	
B. Medium-size farms		Analysis will also be completed by:		E. Collection of baseline production data and other macro data on agriculture sector.
		- enterprise		
		- size of farm		
		- irrigated and dryland farming		
		- input/output and cost/price relationships.		
VI. SPECIAL SURVEYS AS CONDUCTED BY PROJECT STAFF	December '78	Determine the following:	I; A	
		- input availability and problems;	I; B, C	
		- bottlenecks in production.		
VII. AGRICULTURE SURVEYS AS CONDUCTED BY "BUREAU DU PLAN"	April '77 and quarterly	Determine the following:	II; E	
		- present production levels of beef and milk;		
		- changes in milk production		