

# Integrated Family Farm Development

## STRENGTHENING GRANT



First Report  
August 20, 1994 - August 19, 1995  
USAID Grant: FAO-0158-A-00-4026-00

Heifer Project International  
1015 S. Louisiana St.  
Little Rock, AR 72202

**Cooperative Agreement No. FAO-0158-A-00-4026-00**  
**First Annual Report**  
**August 20, 1994 - August 19, 1995**

**Summary**

The purpose of this grant is to strengthen HPI's capacity to assist partner NGOs and grassroots organizations to promote sustainable development. The total estimated amount of this Cooperative Agreement for its full three year period is \$750,000. To date USAID has obligated the amount of \$500,000. The total estimated amount of the program is \$2,097,000. Through the first three quarters (Aug. 20, '94 - May 31, '95), \$116,090 of USAID funds and \$960,216 of HPI funds have been spent.

The agreement provides resources to help HPI to improve and increase capacity to do training and project development in Bolivia and Uganda. This is accomplished at several levels. First, at the country office level in the two countries the program works to improve and increase HPI staff skills in training and extension, and by developing appropriate training tools for each context. Secondly, by building capacity of extensionists and managers of partner project holder organizations in each county the program helps assure greater project impact and sustainability. Third, the program aims to be comprehensive and disseminate information and training to other parts of HPI's program, specifically at headquarters and in other country representative offices.

HPI's matching funds are spent to support country office staff and operating expenses plus all costs of sub-projects in each country. Integrated rural development projects with a livestock component are designed to be sustainable and expand to additional farm families through the "passing on the gift" requirement. HPI has met or exceeded the outputs for the first year in each country. In Uganda, HPI supports 14 sustainable development projects with nine partner organizations, and in Bolivia there are 11 active projects with ten counterpart non-government organizations. More than 1,100 families were directly benefited by receiving livestock and training during this reporting period, either through original placements or pass-on of offspring. Training is ongoing in each country program, and numerous trainings have been carried out at two levels: grassroots project participants receive "basic courses" in animal production and management, plus group formation and leadership; secondly, NGO extensionists and community level technicians receive frequent training to upgrade skills and knowledge on a variety of topics.

This has been a year of gearing up and consolidating plans. In both Bolivia and Uganda an additional staff person was hired to assume major responsibility for coordination and development of training programs. In both countries a participatory self-evaluation was carried out of the training programs, and as a result of this the needs and gaps for development of materials and doing more training were identified.

**Heifer Project International  
Integrated Family Farm Development  
Strengthening Grant  
First Report**

**Table of Contents**

<b>I.</b>	<b>Background to Grant and Project Context</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Project Methodology</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Review and Analysis of Results by Country</b>	
	<b>A. Uganda</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>B. Bolivia</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>Management: Review and Analysis of Headquarters/ Functions</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Financial Report</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Lessons Learned and Long-Term Implications</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>IX.</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	
	<b>1. Detailed Implementation Plan</b>	<b>33</b>
	<b>2. HPI Uganda: An Assessment of the Training Program</b>	<b>47</b>
	<b>3. Evaluation Summary Report - Bolivia Training Program</b>	<b>58</b>
	<b>4. Uganda Annual Report,</b>	<b>64</b>
	<b>5. Bolivia Program Data for AID Annual Report</b>	<b>78</b>
	<b>6. Kisinga Women's Dairy Goat Project Case Study</b>	<b>80</b>
	<b>7. Logical Framework</b>	<b>88</b>
	<b>8. Financial Profile of HPI</b>	<b>94</b>
	<b>9. PVO Project Reporting Information</b>	<b>95</b>

## **I. Background to Grant and Project Context**

- 1. Describe the PVO's organizational purpose, approach and special capability. What were the socio-economic-political conditions and circumstances which gave rise to the project and each country program? What were the express needs of beneficiaries, participants, the PVO, etc. What gender concerns need attention?*

### **(A) Organizational Purpose**

Heifer Project International's purpose is, in partnership with others, to alleviate poverty, hunger, and environmental degradation by:

1. Responding to requests for development assistance, including animals, training and technical assistance, which enables families to seek self-reliance in food production and income generation on a sustainable basis
2. Enabling people to share (pass on the gift) in a way that enhances dignity and offers everyone the opportunity to make a difference in the struggle to alleviate hunger and poverty
3. Educating people about the root causes of hunger and poverty based on HPI's experience and insight gained from working with animals in development since 1944
4. Supporting people in sustainable development and the stewardship of the environment through responsible management of animal resources

### **(B) Approach**

For 50 years Heifer Project International (HPI) has successfully worked to alleviate hunger and rural poverty and restore the environment by providing appropriate livestock, training, and related services to small-scale farmers around the world. One of HPI's primary concerns and contributions is to help farmers utilize livestock as an integral component of sustainable agriculture.

The goal of all HPI projects is to strengthen rural families and communities through improved nourishment, increased production, and the dissemination of skills and knowledge for self reliance. Care for the earth's natural resources are emphasized in most projects through training in pasture improvement, soil conservation, forestation, and water harvesting.

HPI's key concept is that each recipient must pass on offspring of the farm animals they receive to others in need. This principle, called "passing on the gift", assures that each participant in the program becomes a donor to others, enhancing dignity and participation in each project. Passing on the gift also greatly heightens the prospect for the project to become self sustaining. Many project holders are

working out agreements with farmer/recipients to return several offspring, one to be donated to another family, and another for support of the local organization's ongoing training and follow up needs.

Animals in all projects must have access to adequate feed, water and shelter. Project participants are given training and on-site technical advice to improve their skills and knowledge in animal care, planning, and management. The types of animals used in projects depends on local needs and requests, in addition to experience, natural resources, and marketability of surplus production. Projects are selected on the basis of meeting HPI's twelve "Cornerstones for Just and Sustainable Development".

### **(C) Special Capabilities**

One of HPI's greatest strengths is the presence of field offices in major program areas around the world, who in turn work with a large network of local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and grassroots organizations. Most of these field offices are staffed by nationals of the country in which the program is carried out. There are 23 program representatives in total; 6 in Africa, 7 in Latin America/Caribbean, 4 in Asia, 1 in Eastern Europe, and 5 in the USA/Canada program areas.

HPI cooperates with local partner organizations, most of them nongovernmental organizations. Concerted efforts are also made to coordinate with government services in all program areas. Partner project holders have competent local personnel who know the social-political, and ecological context of the communities with which they work. These field staff possess appropriate technical skills to help the project participants to confront the challenges and problems they encounter.

HPI's achievements in promoting sustainable and integrated livestock development in economically and ecologically stressed areas of the world has drawn support from major church, philanthropic, government, and individual sources. HPI has gained recognition as a development agency that specializes in sustainable development using livestock as the primary tool, and is called upon by many other agencies to contribute this special expertise.

### **(D) Socio-economic/Political Conditions**

For this cooperative agreement HPI chose one country in each of two regions, i.e. Africa and Latin America, where families could benefit most from a sustainable agriculture approach. These countries have significant ecological problems, ongoing and growing HPI programs, viable local partner groups and could be used as regional models for a sustainable development approach and strengthened training capability.

**Bolivia:** Typical participants in the tropical lowlands are settlers who have migrated from the highlands. Participants from traditional communities are from high altitude, mountainous and semi-arid zones with limited farmland having low agricultural production. These farmers are in the process of claiming land, or else own land or share communal land. They have little capital to invest and use hand labor only. They are more subsistence oriented than market oriented and live in villages distant from markets with marginal access to basic education and health services.

The rural sector in Bolivia has the highest rate of child mortality, malnutrition, illiteracy and the lowest per capita income. Current statistics (UNDP, 1993) put GNP per capita at \$1,570, infant mortality at 89/1000, 63% literacy rate, life expectancy for men/women at 51 years and 54 years respectively, and 51.2% of the population reside in rural areas.

**Uganda:** The 1993 "Human Development Report" (UN) estimates Ugandan GNP per capita at an average of \$180, infant mortality is reported by the UN at 108 per 1,000, illiteracy among women is at 65%. Agricultural production is growing at about 3.6% per year. While Uganda's economy has somewhat recovered since the liberation war, the level of living of most people, particularly those in the rural sector, remains low.

AIDS is taking a dramatic toll on Uganda with an estimated 1.7 million people HIV positive. This will add dramatically to the number of widows, widowers, and homes caring for large numbers of children. These are among the primary target population for this program.

#### **(E) Essence of the Problem**

The problem of ecological degradation, especially loss of soils and forests, is in need or much more attention by the international development community, including HPI. HPI has learned from nearly 50 years of experience that livestock are an integral part in sustainable, regenerative agriculture. People, plants, land and livestock can function synergistically if their interdependent roles are recognized. Adding livestock to a small farm can bring balance and make the difference between mere subsistence and family self-reliance. Properly managed small farms with a livestock component are environmentally sustainable and can help provide a decent living for farm families. HPI would like to be able to expand its efforts to show how well managed short-term agricultural investments including quality livestock, education, group empowerment and a passing on the gift provision leads to long term, positive impacts on farm families, the environment and local institutions.

The problem of urban poverty and migration from the rural areas can be curtailed by strengthening rural community organizations, which is an aim of this program.

**(F) Expressed Needs**

HPI constantly is faced with the situation of having to respond to requests for assistance from local community organizations, and we always receives more requests for support than can be fulfilled. Each of these countries presents prodigious developmental and ecological challenges: In Bolivia, where quality of life indicators are the worst in Latin America, the program works primarily in the tropical rain forest area being settled by migrants from the highlands; In Uganda, ravaged by poverty, civil strife, and AIDS for the last decade, the program works with rural families of extremely scarce resources in hillside farms using zero-grazing systems. Some projects are on the fringes of wildlife and forest preserve areas. How can be more efficient and effective with limited resources is the challenge.

