

PD-AAR-342 40191

931-1328

THE SECOND REPORT  
OF THE  
EXTERNAL EVALUATION PANEL  
SMALL RUMINANT CRSP

July 1980

-1-

## INTRODUCTION

1. The External Evaluation Panel (EEP) of the Small Ruminant Collaborative Research Support Program (SR-CRSP) held its second meeting July 8 - 16, 1980. All members participated except Dr. J. M. Fransen. The Panel had as major objectives: 1) On-site reviews and, 2) Evaluations of Program Plans, Annual Reports and other documents. The EEP schedule is shown in ANNEX I.
2. The interim activities of the EEP (December, 1979 - July, 1980) consisted of a meeting in Washington DC to finalize the first report (December 27, 1979) and the EEP Chairman attending the BIR meeting May 9 - 10, 1980.
3. The EEP was most reassured by the response of the PI's to the first report in which considerable emphasis was put on the collaborative spirit of CRSP. As stated in that report, the EEP interprets the Guidelines for the CRSP that: 'US participating institutions are expected to develop close collaboration with institutions in the LDC's. Also they are expected to insure development of programs which may become a strong part of the LDC effort toward better efficiency in small ruminant production systems.' The EEP was pleased to note during their second meeting that more of the collaborating US institutions had taken the above emphasis seriously and in a positive spirit changed their programs for the Second Program Year funds towards stronger LDC involvement. In the opinion of the EEP, there are still a few institutions which have not yet made sufficient adjustments. These are noted in the section on project comments.
4. The EEP began its first on-site visits. Without previous experience, the panel adopted the format of a brief viewing of facilities followed by discussions with PI's and other staff participants, including BIR representatives. These discussions were followed by an executive session of the EEP to exchange views. The final step was to reassemble with the local group for a free exchange on the EEP observations. This approach proved very effective and will be pursued in subsequent site visits. The EEP very much appreciated the time and efforts of those involved in the site visits and their willingness for free and frank exchanges. The EEP feels that the site visits are a high priority.

5. In preparation of this second report, the EEP reviewed all available documents held by ME at the time of the panel meeting. The materials used are listed in ANNEX II. The EEP wishes to express special appreciation to the ME for their able assistance in arranging the site visits and splendid cooperation in making documents and their services available.

## GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations developed following EEP deliberations directed towards more than one project or to CRSP as a whole follow. The order of listing is not intended to coincide with order of priority. Following these general comments is a section drawing attention to more specific points of the individual projects.

### 1. LDC Coordination and Development:

A. As PI's, Regional Committees and site coordinators pursue project development in host countries, they should place emphasis on augmenting the effectiveness of existing national resources rather than the establishment of new structures. The principle should apply equally to facilities and to personnel.

B. A major responsibility of the chairman of the Regional Executive Committee should be to assume integration of work plans at each site in order to accomplish coordination of resources available.

✓ C. Locally available resources in LDC's need to be identified as they relate to accomplishing program objectives in the host countries. In addition to direct monetary savings, greater program continuity is assured. The principle applies not only to administrative and technical resources in personnel but to locally available equipment and supplies. Preparation of reports by site coordinators on the above is recommended.

✓ D. With the emphasis of CRSP directed towards interrelationships of various technical disciplines, it is essential to establish standardized recordings that will provide not only inter-disciplinary but also inter-site compatibility. As an aid in deriving estimates of seasonal effects and in determining the extent of transferability of technology, the site coordinator should insure that data is gathered on the local soils and meteorological data, of which the minimum should be maximum and minimum temperatures and rainfall. Estimates of humidity, cloud cover or hours of sunshine and days of rainfall >.1mm would also be desirable.

2. Additional Sites for SR-CRSP:

It is recommended that the CRSP has a major void in not being functional in the Near East-Mediterranean region. Since commitment of existing resources has already been made, incorporation of another project site cannot currently be encouraged. The present structure of the CRSP does not provide the flexibility to add new institutions or to identify new areas of activity. How to best overcome this deficiency should be addressed by the ME and the Technical Committee as a matter of priority.

