

15N 35472

EVALUATION REPORT

Village Livestock Project No. 686-0203

Livestock Production Section

James R. Dickey, SDPT/Livestock

29 September, 1980

---

Action Recommendation:

1. Approve continued support of the VLP between Phase I and II with surplus funds from Phase I.
2. Continue support of GOUV-VLP administrative functions, logistics, the encadreurs, PCV's and the extension/sociologist advisor to maintain relations with the Village Livestockmen Associations and continue the animal health program, well program, range management demonstrations and preparation for Phase II.

General Summary of Project:

The Village Livestock Project (VLP) was planned in early 1976 with the "goal" of improving the quality of life of the people in the affected area through management of range resources and other feed supplies, and through improved animal health and selection. Achievement of this goal is expected to increase net livestock productivity, income to producers and government revenues and export earnings. The Purpose of the project (or the means through which to accomplish the goals) is to develop the capability of the Central Livestock Service and the three OPDs to plan and to implement village livestock management systems which maintain the integrity of the environment.

Property of  
[illegible]  
[illegible]

Only the first of three "Phases" was designed toward achievement of the goal. The first phase was designed as an experimental stage to collect baseline data, test and identify the most appropriate interventions and design a Phase II to implement and further evaluate those most appropriate interventions. A Phase III was suggested in the Project Paper as a final stage for extensive promotion of the time-tested interventions to ultimately reach the stated "goal".

Following signing of the Pro-Ag in May 1976 it took until June 22, 1977 to select, approve and sign with a contractor to provide technical assistance for the project. The Consortium for International Development (CID) contracted to provide the technical assistance team which completed approval procedures and was located in Ouagadougou on October 31, 1977. The team included a Team Leader/Livestock Advisor, a Range Management Advisor and a Sociology Advisor.

During the year and a half between Pro-Ag signing and CID team arrival the GOUV-VLP Director and USAID-VLP Co-Director/Project Manager were appointed and initiated preparatory actions. Many of the commodities were ordered, thus facilitating initiation of team activities upon arrival. While some of the materials ordered were ultimately judged non-appropriate, the overall effect of the early unilateral order by the USAID/Project Manager was a positive factor for speeding project implementation. Other materials had to be ordered by the GOUV and CID technical teams to supplement the initial purchases.)

Two participants were selected for long-term training in range management and animal production in the U.S., one received short-term training in Agricultural Statistics in the Ivory Coast, twelve encadreurs were trained in-country and assigned to the six selected project sites; PCV's were assigned to the project and actions were initiated to form the Village Associations. Unfortunately, the participant trained in Agricultural Statistics was assigned to another Service de l'Elevage project instead of returning as counterpart for the sociologist.

Apparently from early in the project there were interpersonal conflicts among the USAID, GOUV/VLP and CID/VLP personnel. These lead to misunderstandings and/or were complicated by lack of general agreement on project activities and emphasis. While a change of the GOUV VLP Director and the USAID/Project Manager partially alleviated the problem, there has never been complete agree among the parties as to the main emphasis of the project.

The Project Paper clearly emphasized that Phase I would be an experimental, testing and baseline data collecting project. This apparently was not completely understood or accepted by the GOUV VLP personnel. And, the USAID/Mission personnel had some change in support of the original concept of the project with the change of mission personnel over the life of the project.

The contract team was selected and contracted on the original/ research emphasis concept of the Project Paper. Upon arrival at post and development of a work plan the differences in understanding began to surface. In early 1978, the GOUV Director of VLP and the Director of the Service de l'Elevage expressed disapproval of the experimental emphasis of the project and asked for more action projects. While some test actions were included in the work plan, the GOUV and eventually the USAID/Mission personnel did not consider the CID team projects to be sufficiently action orientated.

The resolution of these problems and development of good lines of communication were farther complicated by lack of assignment of GOUV counterparts for the expatriate technicians; shortage of clerical and translation support from the USAID/Mission; shortage of operating funds and poor interpersonal relations.