Finally, HPI faces the challenge of knowing that training is an essential part of successful development programs, and that effective projects will depend to a large degree on our partner organizations having the capacity to train the farmers. The gap between that reality and the possibilities of developing a comprehensive training program and approach to sustainable development is one of the greatest needs addressed by this cooperative agreement.

**(G) Gender Concerns**

In both Bolivia and Uganda the program needs to continue to stress the importance of gender balance in our programs. As one of HPI's program cornerstones there is a need to raise consciousness with both staff and partner organizations about this concur. Some projects are just with women, though it is more common for both men and women to participate as equal partners. As the projects introduce improved livestock and training, the role of women is enhanced and the level of participation increases. The nutrition level for families improves. Training in projects gives due attention to the role of women in livestock development, and attempts to equip them with the tools for leadership.

**2. *What other resources were available to meet the needs? Why was funding necessary?***

HPI always has the need for more resources for training. It is relatively easy to raise funds for direct project funding, especially for the livestock component. Donors often have more difficulty in supporting training, especially the relatively costly process of developing a comprehensive approach and the accompanying materials for participatory training.

HPI project recipients have to contribute a significant amount of "sweat equity" in their projects. They are required to obtain materials for a small shelter, fencing, or corrals, and plant sufficient fodder to provide feed for the animals. In addition,

each "pass on" contract signifies a substantial in-country capital resource being generated by the beneficiaries themselves to help additional farm families.

In each country HPI seeks out local private and governmental organizations with which to cooperate and develop partnerships. For example, in Uganda, there is a core of capable civil servants and extension agents. These people are underpaid and do not receive adequate support from their government. HPI receives willing cooperation from these people because they have seen first hand that the HPI system works, and, when applied correctly, can generate income, nutritious food and opportunities for Ugandans.

The country HPI offices in both countries actively seek resources from both local governmental sources as well as international agencies. Grants and in-kind contributions from partner organizations in Europe (especially England and Ireland) have been significant in Uganda. Collaborative relationships with other international NGOs, such as World Concern and Lutheran World Relief, has been significant in Bolivia, as well as funding from the Canadian and Bolivian governments, aimed at strengthening community organization. HPI alone does not have sufficient funds to respond to all the expressed needs in any one country. USAID funding provides a very valuable resource to help HPI build up its capacity in training and project management, while securing mostly private source funds for the major part of project funding.

## **II. Project Methodology**

1. *Summarize the grant project goal, purpose, objectives, approach, methodology, and strategy. What are the key inputs for achieving this strategy? Who are the target groups? What are the expected outputs and products? How does strategy involve women as both participants and beneficiaries?*

### **(A) Goal of the Project**

The goal of the cooperative agreement is to enable small-scale farm families to improve their capacity to feed themselves, care for their land, and profitably integrate livestock into regenerative agriculture practices.

### **(B) Purpose of the Project**

The purpose of the project is to strengthen HPI's capacity to assist partner NGOs and grassroots organizations to promote sustainable development.

**(C) Objectives**

1. Undertake livestock project with 1,900 farm families in Bolivia and Uganda.
2. Develop a resource manual on participatory development training.
3. In Bolivia, organize local farmer organizations, giving leadership, planning and management, and technical training.
4. In Bolivia, provide training and technical assistance to HPI country staff and to partner organizations on ecologically sound livestock management practices, including agro-forestry.
5. In Uganda, assist partner project holder organizations wishing to adopt the zero-grazing model. This will involve funding, plus training of group leaders in the technical, management, monitoring and leadership aspects of NGO and farmer group development.
6. Adapt participatory training curriculum developed in both Uganda and Bolivia for use in both countries and for HPI's worldwide program use, and provide training in their use.
7. In Uganda and Bolivia provide training and consultation to HPI in-country staff and partner organizations in participatory evaluation approaches.

**(D) Approach, Methodology and Strategy**

Farm families are provided with training and technical assistance in ecologically sound livestock production. Families provide their own contribution in time, labor, land and other production resources, such as housing, fencing, mineral salts, etc. HPI provides external stimulus and the means in the form of appropriate technology, livestock, and some planting materials. Those initially assisted become demonstrators of sustainable practices and the source of livestock to others through the "passing on the gift" of offspring.

A major thrust is the effort to strengthen local NGOs and community-based organizations. This is done through HPI sponsored seminars, workshops and field days for project leaders and extensionists of the partner organizations.

Prospects for significant benefits in terms of income, food and improvements in the landscape provide the incentive for farmers to invest in sustainable farming practices. HPI's experience in these countries shows that farmers will invest in planting grass, legumes and multi-purpose trees on contours, utilize crop residues to feed ruminant livestock and other animals capable of digesting feed high in cellulose, and recycle manure, urine and composted waste back to their fields.

The program gives special attention to place knowledge and skills in the hands of women as an effective way to assist the whole family. This is done through women's groups, and through the training of local NGO and community groups in how to work effectively with women.

The grant agreement program is aimed to strengthen HPI's capacity to train others in a participatory methodology. This is done in several ways; first, by giving training opportunities to HPI's staff, secondly, by offering training opportunities to partner organizations, and, thirdly, through support of the training aspects of the actual livestock projects. Training materials will be developed, tested, and published for use in these country programs (Bolivia and Uganda), and in other country programs, as appropriate.

#### **(E) Key Inputs**

HPI provides all the funding and in-kind inputs for the actual projects with partner NGOs and grassroots organizations. These include money for sub-projects to cover extensionists, training, travel, etc. In addition, HPI directly funds the purchase of livestock and agricultural supplies for each project. Significant in-kind donations of livestock are received from sister organizations in Ireland (Bothar) and England (Send a Cow) for the Uganda program. Also, some veterinary supplies are occasionally donated and shipped by HPI.

HPI also makes available its in-country staff, technical training materials, vehicles, office space, and supplies. Staff that are funded in part or fully by AID are shown in the budgets pages of the Detailed Implementation Plan, Appendix 1. AID funds are also used for training materials development, training events, consultants, evaluation, and travel.

#### **(F) Target Groups and Outputs**

HPI targets low income farmers living in rural areas. In Uganda the farms are very small, often between one and three acres. In the tropical area of Eastern Bolivia, where HPI concentrates much of its work, the farms are larger (20 to 40 hectares), but the conditions are very harsh for settlers from the highlands with little capital or tools to work with. HPI pays particular attention to groups that permit women and families to achieve a better livelihood. Projects work only with organized groups, community and farmer associations.

At the project level the expected outputs in all projects are: reasonable production levels within the context and resources available; including passing on the gift of an

offspring to another family. The participants generally prioritize the use of benefits in this order: milk for improved nutrition of children, income for emergencies, school fees, and basic necessities, and purchase of farm inputs, and, lastly, home improvements or building of new houses.

At the program level, the expected outputs are increased capacity in HPI staff to do training, extension services, evaluations, and planning. Also, training materials and information sharing will be a significant output.

2. *Provide a comparison of actual accomplishments with those originally proposed for the period for the report. Include gender accomplishments. State the reasons for any variance.*

A table showing targets for the first year of the grant and accomplishments is found on the following page. The evaluation from the last matching grant had recommended that in a future AID matching grant HPI should gather staff for a startup workshop. This greatly facilitated the initial phase, and we feel we have been essentially on target this first year.

Year One Targets	Accomplishments
1. Startup workshop with all pertinent staff	Completed, October, 1994 - included Uganda and Bolivia Country reps, plus training personnel from each country, and all pertinent Headquarters staff.
2. Training program assessment and evaluations in each country	Completed - January, 1995 in Uganda, by Jerry Aaker, Director of Training, and Jim DeVries, Director of International Programs with participation of HPI Uganda staff and partner organizations. <u>Appendix 2.</u> March/April, in Bolivia a participatory evaluation by HPI and CVM staff with focus on the training methodology, application of learned knowledge and skills, and women's participation. <u>Appendix 3.</u>
3. Hire training coordinators in each country	Completed, - Bolivia in February, '95 and in Uganda in March, '95. In Bolivia this staff person is Clelia Ayreyu, a female, and in Uganda, Athanasius Beinempaka, a male. The permanent training director in Uganda is a woman veterinarian.
4. Collect and copy training videos on animal health and production.	Completed - 86 different training films collected and put onto 16 video tapes, on

	all areas of animal production, health and related subjects. Made available to HPI field reps worldwide.
5. Literature search of training materials available that use a participatory approach	Completed - Over 50 training manuals and written materials collected, reviewed, and written up into an annotated bibliography.
6. Implementation plan for training events for the three year period.	Completed - in each country a detailed plan and corresponding budgets were drawn up, subject to changes as needs might dictate.
7. Plan for materials development	Completed - in each country staff have set their priorities as to which training materials to work on and the general content and purpose of each.
8. Carry out training events with project participants (male and female farmers)	Workshops and field days were held in each country according to plan, (information on training in Uganda is contained in <u>Appendix 4</u> , and <u>Appendix 5</u> for Bolivia)
9. Publish four issues of the EXChange Newsletter	Accomplished as per schedule. 1,814 are on this mailing list from 111 countries.
10. Send out Technical Information upon request	Accomplished as per plan. Average number of technical information orders filled each month was 517, sent all over the world in response to requests. Also, fill an average of 48 orders for books each month.
11. Develop and begin to write up the "HPI Model" for holistic planning and management.	In process - The basic model has been agreed upon through a process of discussions and workshops in-house. A first draft of a manual on this model is about ½ complete.
12. Program Directors administrative and programmatic visits	Accomplished - Jim Hoey, Latin American Program Director visited Bolivia in May, Dan Gudahi, Africa Program Director, and Cindy Walla, Administrative Assistant visited Uganda in May.
12. Livestock development projects implemented in each country	HPI is working in projects in Bolivia with six NGOs and four regional farmers' associations. In Uganda fourteen projects are carried out with nine local partner organizations, both Ugandan NGOs and community organizations.
13. Trainings for HPI staff, partner extensionists	Numerous trainings - details covered in body of this report and appendices 2 & 3.