3. Budget Utilization:

A. The expression of the Executive Committee following their June 5, 1980 meeting is endorsed: 'The Executive Committee recommends provision for carry-over from year to year to provide responsible expenditures of funds. Policy of not permitting carry-over is unwise. Request this matter be reconsidered by the Board.'

Also in concert with the Executive Committee, it is recommended that the \$500,000 identified by the Board for dispersion during the next budget period, be reconsidered and---that additional allocations be made on a case-by-case basis. We are under no obligation to spend the full \$500,000 next budget period. Additional allocations to projects at this time are premature. We are skeptical of added second year funding above that already approved. A reserve should be maintained.' (Robinson memo of June 18, 1980 to PI's, RE: T.C. Executive Recommendations)

In view of rapid development of program commitments and many projects being in embryonic stages, substantial carry-over to the third project year is recommended for anticipated program growth at that time.

B. The EEP recommends that if further expenditure of Program Year Two funds are not to be permitted, they should be used for the establishment of a finite contingency fund to be used at the discretion of the Executive

Technical Committee and with the approval of the Board to fund special projects on a case-by-case basis.

C. When the EEP identifies serious program deficiencies, its observations will be directed to the ME as a special report for transmission only to the respective PI. The EEP may recommend withholding of funds pending suitable action by the PI concerned.

D. The EEP endorses funding of individual projects based on the formula reviewed with the ME on July 12, 1980 which has been prepared for submission to the BIR.

E. Using project funds to augment the libraries of US institutions or for US scientists to attend general professional meetings in the US is not considered contributing to CRSP objectives. This recommendation is not intended to discourage participation described in item 5.

4. Reporting:

Further improvement in reporting procedures is mandatory.

✓ A. Reporting of closely related activities to projects is encouraged but CRSP dependent and financed activities should be distinguished as clearly as possible from those activities that are not CRSP funded.

✓ B. Serious interruption of the CRSP momentum has resulted from failure of timely submission of reports to ME. It is recommended that PI's comply strictly with agreed upon reporting schedules.

5. PI's from more than one US institution representing a specific discipline, such as Nutrition or Health, are encouraged to meet periodically to coordinate program objectives and results. Representation from Economics and Sociology should be included when feasible.

6. In the first EEP report (Item 8 General Comments), it was recommended that a clearer definition of the nutrition study goals be provided.

- ✓ However, in the Second Year Program, identical goals were used by the nutrition related programs as in Program Year One. The EEP again recommends that PI's concerned with nutrition more clearly identify the projected priorities relative to nutritive requirements versus feeding systems.
7. ✓ With the rapid expansion of project activities, both at US institutions and at host country sites, it is obvious that attention to technical coordination and administrative detail requires that the ME be provided with an Assistant Project Director. It is recommended that action be taken in this matter to assure continuity of CRSP momentum.
8. Although initial work in some countries will involve rather large sheep or goat operations, the EEP recommends that research results should be directed primarily to solving problems of smallholders in order to comply with the spirit of CRSP.

COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL PROJECT PROPOSALS - PROGRAM YEAR TWO

University of California - Davis

Small Ruminant Flock/Herd Health Programs in Smallholder Systems

Submitted April 25, 1980

The EEP made a site visit to this project on July 10, 1980. Based on the presentation of the PI and the review of both the Integrated Program Plan for Brazil (Part II) and the Second Year Program Plan and budget proposal, the EEP considers the overall approach of the project highly commendable.

The EEP furthermore considers it necessary to point out the following aspects in relation to the development of the project:

1. Data collection systems need to be standardized in so far as possible with other health projects such as Colorado State University and Washington State University.
2. Health data collection must take into consideration and be compatible with related factors such as nutrition, management, seasonal variations, sociology, economics, etc. Therefore, close collaboration among PI's working in Brazil is emphasized.
3. A system of animal identification on the collaborating farms is necessary for epizootiological studies (flock surveillance). The system should be compatible with the requirements of other disciplines.
4. A specific work plan for Indonesia must be prepared shortly. In general, the amount of resources provided for Indonesia, as reflected by the 1980-81 budget, is very limited.