The CID team was unable to maintain the overly optimistic work plan schedule, given the various difficulties and disagreements encountered, therefore several revisions were necessary. Approaching the end of the second year of the project the most significant activities had been in social, range resource and animal production baseline data, with relatively less action oriented projects having been effected. The classification of many of these projects, which are discussed below, as "action" or "experimental" depend on the specific objective of the person or organization concerned. The GOUV had an urgent desire to effect as many short-term physical improvements possible for the target group. The USAID/Mission, while wanting to cooperate with the GOUV to obtain their short-term goals, has had to consider the long-term planning of the Project Paper by technical experts, as well as the current advice of a professional contract team. The technical contract team which had contracted to search for the most appropriate long-term solutions to the problems felt professionally bound to actions to test and identify those solutions. Given the difficulty of the solutions to these complex problems and the diverse interest of those concerned, the difference of opinions is understandable.

The USAID/Mission organized a meeting with CID VLP and GOUV VLP at the beginning of the third year of the project to establish through a "Memorandum of Understanding", that there should be a reduction of research efforts, an increase in action projects and ultimately the development of a plan for Phase II. Additional

agreements of authority and logistical support responsibilities were included in the "Memo".

At this date, the baseline data has been completed, Village Livestockmen's Associations established, personnel trained, water wells dug, vaccination parks constructed, vaccination and deparasitage program established, vaccine cold storage provided at two sites, range resource survey completed on two sites, and two range management demonstrations established. The number of sites of range resource and some other activities were reduced from those planned due to various delays mentioned above and because the original time frame was overly optimistic given the detailed studies conducted. It may have been prudent to have limited the study detail rather than the sites studied. A plan for the Phase II was prepared. The specific actions proposed in Animal Production are discussed in detail below as to appropriateness and as related to the "purpose" of the project.

A final report of the project is in preparation at the University of Arizona and is expected at the end of November 1980.

Evaluation Methodology:

1. Interviewed USAID Project Manager to establish terms of reference for the evaluation of Phase I and recommendations for Phase II.
2. Reviewed project documents and correspondence.
3. Interviewed other USAID staff involved with project, CID team member, GOUV/VLP staff, other Service de l'Elevage personnel, and other bilateral and multilateral donor livestock range personnel.
4. Project site visits at Koukoundi and Tafogo in the Kaya ORD.
5. Met with and interviewed members of the Livestock Owners Associations at Koukoundi and Tafogo.
6. Interviewed the encadreurs at each of these two sites.
7. Inspected project interventions including: traditional water wells, vaccination parks, poultry breeding centers, housing for encadreurs and for material and refrigerated vaccine storage, and range management demonstration enclosures.
8. Note: The Gnanguedin (Koupela ORD) site, encadreurs and interventions were visited by Dickey on a previous trip in January, 1980 at which time Mr. Scott and Mr. Deffendol were interviewed.

Specific Livestock Section Related Activities:

I. Relation of Inputs to Outputs:

A. Inputs:

1) USAID:

- a) Project Manager - 4 y rs. There has been three different Project Managers which has made coordination difficult. The present one is well trained and experienced technically and should help facilitate future activities.
- b) Technical assistance: Livestock Production Advisor - 3 years. This responsibility was a joint assignment with the Chief of Party duties. He was assisted to varying degrees by the Sociologist Advisor - 3 years. the Range Management Advisor - 3 years. TDY Veterinarian; TDY Marketing Specialist; and four PCVs for one or two years each. The Livestock Advisor was apparently well training in animal nutrition and more specifically in poultry production. He provided good guidance in determining economic feasibility of several action projects which provided very useful data for future project planning. Much of his time was occupied by the COP duties, therefore a great deal of the animal production baseline data were collected by others mentioned above or from previous studies.
- c) Training - Long-term training (BS) in the U.S. was provided for a GOVU participant in Livestock Production. 12 encadreurs and the PCVs received short course training in animal health prior to assignment to the six sites and later received on the job training and seminar instruction from the CID Livestock Advisor; and livestockmen received instruction on importance of animal health care, livestock nutrition and poultry management.

also TDY  
Reserve  
Shawn

The encadreurs interviewed seemed to be well prepared for their project responsibilities in animal health and management as well as their other duties including relations with the herders through the Village Livestockmen's Association. They appeared to be well respected in their village sites (where they lived and worked).