### **III. Monitoring and Evaluation**

*1. Describe and discuss PVO refinements, changes, and additions to the following monitoring and evaluation information from that originally presented in the PVOs proposal:*

#### **(A) Baseline Data**

HPI receives reports on each project holder semi-annually. The basic data from these reports includes both quantitative and qualitative information. Included in the baseline data are the number of direct beneficiaries of livestock (by species), aggregated by sex, the number of pass-on animals, number of persons trained and number of training days. Extension staff do frequent on-site visits to monitor other aspects such as production, animal health, group and organization progress and problems, as well as the application of farming management practices, such as planting of leguminous trees, ally cropping, pastures, etc. There are no changes in the basic data collected and compiled since the inception of the program.

#### **(B) Targets**

Targeted outputs have not changed significantly or at all and are being accomplished, as reported above. The areas in which we are behind are mostly due to requiring longer than expected on some startup activities, especially filling the trainer positions in each country. Also, the scheduling and carrying out of participatory self-evaluations of the current training programs required several months to set up and do. It was, however, very prudent to undertake this evaluation early in the program as the basis for sound planning based on the findings of needs and priorities of all concerned.

#### **(C) Critical indicators of effectiveness**

Design of the evaluation of the training program in Bolivia included work on indicators in three critical areas: participation of women, training methodology, and application (use) of what is learned in the training. This exercise was very helpful to the staff. In Uganda, a workshop with HPI staff and 25 project extensionists worked on indicators of effective training, which was used as HPI looked critically at the training program in that country.

#### **(D) Benchmarks of project progress**

A Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP), together with above listed specific objectives constitutes the essential benchmarks of the project. Appendix 1. Though behind schedule in expenditure of budget in the first year, all elements are in place for a rational progression of the program and budget expenditures at this point.

#### **(E) Monitoring Plan**

The Director of Training monitors the overall cooperative agreement program, and reports to the Director of International Programs. He coordinates with the Program Directors for Africa and Latin America. The Program Assistants in Little Rock are responsible to monitor financial reporting from the two country programs. Authority and responsibility for daily management and monitoring of the programs in each country lies with the country representatives.

Annual reports from the field, giving specific information and data on each project and training event, as well as overall assessment and comments were submitted on time with detailed information. Also, the Director of Training did field assessments in both country programs during the course of the year.

#### **(F) Evaluation Plan**

As mentioned above, self-evaluations have already been conducted of the training programs in each country during the first part of 1995. Staff and colleague agency personnel in each country participated in these reviews, and helped to develop the conclusions and recommendations. (summaries of the reports for each are attached as Appendices 2 & 3). The Director of Training will conduct a training session in Bolivia in January to train staff and partner organizations in participatory evaluation. The mid-term evaluation is scheduled for May, 1996. A scope of work (SOW) for the mid-term evaluation will be prepared and shared with AID in the first quarter of the year, so that AID/PVC and HPI can agree on the SOW, the make up of the team, and other issues related to the mid-term evaluation.

### **IV. Review and Analysis of Project Results by Country.**

#### **1. Describe for each country for the report period:**

- a. the specific outputs achieved in each country*
- b. effect on target groups disaggregated by gender*
- c. problems encountered and how they have been addressed*
- d. impact on local institutions, local policy, and people (disaggregate by gender) outside the project*
- e. unintended effects*

## **UGANDA - Background**

HPI began work with small farmers in Uganda in 1982. The first animals were distributed in 1983. Since then, HPI Uganda has expanded its program across many districts of the country and has become involved with several indigenous sponsoring organizations. The benefits to project partners include improved nutrition, education in management of livestock and farms, income from milk sales, sale of bulls and heifers, enhancement of community spirit and improved environment. Most of the projects use improved dairy cows as the principle input, though one dairy goat project was started in 1990 as well as one poultry project. In a previous grant from AID (1989-92), it was reported that 766 new families had been assisted through animals and training (60% headed by women)

### **(a) Specific Outputs**

A report for the period (August, 1994 - August, 1995) is attached. (Appendix 4) This provides statistics and descriptions of all training activities in the country program, plus other activities carried out by the HPI county program. The table in that report entitled Projects Supported by HPI in the Country during the Period, shows numbers of both original and pass-on animals placed with families. The report, of necessity, shows the actual data through the time of writing the report (mid June), and projections through August. In summary, the specific outputs achieved are the following:

- **Families Benefiting from Projects:**
  - 182 families have received original animals (imported or locally purchased)
  - 74 families have received pass-on animals
  - 160 families are to receive original animals by August
  - 91 families are to receive pass-ons by August
  - 456 families will have been served by the end of the reporting period.
- **Training -** The table, Summary of Trainings at Project Level Disaggregated by Sex, found in Appendix 1, shows totals numbers of participants training, by month. In summary,
  - 342 one-day training sessions will have been carried out by August 31
  - Total number of person/days of training was 6,467
  - Ratio of women to men amongst training participants: 66% female, 34% male
  - Training needs for extensionists as well as for farmers have been identified through workshops, surveys, and field visits

- Training curriculum for extensionists has been reviewed and more topics on sustainable agriculture and integrated farming incorporated
- There is an increased adoption of tree planting by the farmers for environmental protection and fodder production
- Monitoring of project activities has been carried out by the Country Representative, Training & Extension Services Coordinator, and through reporting by extensionists and project holders

**(b) Effect of Target Groups disaggregated by Gender**

Most projects strive for participation of both men and women, though a significant proportion of the projects have targeted women as the chief participant. That is, they own the animals, attend training, and run their own organizations. An evaluation and case study of one of the women's projects in Uganda, the Kisinga Women's Dairy Goat Project, was carried out during this period, with interviews of all 81 women farmers, looking mostly at livestock management, reproduction, costs and income. Baseline data was collected on all these farm families. A copy of this evaluation is attached as Appendix 6.

- **Women**

- have been empowered through participating in trainings, meetings, cross project visits and exposure to and interaction with other people.
- have been able to take up some leadership roles, especially within their community organizations
- now have more of a role in planning for and use of family income resulting from sale of milk and offspring animals
- have benefited from integrated farming by using manure and compost and planting nitrogen fixing trees to improve their soils; hence have more vegetables, fruit and grain production to enhance their families' nutrition.

- **Men**

- have increased employment and productive work through the livestock enterprises
- have additional income to support needs of their families, and in some cases can start other small-scale income generating activities, such as retail shops
- have increased dignity and status as self-reliant community members

**(C) Problems Encountered**

- **A high degree of illiteracy among the women. This has been, to some extent addressed through training, using hands-on activities, visual aids and demonstrations. There is still more to be done to develop these training materials.**
- **Lack of enough audio visual devices to supplement other teaching aids. For some trainings we have rented these (i.e. videos, slide projector).**
- **There has been a problem of breeding animals, because governmental artificial insemination (AI) services have not been effective.**
- **Low milk production for some of the farmers, mainly being addressed through more training on pasture management and feeding programs.**
- **Lack of transport. The available field vehicles and motorcycles are getting old and in need of frequent repairs, and thus getting costly.**

**(D) Impact on local institutions, local policy and people outside the project.**

- **Through a diffusion process (word of mouth, observation, etc.), there is some evidence of groups being formed and starting up livestock activities using this model (without the support from the outside)**
- **There is a multiplier effect noticed in some areas where farmers have copied partially or completely the zero-grazing model by individuals and groups, and this is being sponsored and encouraged by the Ministry of Agriculture,**
- **Milk availability in local institutions and local communities has increased,**
- **AI services have improved and been extended outside the project areas,**
- **Soil and water conservation practices, and agroforestry have been picked up by some others outside of the projects,**
- **In the area of the dairy goat project, people in the areas have become accustomed to and adopted goat milk consumption as acceptable.**

**(E) Unintended Effects**

**None are noticed to date. HPI trainings are so popular in Uganda that staff lacks budget to carry out all trainings requested by extensionists and project workers.**

**2. *Comparison of actual accomplishments with those originally proposed.***

**Everything originally proposed in terms of training, projects, animal placements, pass ons, and personnel deployment have been accomplished in this period as per the plan. In fact, the project is ahead of schedule in all aspects except in spending the budget.**

**Proposed - for three years****Actual - first year****UGANDA:**

1,000 beneficiary families	456 families
Eight partnerships with local NGOs	Nine
Twelve sustainable development projects	Fourteen
800 farmers participating in training	1,250
Four women's projects	Three
50% of trainees are women	65%
Training workshops for HPI staff and partner organizations	Three

***Anticipated problems in meeting the final project objectives.***

Though we are behind in expenditures for the first year, the Uganda budget projection for the three years of the AID cooperative agreement is in excess of the approved and available headquarters budget. The program will readjust some objectives and activities in case of failure to attract additional matching funds. As milk production increases in some of the project areas, marketing will become more of a problem. Projects have, however, been challenged to look into other possible ways of addressing this problem, e.g. forming cooperatives and selling milk in bulk to cooling centers.

**BOLIVIA - Background**

HPI's long standing program since 1957 in Bolivia works in all three of the major ecological areas of the country, the *altiplano*, the mountain valleys, and the tropical lowlands. The majority of the projects are in the tropical areas of the Beni, La Paz and the colonization zone north of Santa Cruz, and in the Chapare region of Cochabamba.

Several years ago, HPI was instrumental in helping a loose confederation of livestock project committees that had received assistance from HPI to form a National Federation of Small-scale Cattlemen, (UNAPEGA). This is now one of HPI's partners in Bolivia, along with five other Bolivian NGOs and four grassroots membership farmers' associations, all of the latter located in the tropical lowlands.