University of California - Davis

Genetic Improvement of Sheep and Goats for Smallholder Production Systems

Submitted April 18, 1980

The EEP made an on-site visit at Davis, July 10, 1980. In view of the need for the PI to make shifts in site location from Morocco to Kenya and Indonesia and limitations on

funding to construct the planned facilities at Davis for goats, the current plans and progress were considered satisfactory. The main recommendations by the EEP were:

1. In developing dual purpose goats, more attention should be directed towards the utilization of males for meat through tests of such management inputs as the effect of age of castration on meat quality.
2. The influence of genotype and management systems on hide quality of goats should also be included in the program.
3. Close collaboration should be developed with animal health units in an attempt to derive means for assessment of disease resistance.
4. PI should insure in so far as possible compatibility of recording between California LDC sites and with other breeding projects.
5. PI should proceed as rapidly as possible to identify site(s) in Kenya so as to determine whether the plans proposed in Phases I and II in the Program and Work Plan are feasible, particularly with respect to number of animals and number of breeds or types which can be evaluated.
6. The current work with US-DHIA milk records on goats and evaluation of levels of nutrition on milk yield and other traits at Davis is desirable and necessary for development of expertise for overseas planning.
7. The proposed tests for ranking of bucks in California and Kenya be delayed until more is known about the performance of local types, potential health problems and feed availability in Kenya.
8. The PI is complimented on steps taken to collect village data in Indonesia and on his plans to conduct short course training during 1980, both in Kenya and Indonesia.
9. The PI should contact the Kenya government training school on hides and skins for some input on measures which may be employed in germ plasma evaluations.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona and Utah State University, Logan  
Improving Male and Female Reproductive Performance of Small Ruminants in LDC's  
Submitted April 1, 1980

The EEP made a full day site visit to Cal Poly on July 9, 1980 to discuss the project on investigation of the reproductive physiology of small ruminants. As this is a joint project between Cal Poly and Utah State University, the PI at Utah, Dr. W. C. Foote, had kindly come to Pomona to participate in the meeting.

The facilities at Cal Poly for the project were demonstrated by Dr. Nelson, who summarized progress and plans for the male reproductive physiology component of the project. Dr. Foote made a corresponding review of the female reproductive physiology component. These presentations were followed by discussions during which constructive proposals and views as to how to improve the project were expressed by both parties.

The EEP made the following recommendations:

1. The objectives of the physiology and reproduction project as originally defined, were too broad and it was necessary for the project leaders to narrow the objectives to what could feasibly be achieved with the resources available.
2. There had been some discussions as to whether the project as originally conceived should remain as one project with a component each at Utah and Cal Poly or whether it should be split into two entirely separate projects. The BIR in its last meeting decided that the project should be divided into two separate projects. The EEP is of the opinion that due to the very close connection between the activities of female and male reproduction components, the project should continue to be treated as a single project with clearly delineated budgets and work plans for female and male reproduction, each being the responsibility of Utah and Cal Poly respectively. The EEP further recommends that the BIR should reconsider this issue at its next meeting and allocate funds as if for one single project.
3. Due to the overall importance of reproduction, it was considered necessary to collect information on reproductive traits and parameters in all herds and flocks participating in CRSP activities. This applied equally to the sites which did not have any specific research project on reproduction. The

EEP recommended that Drs. Foote and Nelson make early contact with the other PI's to work out standardized or at least compatible formulas for the collection of reproduction information in the overall CRSP.