The long-term participant has completed his BS and has been accepted in a Master of Science program; therefore his input into the project will be delayed another year or so. Three to five recent graduates have been

Local University

assigned to the project and should improved the technical status.

- d) Commodities: Provision of project vehicles, maintenance and fuel has been an essential need of the livestock section as it has for the entire project. Timely maintenance and provision of fuel has caused delays in project activities. No record could be located of the exact materials purchased for the Nutrition Laboratory, the Veterinar Laboratory and the Livestock Management Package, however, verbal reports indicate that the Nutrition and Veterianry Laboratory equipment was given to the Service de l'Elevage Animal Disease Diagnostic Lab when it was jointly decided by GOUV VLP, CID/VLP and USAID that this activities would not be conducted by the VLP. The vaccination equipment, salt and miner and some other livestock management equipment has been distributed to the encadreurs for their use in the vaccination program and demonstrations. Much of this material is still in the project warehouse and not likely to be used.

An inventory of what has been purchased, turned over to GOUV VLP, present stock in the warehouse and that distributed to the encadreurs for project use should be located or prepared with best present information for subsequent control.

- e) Local hire personnel, office equipment and supplies, and logistical support - Secertarial help was apparent less than adequate, as was translation service which lead to poor communications between the technical team and the GOUV VLP because of late reporting. Funds or facilities should be made available to a technical team to expedite typing and translation service to maximize the utility of these experts.

## 2. GOUV:

- a) Personnel - Project Director - 4 years. The original Director was changed after one year and was sent off for long-term training. Personality problems existed between the first Director and the USAID Project Manager, but this appears to have been a problem of the USAID Project Manager who was later replaced himself.

A Rural Sociologist counterpart was sent to the Ivory Coast for training in Agricultural Statistics, but upon return was placed in another Service de l'Élevage project. Neither the sociologist, the range manager, nor animal production counterpart was provided as agreed. However, five University Trainees and recent graduates have now been provided.

This lack of high level technical counterparts has had a significant negative effect on project progress, intra party communications, and on the potential of leaving a trained cadre of technicians to continue live development.

Twelve encadreurs, and three veterinarian nurses were provided at the regional and village level, and have functioned well, while partially replacing the counterparts in spite of limited technical expertise.

A National Executive Committee was apparently formed to help coordinate efforts of the project, but their success was limited due to lack of participation, notably from the ORDs.

- b) The Central Veterinary Laboratory and personnel were made available for analyses and training.
- c) Land and office space was provided for project site and office. The land has been somewhat dependent on cooperation with the Regional ORDs which has not been optimal.

The office space provided was very minimal and often necessitated the use of the expatriates' home as his office.

- d) Trainees and participants were provided for the programmed training.
3. Peace Corps - four PCVs were provided to work with the encadreurs at the village level. They have been an effective part of the project, especially in the animal health program and the traditional water well program.

#### B. Outputs:

- 1. Animal Production Baseline Data - these data were collected in detail at two sites and supplementary data were obtained for all the area from other project reports and impenical data available for the region.

2. Village Livestockmen's Association Sub-Committees - Six such committees were formed in cooperation with the Sociology and Range Management Sections. These sub-committees were used effectively to promote and introduce various interventions for demonstration, or sometimes for rejection of ideas as not applicable. The association meetings attended by the evaluation team gave the impression of interested and active organizations.

These associations should be very useful in future project activities and every effort should be made to maintain contact and, at least, minimal activities during the interim period between Phase I and Phase II.