HPI Bolivia works closely with World Concern/Christian Veterinary Mission (CVM). CVM and HPI have worked out an arrangement whereby CVM takes responsibility to develop the training program and for several years has done intensive work at the

community level to train locally chosen technicians. Spearheading this work has been veterinarians, Drs. Susan Stewart and Mark Bounds, both veterinarians.

Training is done at several levels - first, the basic course for the farmers in both sheep and cattle, for men and women, and secondly, more advanced and continuous training for the "*tecnicos*". Thirdly, there is a need to disseminate this participatory methodology with extensionists in the partner NGOs and other colleagues who work in rural development in Bolivia. This has been done on a very limited basis so far, but the USAID cooperative agreement is intended, in part to fulfill more of this need. In addition, the participatory methodology that has been and continues to be developed by the veterinarians from CVM was to be evaluated, further refined, and written up. The result is the publishing of a manual on this method, along with orientation and training in the approach for others in Bolivia, but also for HPI, CVM and other programs in this region and globally.

#### **(A) Specific Outputs**

A process for evaluation of the training program began in December, 1994 and was finalized in April. This was to determine the effectiveness of the methodology, the application of skills and knowledge, and participation of women. The major findings of this evaluation are found in Appendix 3. This was an evaluation only of farmer associations (as contrasted to the NGO projects) Findings included:

- **Grassroots participants are applying knowledge and making good use of the inputs for**
  - Improving pastures, alley cropping, animal management, and democratic community organizations
  - Increased attendance at meetings by both men and women, and increased participation in their own organizations
  - Increased animal production and generally healthy animals,
  - High participation in the courses, (80%), and improvement in decision-making and planning.
  - 18 basic courses were given to the farmer associations (generally sheep course for women and cattle for men), - these are week long course use the participatory methodology.
  - 12 courses were given to the community technicians and regional animators, in such areas as animal health and veterinary principles, project planning, leadership, training skills, (these are all within the farmer associations)
- **Technicians have benefited from training and the animal inputs,**
  - Men and women technicians are fulfilling many of their communities production needs

- They regularly organize for vaccinations, deworming, demonstrate castrations, give treatments, and help with genetic control and selection
- They are skilled as facilitators and good resources for local and area organizations.
- Families benefiting from projects,
  - 685 families benefited from livestock projects, and an additional 577 from poultry projects
  - Families have received the following livestock purchased in country: 266 ruminants (goats, sheep, cattle, llamas), 232 guinea pigs, 3,250 poultry
  - Families received Pass-on distribution of 422 ruminants, 34 guinea pigs, and 3,250 poultry
- All projects with NGO project holders carry out training on many subjects,
  - Of seven NGOs reporting on training, 43 trainings were given on many themes.
  - The range of participation by women in training in NGO projects varied from 18% to 58% of trainees attending (are women)

**(B) Effect on Target Groups disaggregated by gender,**

Of the total number of participants in all training events with the farmers' associations 55% were women and 45% men. In the participatory evaluation the role and participation of women was an important focus area. It was found that the majority of women participate with their husbands in the planning of agriculture and animal raising activities. Women's participation in training courses has resulted in better production and management of livestock resources and in implementation of agroforestry systems. On the organizational level, the influence of women on community organizations is noticeable after they have attended training. Many of the women are active in their organizations' meetings, making the groups stronger and able to take on other development activities. Most of the projects that are formed only with women, essentially the sheep projects, showed strong and stable group organization and continuity of work together.

Forty percent of all technicians are women, leading to a rise in the number of women leaders in the communities. More than 40% of the workshop participants (in basic courses) are women.

In the majority of the projects visited in the evaluation, the animals are in excellent shape and reproductive indicators were good, pointing to good preventative health care and nutrition. Pass-on rates are very favorable in most projects, allowing for growth in the number of beneficiaries year after year.

**(C) Problems Encountered**

- **Lack of an overall strategy for the organizations to become self-sustaining, though the project participants themselves are sustainable in their livestock enterprises**
- **Many men and women participants still do not fully understand or appreciate the potential role of their community organizations**
- **Difficulty in recruiting a qualified training coordinator, and the budget available**
- **Difficulty of finding women in communities who will work as animators**
- **Difficulty of training and technology transfer when a high percent of participants are illiterate, or do not speak Spanish, necessitating Quechua speaking trainers**

**(D) Impact on local institutions, local policy, and people outside the project.**

**In the settlement areas of Berlin, two large farmers' organizations have been joined into one, due in part to the close work and training with the livestock raiser association by the program. This joining of two organizations increases self-reliance.**

**In the distant and isolated area of Yucumo (Beni Province), Veterinarians Without Borders have entered into a program with HPI modeled after the HPI program approach.**

**Recently the local development organization FIDES has decided to implement all their projects using the HPI/PROPECO model of training local promoters, adopting the PROPECO training approach.**

**Another local NGO, CAIZA "D", which works with an HPI project in the very poor and resource scarce province of Potosi, has become the only institution with experience and success in implementation of poultry projects. As a result other NGOs in Potosi are coming to CAIZA "D" for training and preparation.**

**Due to the self-evaluation which HPI helped UNAPEGA (National Union of Small Livestock Farmers) do in the Chapare of a project financed by USAID, this HPI counterpart organization has been favored with additional help from USAID to strengthen their organization.**

**(E) Unintended effects,**

**There has been some misunderstandings with other NGOs who have development projects in the same settlement areas. The HPI program attempts to stress training of local technicians and grassroots farmer groups, using the community animators and technicians to the maximum degree possible. Some professionals have not agreed with that approach. When professionals do not accept or understand the participatory approach to training, they can undermine the locally selected community technicians and animators.**

## **V. Management: Review and Analysis of Headquarters/Support Functions.**

*1. Describe for the reporting period: a. project planning and management activities, b. staff resources (management and technical), c. training (disaggregated by staff and beneficiary and gender), d. logistical support, e. technical assistance, f. project fund-raising and marketing, g. role of the Board of Directors, h. development education.*

### **(a) Project planning and management activities**

As per a recommendation of the final evaluation of the last USAID matching grant, a workshop was set up soon after the approval of this cooperative agreement with all key headquarters and field staff. This was for the purpose of reviewing in detail what the agreement calls for, to clarify fuzzy areas, and start setting up specific action plans for the implementation of the program. This was felt to be lacking in the previous matching grant, leading to delays in start up. Due to an oversight on the part of the coordinator, Jerry Aaker, the Detailed Implementation Plan was not transmitted to PVC/AID for some months. However, all the essential elements had been planned earlier. Ongoing coordination of the cooperative agreement is with the Director of Training, who works closely with the Program Directors for Africa and Latin America. Country Representatives in Bolivia and Uganda report directly to these Program Directors, though it is understood that the grant coordinator can communicate with the field for information and to make suggestions and questions.

### **(b) Staff resources**

It was not necessary to recruit and hire any new personnel at headquarters, as all staff were already in place, as were the Country Representatives in both countries. This has facilitated a smooth transition into the grant program. The one staff person in Arkansas who was going to provide some technical support, upon request, is Chuck Crimins, a forester and organic farmer newly on staff at the HPI ranch (International Learning and Livestock Center, Perryville, AR). He is a returned Peace Corp. Volunteer with experience in Ecuador and the Philippines. However, the basic principle we use in terms of supplying technical and consultant services to the field is that they should be found first in the country, if possible, and only sent from the USA if not locally available. During the first year of the grant, there has been no call from the field for the services of Chuck Crimmins, and we have, therefore, taken him off the list of personnel partially paid for by the grant. In both Bolivia and Uganda, there are excellent local resource people in the agroforestry area. Nevertheless, Chuck is still on call and available in case of future need especially at the stage of applying the lessons learned in the other countries in the region.

One staff change of a position supported partially by the grant was that of the Coordinator of Information Resources. That person resigned and was replaced during the first quarter of '95 with Johnny Mullens on April 17, 1995. This has been a relatively smooth transition, even though there is much to learn about the publication

and distribution of the EXChange Newsletter and the Technical Information Service (TIS).

Headquarters personnel have visited both countries during the period. The Director of Training has visit both countries, principally to participate in evaluations and replanning regarding the training component in each country program. Also, the Director of the International Program Department, Jim DeVries, went to Uganda in January, 1995 to participate in this process of evaluation and planning. The Program Directors for Latin America and Africa have both visited their respective countries; and the Program Assistant for Africa also went to Uganda, to work out reporting and book keeping and training plans for the grant with the accountant in that office.

The Women in Livestock Development (WiLD) program has strengthened the gender component in HPI's training program with work on a slide show called "Gender and Training." The script was written by Beth Miller, and will be translated into Spanish for use in Bolivia. The slide show will be distributed by the end of the year.

HPI continues to build capacity in the training program with gender awareness for livestock extensionists and village promoters around the world. The WiLD program will share strategies for encouraging women's participation in livestock projects at the NGO Forum/UN Conference on Women in Beijing (August-September 1995). WiLD has also organized a workshop in Chengdu, China (August 1995) to teach participatory gender analysis to livestock extensionists from China, India, Vietnam, the Philippines and Tanzania. Previously, the WiLD program has carried out "gender analysis" workshops in the Andean Region, in Kenya, and rural New York state. Follow up to the WiLD workshop in Kenya, which was attended by several extensionists from Uganda, is being carried out by Margaret Makuru, the HPI training coordinator in Uganda.

WiLD has undertaken a case study on the impact on women of HPI's dairy projects in Kenya. The field interviews are completed, and will be written in narrative form and published as a resource for livestock trainers.

### **(c) Training**

Training is a very important part of all HPI projects, and is budgeted for and planned as part of every project. In 1994, six percent of HPI's entire budget was spent on technical training. HPI has made a commitment to develop a comprehensive approach to training in the international program (including the USA), and this is reflected in the fact that a full time director of training was put on staff in 1993.