4. As artificial insemination and work on reproduction in general could cause serious cultural conflicts among certain smallholder societies, the PI's were asked to keep close contact with the PI's involved in the socioeconomic aspects of the CRSP.
5. As the cammelidae and sheep are of much more importance in Peru than goats, the project should concentrate on the sheep and cammelidae, particularly as goat production occurs mainly in the coastal zone which is far away from the areas where sheep and cammelidae are located.

#### Colorado State University

An Investigation of Small Ruminant Health Problems in Peru.

Submitted April 25, 1980

A site review was made by the EEP on July 14, 1980. The Principal Investigator, Dr. J. C. DeMartini and the other project participants reviewed their program objectives. Modifications to the Work Plan and budget were proposed by the CSU team, reflecting increases in both areas.

The CSU team presented the EEP with a demonstration of current research being done by the College, particularly in the area of immunology.

Following the review of the activities presented, work plan and budget, the EEP met in session to consolidate its evaluation; following which, the CSU team joined the EEP for a review of the observations. The following points were discussed in joint session.

1. In the past, approximately 30 days of CSU professional time has been committed to the project in Peru, with no further provision for CSU presence there until early 1981. In the future, assignment of CSU personnel in Peru is scheduled for about one month in duration. The EEP recommends that CSU presence could be more effective by augmenting the time spent in Peru and the development of in-country training courses.

2. Research objectives described are directed to large cooperatives and to the more obvious communicable diseases whereas CRSP objectives are intended to be applicable to smallholders whose social patterns vary considerably from those groups identified for study. For example, helminth parasites may be well controlled in identified flocks but would be a major deterrent to smallholder productivity.
3. The EEP recommends that the animal health research activities be oriented to requirements of the animal health service in Peru to assure dissemination of findings not only to large cooperatives but to identify their application to smallholders.
4. The research objectives described for the project, especially in the field of immunology, are basic in nature and of primary interest to the CSU scientists. It will be necessary for the team to ascertain that CRSP supported research be relevant to the problems of Peru as well as to their interests and that Peruvian scientists are functional in the application of this technology.
5. It was agreed that development of compatible data gathering systems be accomplished between the animal health projects.

The CSU team is commended for its constructive approach to developing existing resources, facilities and personnel in Peru and for identifying at least two diseases of major concern to sheep and alpaca production in Peru for study. The incorporation of more epizootiological studies in its program is recommended.

Some of the CSU project staff expressed the intent to commit sabbatical leave time to work in Peru on project-related activities. This is encouraged.

University of Missouri

Sociological Analysis of Small Ruminant Production Systems

Submitted April 8, 1980

The EEP compliments the PI on the rapid progress since the last review in site identification, work plan development and selection of overseas collaborators. The EEP especially appreciates the PI's efforts to inform other CRSP participants on the potential

compatibility of the sociological studies.

The EEP cautions that vigorous management will be required to obtain the expected results. For example, the field workers may not have on-site collaborators as there will be for animal breeding, etc. Frequently, their nearest contact may be in the headquarters of ministries. This means mechanisms will be needed to maintain confidence of the field personnel, especially when they are graduate students.

The EEP reemphasizes the necessity for sustained programs of study in order to adequately characterize small ruminant production systems.

Plans for training of LDC participants needs further attention.

The Missouri program has the potential of developing a number of publications. Neither the program plan nor budget describes provisions for publication. Also there are no indications of the nature of these early reports. Will they be 'descriptive' or will there be data which can be tested for statistical inference? Further elucidation on types of data collected and planned evaluations should be included in future reports.

#### Montana State University

#### Evaluation and Genetic Improvement of Sheep and Goats in Extensive Management Systems

Submitted April 1, 1980

The main comments of the EEP are:

1. Project approach deserves compliments.
2. Several aspects of the work planned for Program Year Two may overlap with studies to be conducted by the Physiology project (Utah). Early coordination is necessary to avoid unnecessary duplication.
3. Since breeding studies, including evaluation of different genotypes, are being planned for SAIS Tupac Amaru, it would be desirable that the Physiology project also be carried out at that location.
4. Recognizing the importance of meat production in the selection process in both sheep and alpaca, it would be desirable to specify how this will be evaluated, i.e. live weight, carcass weight or both. Also, it would be

desirable to take into consideration hide quality assessment in both sheep and alpaca.