3. Development of a Nutritional Analysis Laboratory - This was not accomplished, having been eliminated from the project by mutual agreement of CID/VLP, GOUV/VLP and USAID. This lab was not specifically needed to carry on the project and there had been no provisions for expatriate expertise, nor GOUV personnel to administer this operation. Although no records were located on the equipment purchased, it is understood that such equipment was transferred to the Veterinary Diagnostic Lab.
4. Livestock Feeding and Forage Production, and Storage at the Village Level - following collection of feed prices and availability data, and after fruitless efforts to interest villagers in forage production and storage, this project was dropped due to being non-appropriate. Most of the available crop residue feeds are being fed to work oxen, small ruminants, horses and rarely to young calves. Labor constraint is a significant obstacle for forage cultivation or storage.
5. Development of Water Resources - This was primarily a responsibility of the Range Management Advisor with the help of the PCV's, but due to the nutritional improvements which an adequate and well distributed water source can provide, this intervention is also mentioned in this section. A total of fourteen wells have been completed or are near completion. During meetings of the Village Livestockmen's Association, this was one of the main needs expressed.
6. Animal Health - this action project in cooperation with the Service de L'Elevage Animal Health Section was established at each site and has been acclaimed by the Village Livestockmen's Association as one of the most

important efforts of the project. Herders in the meetings attended by the evaluation team reported reduced death loss and increased production of milk for the family and animals to sell.

7. Construction of Vaccination Parks — this has been in support of the animal health program: therefore, has been important, however, the cost effectiveness of this project is questionable due to the high cost and the alternative potential of minimal cost improvements of traditional corrals. ~~Four~~ parks were constructed and two traditional parks were repaired.
8. Salt and mineral feeding - Salt-mineral blocks have been sold through a VLP rotation fund with increasing sales over the past year, however, due to the high cost and questionable cost effectiveness, it is believed by some technicians that the salt is actually being used as table salt rather than being fed to livestock. *Unless a cheaper source is found, this action can not be cost effective.*
9. Selection of Livestock based on Individual Identification and Records - This was not initiated and is not considered a viable action for the future.
10. Poultry Breeding and Feeding - Poultry projects were organized at three sites, however, due to high construction cost of modern facilities, high feed cost, poor and expensive feed distribution and high death loss, this project has not been cost effective. There is much interest in a poultry program, but it will apparently have to be limited to a more traditional system with possible introduction of improved breeding stock and improved health care.
11. Trained GOUV/VLP Personnel - The Project Director has received short-term administrative training in the U.S. and is well experienced after three years with the project. **The 11 remaining encadreurs ( one was killed in** work related accident) have received minimal training and excellent experience. The five recent University graduates assigned to the project are potentially useful as future counterparts. The range management specialist trained in the U.S. has returned and is ready to assume this counterpart position and the animal production participant working on his masters is scheduled to return to the project in one to two years.

12. Development of a plan of action for Phase II - the plan was developed, however, it is the opinion of the animal production *evaluator* that the plan included too many options, leaving as much or more research as in Phase I and failing to use lessons learned in Phase I to eliminate possible actions in phase II. A more detailed action plan of fewer potential interventions might have been more useful.

## II. Relation of Outputs to Purpose:

The purpose of the project "to develop the capability of the Central Livestock Service and the three ORDs to plan and to implement village livestock management systems which maintain the integrity of the environment" was only partially accomplished during this Phase I project.

While the Project Director, some intermediate technical personnel and the encadreurs were relatively well trained in project activities, the counterparts *needed* to closely monitor and develop each specialized activity have not been completely prepared. Several improved management practices were identified in Phase I, but a complete management system is *still to be* developed and needs the collaboration of trained counterparts. These deficiencies in the Central Livestock Service can be corrected, but significantly better cooperation and participation on the part of the three ORDs will be necessary.

*The objective to increase exports should be dropped, as domestic consumption increase and lack of potential to increase herd numbers make its possibility doubtful.*

### Conclusions:

1. The project has accomplished a large part of what was proposed for Phase I, while certain external factors, mentioned in the "Logical Framework Assumptions" have precluded complete accomplishment of the project purpose.
  - a) While GOUV, VLP encadreurs at the ORD level have been trained and experienced; range and animal management specialist train project administrator trained and experienced; and commodities in place, the government has failed to provide funds to support these technicians and efforts.
  - b) While a few of the many technical interventions studied were identified as being economically feasible, only a partially proven management package could be offered for action in Phase II.