There have been two short workshops, the "Start Up Workshop" has already been reported on in section "a" above. Also, headquarters staff held a one day workshop to work on the "HPI Model for Holistic Planning and Management", which is seen as an important part of strengthening and solidifying HPI's overall approach and capacity for planning and managing for sustainable development. The Director of Training gives considerable time to developing this model and is writing a book for eventual training

of all field staff in this model. As a part of this process, the Director of Training attended a conference on Holistic Resource Management (HRM) in New Mexico. We have a good working relationship with the Center for HRM for dialogue and some possible joint work.

The Director of Training conducted a training needs survey of all field staff and compiled the results for sharing with the entire department. This gives guidance to Program Directors and Country Representatives for planning how to upgrade staff competency for the jobs done by field reps and staff. The Training Director also is invited to give short training sessions to team meetings of representatives on an ongoing basis. One such workshop, on "Training the Trainer" was carried out in October in Little Rock for many of the field staff, and others meetings have been held with regional teams, i.e. the USA team, the Latin America team and the Asia/South Pacific team. Though these activities are not all charged to the grant, they are a part of ongoing efforts to upgrade and strengthen our staff capacity to carry out the complicated job of participatory development work.

International Program Department staff hold two "Think and Talk" meetings a year, on specific topics where we feel the need to improve our competence, and we also do SOS sessions (Set Our Sights), as part of ongoing team building and in-service training for staff.

**(d) Logistical Support**

Other than planning and coordination for trips to the field, and of the above mentioned workshops, there is not much to report regarding logistical support. The logistical aspects to this program are quite straightforward.

**(e) Technical Assistance**

Though there is budget for outside consultants in the budget, this resource has not been needed yet. This will come into play principally when some of the materials development is more advanced, such as writing, editing, and artwork, as well as the scheduled evaluations. We hired one consultant, an expert researcher and experienced development professional, to help with the literature search regarding manuals on participatory development training.

**(f) Project fund-raising and marketing**

There are encouraging signs that HPI fund raising is picking up this year. At the mid point in 1995, income is about \$400,000 above last year at this time. HPI is now in a strong position, with an excellent Executive Director, strong teams in all departments, and consistency in the Resource Development and Education Department. Superb fund raising tools have been developed, including a world-class promotional video, "Legacy for Efrain", which has footage from both Bolivia and Uganda. We encourage

anyone who is interested in HPI to see this film., which has won several awards. In follow up to that, this year two more specialized videos are being produced, one aimed at Children, "The Promise", and another (yet untitled) on Women in Livestock Development (Wild).

Regarding HPI funding for the matching portion of the Bolivia and Uganda programs, it is obvious from the financial report that we are more than matching the amounts called for in the agreement. Strong project support is received from partner groups in England and Ireland for the Uganda program, and HPI constituency has a solid commitment to the program in Bolivia. For example, for the llama project with Ketchuaymara in Bolivia, we are appealing to and working with members of the American Llama Association. So far members from that grouping have donated over \$20,000 towards that project, and are interested in continuing over the long haul. We will probably organize a study tour of American llama raisers to visit that project as a part of this marketing strategy.

**(g) Role of the Board of Directors**

HPI's Board is interested in progress of the entire HPI program and receives information regarding this cooperative agreement. The Board role is to set policy, and strictly follows the practice of not interfering in program management. HPI does have a general policy to not become dependent on government funding by not receiving more than 25% of its total funding from US Government sources. Last year (1994) the percentage was 4%.

**(h) Development Education**

HPI believes it is our responsibility to inform HPI partners and donors about how to become responsible global citizens. Each year, thousands of churches and schools use HPI educational resources to educate people of all ages about the environment, poverty, sustainable consumption and other world hunger issues.

Hundreds of volunteers and staff make presentations to religious group, schools and civic organizations. More than 30,000 visitors a year take part in hands-on education at HPI's three Learning and Livestock Centers, where a variety of programs teach concerned people about the root causes of hunger and poverty and the way animals - and people - can make a difference. In 1994 19% of HPI's resources were spent on global education.

***2. For each of the above, provide a comparison of actual accomplishments with those originally proposed for the period of the report.***

See following page

<b>Proposed Accomplishments - Year One</b>	<b>Actual Accomplishments</b>
Startup Workshop	Oct., 1994
Field visits to both countries	Completed, Jan, Mar, Ap, '95, by headquarters staff
Evaluation and re-planning of training programs	Completed - Jan - Uganda, March - Bolivia
One trip to meet with PVC Program Officer	June, 1995
Detailed Implementation Plan	Done Jan-March, submitted to AID in June
Submit financial reports on time	Done on time for first three quarters
Literature search on participatory training	Done between Feb.-May, '95
Survey of Training Needs of field staff	Done, Oct./Nov., '95
Publish/distribute EXChange quarterly	Done, three quarters, next due in August
Hire field staff	Done, Feb. - March, '95
Staff training and consultations	Done, throughout the period

## **-VI. Financial Report**

### *1. Provide completed, updated project financial overview*

The financial report is found on the following page.

The HPI Financial Overview is Appendix 8.

Project Agreement start date was August 20, 1994

**A. Financial Profile of the Project**

Project Elements	Three Year Budget		Year One through May, '95 AID		Year One thru May, 95 HPI	
	AID	HPI	Budget	Expended	Budget	Expended
<b>HEADQUARTERS</b>						
(1)Salaries	141,000	132,000	47,000	30,068	40,000	24,710
(2)Travel	41,000	19,000	12,000	9,520	4,000	433
(3)TIS*	30,000	30,000	10,000	2,864	10,000	3,591
(4)Training	17,000	6,000	8,000	351	2,000	
(5)Publications*	19,000					
(6)Train. tools*	8,000	5,000	4,000	760	2,000	1,371
(7)Consultants*	16,000		3,000	800		
(8)Evaluation	33,000	12,000				
Headqtrs. Total	305,000	204,000	84,000	42,220	58,000	30,105
<b>BOLIVIA</b>						
(9)Salaries	81,000	87,000	21,000	17,392	25,000	
(10)Travel	15,000	15,000	5,000	2,571	5,000	
(11a)Project grants		285,000			95,000	90,165
(11b)Field Advances				7,215		
(12)Office Expenses	10,000	13,000	3,500	2,571	4,000	
(13)Training and TA	42,000		12,000	1,786		
(14)Publications	7,000					
Bolivia Totals	155,000	400,000	41,500	31,535	129,000	90,165
<b>UGANDA</b>						
(15)Salaries	86,000	187,000	25,000	14,051	45,000	26,900
(16)Travel	15,000	30,000	5,000	3,906	10,000	
(17a)Project Grants		268,000			135,000	593,751
(17b)Field Advances				1,230		76,844
(18)Office Expenses	10,000	15,000	3,500	1,888	5,000	
(19)Training & TA	35,000		12,000	4,037		
(20)Publications	9,000					
Uganda Totals	155,000	500,000	45,500	25,112	195,000	697,492
<b>SUB TOTALS</b>	<b>615,000</b>	<b>1,104,000</b>	<b>171,000</b>	<b>98,867</b>	<b>382,000</b>	<b>817,762</b>
Indirect @ 22%**	135,000	243,000	29,788	17,223	66,544	142,454
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>750,000</b>	<b>1,347,000</b>	<b>200,788</b>	<b>116,090</b>	<b>448,544</b>	<b>960,216</b>
<b>AID + HPI</b>		<b>2,097,000</b>				<b>1,076,306</b>

\*these line items, totaling 73,000, are grouped as "Procurement" in the approved AID budget  
 \*\*1992 rate of 17.42 used, pending word from AID audit review office of 1994 rate

*2. Compare the proposed budget with actual expenditures, both AID and PVO, for all project years to date, and provide update estimates for remaining project years. Discuss any actual and/or anticipated variance from the proposed budget line items.*

The budget is behind anticipated expenditures for the first year. However, now that all plans for training, materials development and staffing are in place, the rate of expenditures is picking up to the expected level. The two additional staff persons were not hired until well into the second quarter of the grant year. Also, it is logical that expenditures will be greater in the second and final years of the grant due to two rather large budget items: the mid term evaluation will take place in year two, training materials development and production will start to pick up in year two and be greatest in year three, and training workshops and seminars will be greater from now on. In fact, the Uganda staff have projected a training plan that exceeds presently anticipated budget. This will necessitate efforts on the part of HPI to search for more matching funds and/or modify the training plan as we proceed to come in under available budget. We are not anticipating any significant variance in any of the line items, though the AID audit office will act soon to authorize the higher indirect cost rate. The proper documentation for both 1993 and 1994 have been submitted on time, but HPI has not yet received notification of such authorization.

*3. Discuss the status, usual timing and rate of letter-of-credit drawdowns. Provide analysis and explanation of any actual and/or anticipated changes in the rate of drawdown as well as cost overruns or unusually high expenses.*

Three quarterly Financial Status Reports and Federal Cash Transaction Reports have been filed with the USAID Office of Financial Management. All have been filed on time and reimbursements have been received promptly. In addition, a Modification of the Cooperative Agreement has been received from the FAO Branch, Office of Procurement increasing the obligated amount of the grant to \$500,000, extending the time until August 19, 1996. No cost overruns or unusually high expenses are anticipated for the next period.

*4. Provide a brief discussion of fund-raising plans and activities; main sources, status, and actual or anticipated problems, if any.*

Matching funds to meet HPI's obligations to this program plan are supplied from normal fund raising and budgeting within HPI headquarters. The core budgets for the country programs are guaranteed from this source. In addition, fund raising is carried on within each country to augment overall HPI fundraising. As has been noted, the Uganda program benefits greatly from its relationship to several sister organizations in Ireland and England which make shipments of high quality dairy animals to Uganda.