5. The project should be aware of the alpaca fiber pricing studies planned by Winrock to properly delineate selection criteria in alpaca breeding.
6. The EEP considers that it is very important at this stage to strengthen existing research institutions rather than diverting resources to the development of new research stations. It is reassuring to know that this is being accomplished in the Year Two Work Plan.
7. The EEP concurs with the Executive Committee that training component of the project is low.

North Carolina State University

By-product and Crop Residue Utilization In Intensive Sheep and Goat Production Systems  
For Limited Resource Farmers

Submitted April 1, 1980

Overall, program planning and progress is considered very satisfactory. In view of the emphasis on the utilization of crop residues or by-products and supplementary feeding, it is highly desirable that collaboration with other CRSP projects be developed as rapidly as possible. For example, the North Carolina and the Utah Range objectives indicate close collaboration at a single site in Brazil which will be mutually beneficial. The stated objectives of developing guidelines for dry season and supplementary feeding in the North Carolina State University Program add further impetus to the need for collaboration, particularly with Range Management (Utah), General Management (Tuskegee), and Reproductive Physiology (Utah) and Economics (Winrock).

The EEP concurs with the need for a well qualified nutritionist in Indonesia since the local infrastructure is low at present. The need to study methods of storage for feedstuffs is recognized but it is recommended that engineers be employed on at least a consultant basis in order to develop facilities which could be utilized on small farms. It is also recommended that advice be sought from the Missouri sociology group on the development of questionnaires for village surveys pertaining to field resources and feeding practices.

Ohio State University

Intensive Forage Production Systems for Smallholder Sheep and Goat Producers  
Submitted April 15, 1980

This project is the subject of a special report provided to the ME which highlights deficiencies in need of correction prior to release of funding as requested by the participating institution.

Texas A & M University

Evaluation of Meat Goats and Hair Sheep  
Submitted April 1, 1980

The description of the problem and the project objectives given in the Integrated Program Plan shows that project personnel have made considerable progress in program development. The EEP concurs with the need to characterize local breeds and types of sheep and goats in Brazil prior to the development of long term breeding projects and the EEP also endorses incorporating carcass composition and hides in the assessment of local types. The EEP does, however, have serious concerns over the proposed 'short range approach'. These are:

1. The EEP questions both the validity and necessity of utilizing CRSP funds to establish a laboratory at San Angelo for the study of caseous lymphadenitis (CL). Since there is no appropriate test for the disease at present, will a non-veterinary institution have the resources to undertake such a venture in a satisfactory manner? Also, is such work a worthy objective for funds allocated for breeding research? The EEP is advised that the health units of UC Davis and WSU have work underway on development of tests for CL.
2. The term 'parasite resistance' is used several times in the program documents but there are no indications given as to how this component will be measured beyond perhaps mortality rate. It is implied that the main thrust will be on breed group comparisons. Will this be adequate for selection programs? Should not collaboration and/or consultancy with health personnel be planned to assist in methodology for estimating animal differences?

3. The program also indicates studies are contemplated on 'management alternatives' and 'forage types' without plans given for execution. Will these studies be in collaboration with other CRSP? Also, will there be a need for animals outside 'the breeding flocks'? More details on planning should be incorporated in subsequent reports.
4. The EEP holds that the expenditure of CRSP funds is highly disproportionate for US based activities, particularly in salaries. Although there will be general applicability of the US findings to LDC's, will this be sufficient to justify the high inputs at Texas A & M University? The projected comparisons among relatively small samples of fine-wool, fat-tail and hair sheep is more academic than practical unless the comparisons encompass a rather wide range of economic considerations in order to determine differences in 'net merit'. Also, the EEP is concerned over the non-transferability of observations on Angora goats to other types in Brazil.
5. The statement in the Annual Report and the Year Two Subgrant request, 'other sites will be considered' is of concern. The implication is that sites will be sought outside Brazil or other CRSP countries. This may prove desirable in the long run but the EEP believes that at this time, full attention ought to be given to the Texas commitment in Brazil.
6. The EEP strongly urges including in future reports to ME: a) planned collaboration with other CRSP projects in Brazil; b) how proposed research will relate to needs of small farms; c) progress on developing compatible recording with other breeding projects; and d) greater details on plans for training. The EEP concurs with the Executive Committee that training for LDC participants is limited.