2. It is the opinion of this evaluator that the CID team was too conservative in development of the Phase II Plan, and should have selected a few of the most promising action interventions for implementation in Phase II with a standard stipulation that adequate monitoring of each action intervention be maintained to accurately measure their economic efficiency for future project revision.

Note: See Phase II recommendations below.

3. Too many research and/or test options were included in the Phase II Plan. Many of these were effectively eliminated from consideration by information obtained in the Phase I baseline data.
4. USAID and GOUV Project Management should have maintained accounting of receiving and distribution of commodities. No such records were located during the course of the evaluation, although requested.
5. This project, through the <sup>dedicated</sup> ~~dedicated~~ research efforts of the CID team has provided much useful data for future GOUV livestock and land use development. During this short evaluation period expressions of interest in using these data were received from the CILSS, the FAO Regional Planning Assistance team and the Centre Régional de Télédétection de Ouagadougou.

the  
e Départemental de Planification (Kaya ORD)

#### Lessons learned:

1. Assure that all parties (local government, all concerned USAID Mission personnel and technical assistance team) completely understand the project and their respective responsibilities and obligations before agreements are signed.
2. If a project is judged by one or more of the parties to need revision, then some disinterested third party expertise should be employed to review and advise on possible revision.
3. Technical contracts should include a clause that the project will be subject to possible revision and that the team should be flexible to possible change within their respective expertise.
4. Provision of high level technical counterparts are essential to project implementation and lasting success.
5. Over-optimistic plans of work and time-tables should be avoided to minimize subsequent disappointments and misunderstandings.

## Recommended Actions for Phase II:

1. Continue traditional water well development in conjunction and in support of range management demonstrations through the existing Village Livestockmen's Association.
2. Support surface water point development in the native range areas of undergrazing in cooperation with other projects (example: mixed farming project which proposes building water retaining dams in the Tafogo area) and in support of the pasture management plan to be developed from data collected in Phase I.
3. Continue support of the animal health program by providing vaccines, medical supplies, encadreur assistance, transportation, refrigeration and other logistic support to help the existing Health Service to function most efficiently. Facilitate animal disease diagnostic work on a regular basis and support special surveys when indicated.
4. Help repair and modify the traditional vaccination parks by designing an attached working chute and paying for cutting of traditional poles and post for the repair and modifications.
5. Continue the enclosure range management demonstrations and include a forestry technician (PCV) to initiate tree planting in these sites.
6. Support existing tree nursery in the Tafogo area and consider similar action at other sites to provide trees for planting in conjunction with proposed temporary range management reserves.
7. Establish a credit program and <sup>village level</sup> food grain storage project through the Village Livestockmen's Association to allow the herders to buy grain on credit at harvest (cheaper grain and livestock prices) and to be able to hold their livestock until later in the dry season when livestock prices are higher.
8. Continue a strict monitoring of range, livestock and socio-economic conditions associated with each intervention to be able to maximize management efficiency, evaluate the intervention effects and demonstrate those positive interventions to the livestockmen.

9. The CID team and GOUV recommendation to strengthen the ORD support is well taken. Part of both the technical assistance team and part of the GOUV/VLP technicians could be located at the regional level. These regional advisors would need to be more generally trained to serve as backup and support liaison for the range, animal and extension/social work, in the region and the national specialist. Due to the remote locations and less than optimal living conditions, young technicians with BS or MS training, minimal experience and sufficient language training would be indicated. PCV and possibly graduate students might also be effectively used at the regional level to assist the technical advisors. A team leader/socio-economist, an extension range specialist and an extension animal production specialist of a higher level of training (MS or Ph.D) and significant experience in developing countries should be located in Ouagadougou to backstop and coordinate the field agents.

10. Training - mid level and long term technical and administrative
11. Limit construction to improvement or modification of existing Service to leverage on ORD to accommodate project activities
12. Support the existing Livestock Services to help to realize maximum efficiency and use of present facilities and personnel.

List of Documents Consulted for Livestock Sector Evaluation  
September 1980.