**5. Provide a discussion of PVO cost-share; status, any actual or anticipated problems in meeting agreed cost-share, annual and total. Corrective measures planned or taken.**

As can be seen from the financial profile on the following page, HPI has already met more than 70% of its cost-share goal for this three year cooperative within the first year. The only problem we anticipate will be in the ability to carry out all the desired objectives of each country program, in terms of trainings, materials, and staff coverage, given the fact that the amount that was approved by USAID was approximately half of the original proposal to USAID. Obviously, HPI has readjusted plans and objectives, but that does not negate the reality that we had worked on plans that were more comprehensive and would have accomplished more with higher funding levels..

## **VII. Lessons Learned and Long-Term Project Implications**

### **1. Estimates of project costs and benefits**

HPI has a long term interest in costs and benefits in projects, and particularly that each farmer is given the chance to have a profitable enterprise by participating in the projects. There are some marked differences between projects which use imported, high-yielding dairy cows (Uganda), and other projects in Bolivia and Uganda that use locally purchased cattle, or smaller livestock like goats, sheep, guinea pigs, poultry, or llamas. The high-yielding dairy cattle are a tremendous resource to the small-holder in Uganda, giving the farmers an opportunity to greatly increase their incomes. In fact, it is very common to see families building new houses in the second or third year after receiving the cow. This is because these cattle will produce 15 - 20, and even up to 35 liters of milk a day. Some of the best producing cows in all of Uganda are found with HPI project families. The cost is relatively high per family, but so is the benefit in these cases. On the other hand, with the purchase of less costly livestock in the country, the immediate benefit may not be so high in terms of income.

The Kisinga Dairy Goat Project in Uganda is an interesting case. Though these improved dairy goats were also imported from Ireland and England, the cost is obviously lower than that of cattle. A detailed case study based on a survey (interviews) of the 88 women farmers who participate in this project is attached. Appendix 6. In terms of benefits, this study shows, that income is generated from the goats through sale of milk and offspring. Women receiving goats in 1993 have earned an average of US\$47.60, and goats received in 1991 have generated an average of \$132 for the farmers. It is possible for the women to generate a net profit from the goats even after one kidding. Of course, we are looking at sale of excess milk and animals. The greater benefit to the families is milk consumption for the families who, in this study, have an average of six children. It was found that each family supports an average of two additional dependents. Also, of the 88 women surveyed, 22 women were single, and thus heading up households and responsible for the children as well as all of the farming work.

## ***2. Institution building assessment***

Building capacity within the partner organizations in Bolivia and Uganda is one of the main aims of the program. It is to this end that much of the training is carried out with extensionists and managers of the NGOs and membership organizations. For example, in May the Uganda team carried out a workshop on “Leadership Skills and Project Sustainability” for 45 extensionists and community organization leaders in Uganda. Areas covered included reporting and record keeping, budgeting and control, project sustainability, and organization. The Bolivia HPI office plans to do a similar workshop, though concentrating more on skill building in leadership, facilitation and training for all partner organizations. HPI puts strong emphasis on working patiently with the *campesino* associations, as the best strategy toward sustainability.

The cooperative agreement is designed to help build HPI’s institutional capacity, and this is happening on the global level, as well as in the two specific country programs where the grant is being applied.

## ***3. Estimate of Sustainability***

In both country programs, the aim is help both individual farmer participants and the community associations to which they belong to become self-reliant. This is one of HPI’s cornerstones, and is discussed frequently with the project groups and partner organizations. The passing of the gift system is HPI’s greatest contribution to the whole discussion about sustainability, and this has been going on for many years.<sup>1</sup> There are numerous examples where local groups and communities continue with this system long after HPI has left the scene.

One notable example on sustainability and continuation of benefit was observed by the Director of Training during the recent evaluation in Bolivia. About 10 years ago, HPI had made a small shipment of tropical hair sheep to Bolivia, and these animals were placed with several local institutions and farmers. It was encouraging now to see dozens of small flocks of quality hair sheep being cared for by (mostly women) farmers in the resettlement areas of Berlin and San Julian. The “animal capital” has been built up so that the families have a reserve in case of emergencies, and also an yearly benefit from the sheep in terms of occasional sales and meat consumption. With this modest input of animals and training, what was put in place in years past is now a permanent and sustained economic and health resource for those people. And the number of families benefited grew from a handful to over a hundred.

Ideas under discussion or being implemented in various forms and places in the Uganda and Bolivia programs include,

- -farmers, in addition to the pass-on, contribute a bull to the group or project. In case of dairy goats, the arrangement is that after the sale of each kid, 1/3 of the money is handed over to the project for operational and training costs.

- -project groups look to sources of funding other than HPI, especially local governmental resources,
- -project groups are being encouraged to move toward the formation of cooperatives, giving members a stronger possibility on the economic side, especially the prospects for credit,
- -project groups are mobilizing for more membership in savings and credit schemes, or funds are raised through membership and annual fees of the organizations. allowing for the organizations to provide more services such as farm supply shops, and production inputs.
- -revolving funds are being activated in projects,
- -local fundraising functions involving politicians, institutions and local communities are encouraged,
- -continued education, training and discussion of the issues surrounding sustainability.

#### ***4. Benefit distribution, 5. Local participation, and 6. Leadership***

Information about this has already been covered in section IV, as well as in some of the above questions in this section ,and detailed in the appendices. The original logical framework is attached as Appendix 7.

Overall, in this reporting year, 1,140 families were direct beneficiaries of livestock distribution and training - that is these families received one of more animals, the training and participation in management of livestock, technical assistance and extension services, and, in some cases, other inputs such as seedlings or inputs from a revolving fund. Over 60% of all of these direct participants are women. In addition, many other farmers attended training events, field days, basic courses, and workshops. Again, between 55 and 65% of these participants were women.

The Bolivia evaluation highlighted the importance of training in both technical and leadership skills areas. The grant is helping HPI to focus on our special niche in training, - participatory training in the technical area of livestock management, which at the same time develops peoples' basic skills in leadership and organization development.

Participation in sustainable development is the key focus of the whole program, and the training is aimed at helping to increase capacity at several levels; 1) the grassroots farmers, 2) community and group leadership (animators, *tecnicos*, elected group leaders), 3) partner organization extensionists and trainers, and 4) HPI headquarters and field staff. So far, we are on track and can verify that this is being accomplished.

### ***7. Innovation and technology transfer***

Introduction of zero grazing technology has been an innovation in most areas where HPI has projects in Uganda. This technology package includes care and handling of the animals and milk production. It also covers care and feeding of the cow and calf, establishment of improved pastures which include both grasses and legumes, use of trench or vegetative contours on sloping land to conserve the soil and planting of nitrogen fixing trees for use as firewood, for soil improvement and as a fodder crop. HPI's model of development is well known in Uganda by both official and non-government development programs, and the local USAID mission has both supported the HPI program and used it as a site visit and demonstration of an effective project.

In Bolivia, the technology is adapted to the tropical lowlands or the high plateaus, according to the constraints and needs of each context. Stress is put on conservation technologies in all areas, especially planting trees and agroforestry farming methods. Training for integrated land use and production includes ally cropping, use of nitrogen-fixing trees for soil improvement and fodder, windbreaks, and use of manure. The innovative part of HPI's program in Bolivia are in the participatory training area, and the efforts to help farmers in the tropical area do land use planning.

### ***8. Policy Implications***

HPI has demonstrated in both countries that giving inputs of livestock, training and appropriate technology to small holders is an effective way to bring about sustainable development. HPI is very concerned with the general reduction of funding for agriculture, and especially for the neglect of and lack of appreciation for the importance of livestock in rural development. We are doing all we can to bring information to government officials and policy makers in this country and internationally, in an effort to help them see this reality. Agriculture needs bio-diversity, including varieties of crops, forages, trees, and animals in order to be really sustainable and profitable. HPI has a strong interest in disseminating information about sustainable development, and does so through distribution and sales of our book, "Livestock for a Small Earth: The Role of Animals in a Just and Sustainable World".

### ***9. Collaboration/networking with other agencies.***

Collaboration is an important component of HPI's international program in general, but also of the programs in each of these countries. On a global level, HPI is a key player in the SANREM-CRSP funded by USAID. The management entity for this CRSP is the University of Georgia, and many a large variety of other Universities and NGOs are involved in this, and HPI has a number of sub-contracts for work in Philippines, Ecuador and for the Global Evaluation and Monitoring, as well as participation on the technical committee and board.

In Uganda, HPI works very closely with the Church of Uganda which carries out projects in several of its dioceses. HPI also collaborates very closely with Send A Cow (SAC) of England, and BOTHAR, or Ireland, and shares some staff and offices with SAC. Besides this, HPI and Habitat for Humanity are about to enter into a collaboration in Western Uganda, where HPI will work on the production side with people who Habitat is helping to build houses, thus providing the income necessary for people to pay for their houses. HPI also has close working relationships with all the partner NGOs that implement the HPI projects, as well as several government departments, most notably the Ministry of Cooperatives. The HPI Country Rep in Uganda is in continuous contact with USAID's Uganda mission, and has had the confidence of the local mission in the past for using local mission funds in a bio-digester project (now completed).

In Bolivia there is close coordination with Christian Veterinary Mission for the training program. Also, the offices of HPI in Santa Cruz are the same building with several other NGOs, including Mennonite Economic Development Association, World Concern, Lutheran World Relief and several local NGOs. This is by design, to allow for joint programming and close coordination and networking. Also, in Santa Cruz the collaboration with the British Tropical Mission (a British government agency), is continuous and very fruitful. HPI also works closely with the InterAmerican Development Foundation, as that agency channels funds to UNAPEGA, with the assurance of HPI's continuing close follow-up. Similarly, HPI's partners in the Chapare have received assistance from the USAID mission in Bolivia to construct a processing plant for tropical fruit, as a part of the coca substitution effort of the US government. USAID considers HPI's close accompaniment of that situation to be very important.