Texas A & M University

Systems Analysis and Synthesis of Small Ruminant Production

Submitted April 1, 1980

This project is the subject of a special report provided to the ME which highlights deficiencies in need of correction prior to release of funding as requested by the participating institution.

Texas Tech University

Improving Small Ruminant Nutrition, Management and Production

Submitted April 1, 1980

The EEP has reviewed the 1979 - 1980 Progress Report, the 1980 - 1981 Work Plan and budget proposal and the relevant section of the Integrated Program Plan for Peru, Part III. It is commendable that the long term objectives of this project have been defined, working sites for both alpaca and sheep research have been identified and due attention is being given to strengthening existing national facilities.

The EEP strongly recommends the need to incorporate the animal health aspects in all studies to be carried out through collaborative action with the health component of CRSP in Peru. It is necessary to clearly identify in the budget, the component for training Peruvian graduate students in US.

Tuskegee Institute

Expansion and Intensification of Goat Production in Northeast Brazil

Submitted May 9, 1980

This project is the subject of a special report provided to the ME which highlights deficiencies in need of correction prior to release of funding as requested by the participating institution.

Utah State University

Rangeland Research For Increasing Small Ruminant Production in Brazil

Submitted May 6, 1980

The material at hand for evaluation of this project consisted of the report contained in the Annual Report, Program Year One, Part IIA and the Program Year Two funding request together with a Phase III Work Plan submitted by the PI on May 6, 1980. No report of this project appears in the Integrated Program Plan, Part II, Brazil.

This project was originally scheduled for Morocco and all effort was directed towards that end from October 1978 to early 1980. A site visit to Brazil by Drs. Malechek and Norton was made in March 1980. As a result of the contacts made at that time, it appears that an effective transition of the project to Brazil has been made. A work site has been established and collaborators identified. The work plan has been agreed upon and an on-site project administrator employed. The PI and his co-worker are to be complimented on accomplishing so much in such a short period of time.

The EEP has two concerns to bring forth:

1. The CPATSA station, Petrolina, is some distance from Sobral and this will be the only CRSP project completely located there. The EEP supports the philosophy of combined locations and more efficient use of CRSP personnel, equipment and funds. Seemingly, this philosophy would be adhered to if the Utah Range project were located at Sobral. This would permit more complementarity in activities with the North Carolina State program on nutrition as well as the UCD project on animal health.
2. It is apparent that close collaboration will be forthcoming between Utah and the North Carolina - Nutrition project because of the obvious complementary aspects of the research. The earlier this can be elucidated in both work plans, the more effective will be the results.

Washington State University

Herd/Flock Health Programs

Submitted April 4, 1980

Reviewing the Work Plan, Budget and Annual Report, including Attachment A (no date) as well as recent information in ME indicates:

1. The WSU component of the project has been and remains fully funded with seven faculty professionals receiving support for participation of up to but no more than 0.15% of their time;
2. Recruitment of two full time technicians to be added plus partial funding for four existing and two additional support personnel at WSU;
3. The objective to 'prepare a commonly designed survey instrument for all herd health projects' has been deleted in favor of 'a field form developed by UNDP - FAO for ready transposal to computer
4. Studies are being conducted at WSU for herd health delivery in Kenya, for example, studies on sheep pox;