1. Project Paper Village Livestock Project (VLP 686-0203) dated 3/76 to 78.
2. Pro Ag VLP - May 31, 1976 to 9/30/1979.
3. CID/USAID Contract agreement signed June 22, 1977. Estimated date completion Sept. 30, 1980.
4. TDY Animal Health Trip Report - Dr. C. John Maré, DVM, April
5. TDY Marketing report - Dr. James McCallough, June 1979.
6. TDY Range Management Report, Shawn Kelly, January 1980.
7. Combination USAID/CID VLP Evaluation Report, March 1979.
8. Correspondence file - November 1977 to present.
9. Bi-monthly and semestrial report file.
10. Memo of Understanding, CID/USAID-Ouaga/VLP - September 20, 1979.
11. Rangeland Resource Inventory - Tafogo site - July 1979.
12. Sociological Report VLP - August 4, 1979.
13. Baseline data report VLP/CID, January 1980.
14. Design of Phase II VLP/CID, June 1980.
15. Final Draft Report of Livestock Sector. July 1980.
16. ONERA By-Product Feed Report, 1980.
17. GOUV/VLP Report file of Dr. Sionné.

List of Personal Contacts made during Evaluation VLP

Sept. 17 to Oct. 1, 1980.

Evaluation Team:

Claude Salem, Sociologist  
 Merrill Carter, Range Ecologist  
 James R. Dickey, Livestock Production Specialist

USAID Participants:

Richard C. Meyer, Mission Director  
 Samir M. Zoghby, Chief, Rural Development Division  
 E. Van Voorthuizen, VL Project Manager  
 R. Carey Coulter, Program Officer

CID Team:

Fred Sowers; Sociologist/Extension Advisor  
 Other team members had departed, but interviewed on previous visit in January 1980 by Dickey;  
     Grant Scott, Team Leader / Livestock Advisor  
     Scotty Deffendol, Range Management Advisor

GOUV Service de l'Elevage:

Dr. Boubakar Hama, Assistant Director of the Livestock Service  
 Dr. Lebendé Sionné, VL Project Manager  
 Dr. Salif Guigma; Chief of Animal Production  
 Mr. Oula Coulibaly, VLP, Ing. de Développement Rural  
 Mr. Seydou Ouédraogo, VLP, Ing. de Développement Rural - Elevage  
 Mr. Amadé Younga, VLP, Ing. de Développement Rural - Elevage  
 Mr. Zakarior Sorgho, VLP, Ing. de Développement Rural - Elevage  
 Dr. Adama Pierre Cliver Dera, VLP, Docteur Vétérinaire  
 Mr. Marcel Somda, VLP / University Study Trainee  
 Mr. Daniel Ouédraogo, VLP, Encadreur at Koukoundi  
 Mr. Dieudonné Ouédraogo, VLP, Encadreur at Koukoundi  
 Mr. Bamago, Ouaga Regional Officer, Ing. de Dév. Rural - Elevage  
 Mr. Kafando, VLP, Encadreur at Tafogo  
 Mr. Hubert Ouédraogo, Vet. Nurse at Tougouri  
 Mr. Ouédraogo, Chef du Service de l'Elevage, Kaya

GOUV - Office National de l'Exploitation des Ressources Animales  
(ONERA)

Mr. Amadou Ciré - Ba, Chef de la Production Animale  
Mr. Charles Ouédraogo, Chef de la Statistiques

CILSS (Comité Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Sécheresse dans le  
Sahel)

Dr. Moulaye Diallo, Range/Ecology Expert

Germany Technical Assistance Team:

Dr. Wolfgang Schrecke, DVM, Vet. Pharmacy

FAO:

Mr. Chris Rae, Dutch Planning Advisor, Service Départemental de  
Planification of Kaya

Herders and Farmers:

Chief of the Village of Koukoundi and eight members of the Live-  
stock Producers Association

Chief of the Tafogo Village and 24 members of the Livestock Pro-  
ducers Association

Centre Régional de Télédétection de Ouagadougou:

Mr. Roy Hagen, Forester, USA  
Mr. Christien Prions, Forester, CIDA.