#### *10. Replication potential of project approach and activities*

HPI is putting much emphasis on the development of two products that we expect to have much impact and replication throughout our program and with other NGOs in rural development. The first is HPI's model for holistic planning and management, based on the accountability system that was developed with the help of the last matching grant HPI received from AID. The accountability system, based on twelve cornerstones for just and sustainable development, is used worldwide in HPI's program today. The book, *Livestock for a Small Earth: The Role of Animals in a Just and Sustainable World*, was published in 1994 and describes HPI's approach to development. The "MODEL" will describe in more detail how we do it.

Secondly, the manual which is being written and will be printed in Bolivia, after much consultation with program staff, will be an important addition to HPI's resources for field staff, partner NGOs and international colleague agencies. We are not implying that a training methodology and model developed in Bolivia can be transferred as is into a completely different context. There will be need to develop approaches and materials in both countries according to the needs and context. However, we do hope

that with cross-fertilization and learning from each other, we will be able apply the same principles to our training approach so as to develop and publish materials that will have a broad application in the global program.

## **VIII. Recommendations**

The evaluations conducted in Bolivia and Uganda of the training programs in those counties contain a number of recommendations directed at HPI country offices and the project level. These are found in the appendices, and will not be repeated here. Each recommendation has been reviewed by staff. Some have been felt to be not feasible to implement after further study and debate, (such as doing a zero-grazing video in Uganda). Most of the recommendations are being worked on in-country.

In addition to these, here are several on our main recommendations regarding projects:

### **To project leadership,**

1. Formation of cooperative societies or other organizations for marketing should be encouraged.
2. Implement procedures for assuring financial self-sustainability of the organizations, such as in addition to passing on a heifer calf, each farmer should pass on a bull.
3. Projects should plan for sustainability from their inception. Project groups can charge an entrance fee, membership or annual subscription fee.
4. There is need for continued education and accompaniment of the farmers through the process of the project (inception, planning, implementation and evaluation), through field days, workshops, visits and other communications.
5. Always train for broad based participation and leadership, increasing the number of people with capacity to function as leaders, locally available technicians.

### **To HPI Project management and donors,**

At this point we do not have any major recommendations for changes in the project design or implementation plan., though here are several ideas that may be considered within the constraints of resources:

1. As a part of the make up of the mid-term evaluation team, choose a consultant with special capability in participatory training and assessment of training programs, especially with a livestock component.
2. Given the time and funds expended in evaluations and case studies, effort should be made to structure discussions and learning sessions using these reports/studies.

3. Set up an opportunity for a thorough discussion of what HPI means by “participatory training”, given different experiences, skills, and expectations amongst staff. One opportunity for this would be in early 1995 in East Africa when Dr. Susan Stewart, CVM collaborator with HPI in Bolivia, will be in East Africa. If possible, some headquarters staff will be there at the same time.

**To HPI Country Offices:**

1. Do a follow-up meeting at the end of 1995 or early 1996 to review all the recommendations of the evaluations of training programs carried out in 1995 in Uganda and Bolivia, in order to assess which recommendations have been worked on, and progress with each. Make a written report to the respective Program Directors on this review.

2. Carry out an impact assessment (case study) in Bolivia on one project, with special attention to cost/benefit, effect on families and women, and sustainability.

4. Produce an “interim” report on the long term case study being conducted in Uganda, as an input for guidance of the Uganda program.

5. Continue to work on the issues related to sustainability of development benefits after HPI’s withdrawal. As experience unfolds, write up policy guidelines that can be shared and discussed throughout the international program.

6. As a part of each offices year end review and report, the HPI teams in Bolivia and Uganda should assess how much ecologically sound practices and environment issues are being addressed in this programs. As a result, make recommendations on how to improve, and if additional human or financial resources are needed for this.

7. Explore the feasibility of working in collaborative relationships with other NGOs and governmental agencies to solve the problem of marketing. This may mean developing a pre-proposal for a collaborative and inter-agency project.

## **DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

---

### **Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation**

#### **Matching Grant Program**

#### *Heifer Project International*

*Cooperative Agreement No. FAO-0158-A-OO-4026-00*

### **I. PROJECT PURPOSE**

---

The purpose of the agreement program is to strengthen HPI's capacity to assist partner NGOs and grassroots organizations to promote sustainable development.

### **II. PROJECT GOALS/OBJECTIVES**

---

Goal: The goal of the program is to enable small-scale farm families to improve their capacity to feed themselves, care for their land, and profitably integrate livestock into regenerative agriculture practices.

### **III. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN SUMMARY**

---

General: HPI Country Offices in Bolivia and Uganda work with local NGOs and community-based organizations to carry out rural development projects. All HPI supported projects use livestock and training as the tools to stimulate group and community development. The objectives of each project vary according to need, but in general it can be said that all projects aim to improve the standard of living for small-scale farm families, first increasing nutritional intake and then generating income from the production and sale of livestock products and other direct benefits of livestock, such as draft power, manure, and fiber.

Most projects in Bolivia are with settlers in the tropical lowlands of Eastern Bolivia as well as some projects in the "alti-plano" (high plateau), and are families with very scarce resources. The greatest constraints for small-scale producers is the lack of credit, as well as the high potential for environmental damage to their land using traditional methods and practices.

In Uganda, the farmers, a high percentage of whom are women, are living on and trying to produce livelihoods with very small plots of land (2 to 6 acres), and are at a great disadvantage to do so unless they can farm very intensively. High density of population and the danger of degradation from overgrazing and other unsustainable farming practices are potential constraints. Efficient and effective management systems for small-scale production are needed for Sustainability.

## **Specifics Objectives**

1. Help farm families in Bolivia and Uganda to improve their conditions of living through projects that use livestock, training and sustainable agricultural practices as appropriate to each situation.
2. Develop a resource manual that utilizes the participatory approach for training in technical areas.
3. Increase the capacity of HPI country offices in Bolivia and Uganda to carry out effective training.
4. Increase the capacity HPI partner organizations in these countries to carry out sustainable development projects through training.
5. Increase the capacity of HPI in-country staff and partner organizations in Bolivia and Uganda to do participatory planning and evaluation.
6. Increase the capacity of HPI headquarters and field staff from other countries, especially in the regions (Latin America and East Africa) in areas of training methods, sustainable agriculture, gender concerns, and planning/evaluation.

## **Country Objectives**

### ***Uganda -***

1. Assist 1,000 farm families to greater self reliance through projects using livestock and training.
2. Improve the capacity of 14 local NGOs to work effectively with livestock development projects, by training extensionists and project leaders.
3. Improve HPI in-country staff capacity to facilitate training, planning, monitoring and evaluation with partner organizations and farmer groups.
4. Develop and publish training materials, including field manuals, handouts, and flip charts in order to be more effective in work with grassroots farmer organizations, NGOs and government extension staff.

### ***Bolivia:***

1. Assist 900 farm families to increase their capacity to manage their land and livestock in both the tropical and highland areas of Bolivia.
2. Improve the capacity of 12 local NGO and grassroots membership organizations in the skills of participatory training, and other needs as defined by the participants (i.e. gender analysis, evaluation, etc.)

3. Based on past experience, further develop and write a manual on participatory training, with particular attention to application of this methodology to technical training for small-scale livestock producers.
4. Improve the capacity of HPI Bolivia staff and colleagues from Christian Veterinary Mission to facilitate training, planning, monitoring and evaluation.
5. Publish the participatory training manual and test it for applicability and adaptability to other areas where HPI works.

#### **IV. TRAINING COMPONENT**

---

The main thrust of this cooperative agreement is to strengthen HPI's training program. The Director of training coordinates with respective program staff in headquarters and the field to strengthen the overall training capacity of the International Program Department (both in the field and at headquarters). The grant provides resources for staff training, workshops and seminars for partner organizations, materials development and publication, and evaluation of the overall program generally and the training component, specifically.

#### **V. MANAGEMENT**

---

Overall authority and responsibility for the grant rests with the Director of International Programs, James DeVries. The Director of Training, Jerry Aaker, is the coordinator of the grant on an ongoing basis. He works with the respective Program Directors for Africa, Dan Gudahl, and Latin America, Jim Hoey, (at headquarters in Little Rock), and with their Program Assistants, Cindy Walla for Africa and Alma Sommerhill for Latin America, to assure adequate monitoring and communication with the country representatives in Uganda and Bolivia. Program Directors are responsible for program management in their respective regions, including strategic planning, budgeting, programs monitoring, and supervision of country representatives. The IDP (International Program Department) has three professional positions that support the Program Directors. These are the Director of Training, Director of Evaluation, Jennifer Shumaker, and the Coordinator of the Women in Livestock Development (WiLD) program, Beth Miller.

Country Representatives, Bernard Muyeya in Uganda and Roger Hinajosa in Uganda, have responsibility and authority to implement the agreed upon program strategies within the approved budgets for each country. In turn, they have several field staff that work directly with the various project groups. In Uganda and Bolivia, a staff person has been added to each office for purpose of training coordination and development.

#### **VI. MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

---

HPI headquarters formally tracks project activity through semi-annual progress and financial reports from each project. The Country Representatives routinely forward their office financial and progress reports to headquarters. Country representatives follow the progress of each project through correspondence and regular visits.

The Director of Evaluation helps in-country staff to carry out country program evaluations every three or four years. In the case of Bolivia and Uganda, these are scheduled to take place during the course of the grant. In both countries this will coincide with the mid-term evaluation of the matching grant, taking advantage of the availability of an external consultant to help look at many aspects of the program. HPI has developed an evaluation system, which includes training local staff and partners in participatory evaluation, so that evaluation is a learning process and useful for management and replanning.