5. Program initiation has been materially delayed because of unforeseen administrative problems at the Kenya site.

It is recommended that:

1. Much greater emphasis on development of the Kenya based activities is urgent in order to identify and develop working relationships with Kenya personnel and institutions with emphasis on development of national resources already in existence as well as collaboration with externally funded activities (FAO, CRSP, AID, USDA, etc.).
2. Development of compatible herd health data among the CRSP units needs to be accomplished.
3. Specific Kenya counterpart personnel must be identified along with precise responsibilities for each.
4. Areas of training need to be identified and institutions where such training is to be accomplished if other than WSU.
5. A schedule of the movement of WSU personnel as well as Kenya personnel needs to be established.
6. Research areas, particularly on disease agents exotic to the US should be developed at the Kenya site selected. That control methods for the example used, sheep pox, are available is acknowledged. These observations are intended to encourage apparent recent progress in the development of Kenya resources.
7. A full time senior professional be assigned to Kenya to participate in and coordinate the objectives of WSU.
8. Funds be diverted from the WSU personnel component of the budget to accomplish more effective Kenya based activity, particularly to augment the amount allotted to the on-site professional from WSU.

9. Funds for 'Domestic Travel, US personnel to four meetings within the US (\$16,000)\* should be applied to Kenya related commitments such as training.

Winrock International Livestock Research and Training Center

Dairy Goat Production Systems for Smallholder Agriculturalists

Submitted April 14, 1980

The EEP has studied the proposed Work Plan and budget for Program Year Two and makes the following comments:

1. The general problem chosen for study is an important one. Objectives are sound and the work plans at the Kenya and US sites are satisfactory. They cover survey-type activities as well as actual research and research training. The experimental site in Kenya should be identified.
2. The Winrock matching funds equal 28% of the total budget and about 47% of the total funds will be used for expenditures in Kenya or for activities directly contributing to the Kenya program. The project is also receiving support from Cornell University which has made available a graduate student for work in Kenya during 18 months. The large portion of funds going to research of direct relevance to smallholder production systems in LDC's makes this project commendable.

Winrock International Livestock Research and Training Center

Economic Analysis of Small Ruminant Production and Marketing Systems in Brazil, Indonesia, Kenya and Peru

Submitted April 1, 1980

The project work plan for each of the four LDC sites is progressing well. Following the PI's visit to each country and after consultation with people there and domestically, certain changes have been made in the original project design. Some of these include procedures for evaluation of technology applied to different farm conditions, resource allocation in peasant economies and international marketing of certain small ruminant products. Although the research plan in Kenya on the economics of human nutrition intervention is not clear, the EEP compliments the PI and his coworkers for broadening the scope of this project so that maximum data and benefit

may be obtained.

The following points should be considered as the work progresses:

1. Brazil - Inclusion of the animal health discipline
2. Kenya - Individual collaborators and work site not identified
3. This project has the potential of developing a number of publications. Neither the program plan nor budget describes provisions for publication. Also there are no indications of the nature of these expected reports. Will they be 'descriptive' or will there be data that can be tested for statistical inference? Further elucidation on types of data collected and planned evaluations should be included in future reports.

## EEP PLAN OF WORK - PROGRAM YEAR TWO

In its work schedule for the Program Year Two, the EEP will give priority to continuing the review of the US work sites of the SR-CRSP and to initiate the evaluation of achievements at overseas sites. The next EEP meeting is tentatively scheduled for the period January 11 - 18, 1981 and the ME will be asked to arrange visits to Ohio State University (Forage Production), Tuskegee (Management), Winrock (Production Economics and Dairy Goat Production) and Texas A & M (Production Systems).

As the CRSP will have its largest program in Brazil and as the particular area of the country concerned is largely unknown to the EEP members, the EEP has chosen the Brazil program as the first overseas CRSP activity for full scale evaluation. A site visit is scheduled for approximately one week in June - July 1981 and will be followed by a two day review of the annual reports and the plans and budgets for Program Year Three for the entire CRSP.

Informal site visits to the other countries (Kenya, Peru and Indonesia) are also planned by individual EEP members during 1980. These will be undertaken while EEP members are in the countries on other business so that the travel portions of the expenses are not to be charged to the CRSP.

The EEP very much appreciates the invitation from the Technical Committee to meet with them during their next meeting in April. However, due to the priority given by the EEP to the US site visits and to the evaluation of the Brazilian program, the EEP members are unable to make themselves available as a group. One of the EEP members will represent the group at the meeting with the Technical Committee.

ANNEX I  
AGENDA  
EXTERNAL EVALUATION PANEL  
July 8 - 16, 1980

1. Review the Reproduction projects of Cal Poly and Utah State
2. Review the Integrated Program Plan
3. Review the Annual Report
4. Review the Responses from M E and PI's
5. Focus on existing problem areas in the sub-projects
6. Review the Management Entity and CRSP structure
7. Review the events of the past year:
  - Board Meeting
  - Technical Committee Meeting
  - BIFAD Seminar on CRSPs
  - AID Annual Review of SR-CRSP
8. Prepare an agenda for overseas evaluation
9. Prepare an agenda for the coming year's activities
10. Prepare a budget to cover the activities
11. Discuss meeting with the Technical Committee in the Spring of 1981
12. Review the University of California Breeding project
13. Review the University of California Health project
14. Review the Colorado State University Health project
15. Any other business
  - a. Morocco Report
  - b. Management Entity structure
  - c. CRSP structure
  - d. Budget for future years
  - e. Allocation of \$500,000
  - f. Other requests to join the SR-CRSP
  - g. Review of site coordinators
  - h. Future calendar
16. Drafting of final report

## ANNEX II

### Documents Reviewed

1. **Integrated Program Plans**
  - Part I Background
  - Part II Brazil
  - Part III Peru
  - Part IV Indonesia
  - Part V Kenya
  
2. **Annual Reports Program Year One (1980)**
  - Part I Administrative Activities
  - Part II A
  - Part II B
  - Part II C
  - Part III Budgets
  
3. **Proceedings Joint Research Committee Workshop on the Collaborative Research Support Programs (Board International Food and Agricultural Development, Washington DC, June 9 - 10, 1980)**
  
4. **The Small Ruminant CRSP (SR-CRSP) Second Year Program Budget, June 1, 1980 - September 30, 1981.**
  
5. **SR-CRSP Program Year Two Budgets (D. Robinson Memo to Principal Investigators May 19, 1980)**
  
6. **Second Year Work Plan and Budget Request For:**
  - North Carolina State University
  - Texas A & M - San Angelo (Breeding)
  - University of Missouri
  - Winrock (Management)
  - Texas A & M (Systems)
  - Cal Poly, (Reproduction)

Tuskegee (Management)  
Utah State University (Physiology)  
Utah State University (Range Management)  
Montana State University (Breeding)  
Ohio State University (Nutrition)  
Colorado State University (Health)  
Washington State University (Health)  
Winrock (Economics)  
California (Breeding)  
California (Health)  
Texas Tech (Range Management)

7. Project Year Two Subcontract Documents with Revised Budget For:
  - Texas Tech - Range
  - Utah - Range
  - UCD - Breeding
  - Texas A & M - Systems
  - Texas A & M - Breeding
  - Winrock - Economics
  - Winrock - Management
8. File of PI Responses to the EEP Initial Report
9. Supplement Information from ME as Identified in EEP Report
10. Summary of Activities at Cal Poly Relating to SR-CRSP - Prepared for EEP visit July 9, 1980
11. Small Ruminant Collaborative Research Program (Phase III, Second Year Work Plan 6/1/80-9/30/81). Colorado State University
12. The Small Ruminant CRSP (SR-CRSP) Management Entity Response to the Initial External Evaluation Panel Report of February 1980