The mid-term evaluation is scheduled for May, 1996. This will provide an opportunity for HPI to do an thorough program review in each country. A scope of work will be drafted and shared with PVC for comments and suggestions.

## **VII. TIME LINE/SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES**

---

### **Projects**

- Project planning, implementation and monitoring with all partner organizations - ongoing throughout the period (at the beginning of 1995 there were 12 projects being supported in Uganda and 11 in Bolivia)

### **Training:**

- Startup workshop with all key headquarters and field staff in Little Rock, Oct. '94
- Training the trainer workshop, for field reps and headquarters staff, Oct. '94
- WILD consultation/conference, (gender issues) 'Oct., '94
- Hire training coordinators in Bolivia and Uganda - Feb./Mar. '95
- On going field days and short courses in all projects in Bolivia, - continuous
- Project Holders' workshop on project sustainability - Uganda, April, '95
- Project Sustainability/Reporting and Leadership workshop - Uganda, May, '95
- Communication for Participatory Development workshop - Uganda, June, '95
- Sustainable Agriculture workshops for extension staff, one each year - Uganda
- Annual Subregional Capacity Building workshop for project leaders, - four within Uganda,
- Participatory Training Methodology workshop, for partner organizations, Bolivia, Sept., '95
- Participatory Evaluation workshop for partners and HPI staff, Bolivia, Jan. '96
- Curriculum and Training Materials Development workshop, Uganda, Jan, '96
- Gender and Participatory Development Workshop, Uganda, Mar. '96
- Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation workshop, Uganda, April, '96
- Capacity building Workshops, Bolivia, (agroforestry, gender) One each in '96 & '97,
- Capacity Building workshop, for NGOs and government extensionist, Uganda, May, '97

## **Training Materials Development**

- Training Materials Development - Uganda: Flip Charts, posters, short manuals, handouts, - Start Jan.'96
- Collect a large variety livestock training films and transfer to videos
- Begin writing manual "HPI's Holistic Model for Planning and Management" - Little Rock, March '95
- Writing manual on "A Participatory Approach to Technical Training" - Bolivia, May, '95
- Literature search and review of existing materials on participatory training, Feb-April '95
- Working group review of manual on participatory training - meet in Arkansas, AP. '96
- Participatory Training Manual publication, Bolivia, July, '96
- Uganda version of participatory training manual, publication, Aug. '96
- Book on HPI's Holistic Model for Planning and Management, publish, May, '96

## **Communications and Technical Information Service**

- Exchange Newsletter, published quarterly, Feb., May, Aug., Nov.
- Technical Information sent out on demand - weekly,
- Information & articles from the program areas received for use in Exchange, periodic

## **Assessment and Evaluations:**

- Written survey of field reps around the world of training needs., Sept-Nov, '94
- Assessment of the training program in Uganda, Jan. '95
- Participatory evaluation of the training program in Bolivia, Mar. '95
- Mid-term evaluation in Bolivia and Uganda, May/June, '96
- Final Evaluation, in Bolivia and Uganda, June/July, '97.

June, 1995

Matching Grant Approved AID Expenses  
Three Year Budget

Salaries	\$308,000
Travel	71,000
Office Expenses	20,000
Training & Technical Assistance	94,000
Publication of Training tools	16,000
Procurement	73,000
Evaluation	33,000
Indirect Costs	135,000
Totals	\$750,000

HPI/AID MATCHING GRANT - CONSOLIDATED BUDGET

	USAID	HPI	TOTAL
<b>I. HEADQUARTERS</b>			
A. Salaries	141	132	
B. Travel	41	19	
C. Training	17	6	
<b>II. PROCUREMENT</b>			
A. Material Development			
Wild	8		
Training Tools	19	5	
Technical Info Service	30	30	
B. Consultants	16		
<b>III. EVALUATION</b>			
A. Annual Reviews	2	4	
B. Final			
Consultants	12		
Travel	19	4	
Other costs		4	
<b>HEADQUARTERS TOTAL</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>509</b>
<b>IV. COUNTRY PROGRAM - UGANDA</b>			
A. Salaries	82	155	
B. Travel	15	30	
C. Project Grants		300	
D. Office Expenses	10	15	
E. Training & Technical Assist.	38		
F. Publication of trng. tools	10		
<b>TOTAL - UGANDA</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>655</b>

Consolidated budget - continued			
<b>V. COUNTRY PROGRAM - BOLIVIA</b>			
A. Salaries	81	87	
B. Travel	15	15	
C. Project Grants		285	
D. Office Expenses	10	13	
E. Training & technical assist.	42		
F. Publication of trng tools	7		
<b>TOTAL - BOLIVIA</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>555</b>
<b>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>1,104</b>	<b>1,719</b>
INDIRECT COSTS @ 22%	135	243	378
<b>TOTAL MATCHING GRANT BUDGET</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>1,347</b>	<b>2,097</b>

**HPI/AID Matching Grant - Consolidated Budget**  
**Explanation of Line Items**

**I. Headquarters**

**A. Salaries:**

**Director of Training, Jerry Aaker, Current Salary: \$40,000, plus benefits. 50% charged to Matching Grant. Will have primary responsibility for overall coordination and implementation of this program. Remainder of time spent in developing training materials, training workshops, evaluations, writing, and technical assistance. Inasmuch as this grant is focused on strengthening HPI's overall training program, and he will be key to coordinating the program.**

**Coordinator of Women in Livestock Development, Beth Miller, 60% position, Current Salary: \$25,000, plus benefits. 25% charged to MG. She works on both programming and fund raising for the WiLD program in the US and other geographic areas the remainder of the time.**

**Agroforestry Specialist, Charles Crimmins, Salary: \$20,400 plus benefits. 25% to MG. He works on an organic agriculture and forestry project at HPI's International Learning and Livestock Center the remainder of time.**

**Director of Evaluation, Jennifer Shumaker, Salary \$30,000. AID funds will be used only in year three of the grant when substantial time will be given to the final evaluation.**

**B. Travel: See attached schedule which corresponds to budget**

**C. Training: \$17,000**

**1. Startup Workshop: \$2,000**

All key staff will be brought together at the beginning of the grant period, including Country Reps. and Training Coordinators from Bolivia and Uganda, to work with the headquarters staff on setting out the specific plans, targets, and roles. Most of costs for this are included in the travel budget.

**2. Workshops: - \$4,000 each, total \$12,000**  
Training the Trainer  
Gender Analysis  
Holistic Management

For HPI staff and volunteers, plus open to other NGOs to be held at HPI Learning and Livestock Center. (ILLC) Cost estimate based on past experience and rates at the ILLC, plus subsidy for some participants.

**3. Professional Development for program staff in facilitation and training skills: courses and seminars. \$3,000.**

II. PROCUREMENT  
A. Materials:

WiLD (Women in Livestock Development) training tools: \$8,000

Develop several slide sets and scripts and transfer to video for use in training. Write and publish cases studies on gender issues in livestock development. Publish pamphlets as resource tools.

TRAINING TOOLS: \$19,000

1. Training Posters development/printing: \$3,000

Develop a set of 10 to 15 posters on various livestock in development themes. Computer graphics artist- \$200 per poster, based on preliminary discussion with the artist.

2. Collecting and reproducing videos: \$1,000

Search for all available videos on animal reproduction, management, physiology, disease, biology, and species specific production, from universities, industry, etc. Target of 150 videos. Collection will be centralized, and reproductions made for distribution to livestock in development programs around the world.

3. "Livestock Handbook" printing: \$6,000

A generic guide for use in livestock development programs will be developed, including animal health, reproduction and breeding, production standards, passing on the gift for each species, and a glossary of terms. Estimate based on figures from publication of our recent book "Livestock for a Small Earth". Cost \$6 a copy, print 1,000.

4. "Trainer's Guide for Integrated Livestock Development" printing - \$6,000 for 1,000 copies.

This will be developed, field tested, and written based on the Bolivia and Uganda experience, and English version published in US.

5. Brochures, flyers, on HPI's approach to livestock development: \$2,000.

TIS -Technical Information Service: \$~~40~~<sup>30</sup>,000

Based on past experience in running TIS, which publishes the quarterly technical newsletter EXCHANGE, and distributes technical materials requested from over 40 countries. Annual cost: Copying \$6,500; EXCHANGE printing \$4,500; postage \$6,000, purchase books/journals/technical information \$3,000, = \$20,000.

B. CONSULTANTS \$16,000

1. Editing/writing of "Livestock Handbook" \$3,000

Contracting editor/writer - 15 days x \$150 = \$2,250 plus art work  
(15 illustrations and materials = \$750,

2. Editing and art work, layout, for "Trainer's Guide to  
Integrated Livestock Development" \$4,000

3. Resource person (s) in participatory training and  
development for workshops. \$200 x 20 \$4,000

5. Consultant (s) in curriculum development and participatory  
training. \$200 x 20 \$4,000

6. Computer consultant to advise on setting up and training  
staff in use of computers for desk top publishing, graphics, data  
base. \$200 x 5 \$1,000

III. EVALUATION.

A. Annual Reviews \$2,000 for local consultants to help HPI field  
staff.

B. Final Evaluation: \$12,000

Consultants - International Consultant @ \$250 x 30

Local Consultant in Bolivia and Uganda @ \$150 x 30

Travel : See attached schedule and budget.

HPI/AID MATCHING GRANT  
HEADQUARTERS BUDGET

Revised - ~~June~~, 1994 July

	Yr. 1		Yr. 2		Yr. 3		TOTALS	
	AID	HPI	AID	HPI	AID	HPI	AID	HPI
<b>I. PROGRAM Mgmt.</b>								
a) Salaries								
Dir.IPD 10%		6		7		7		20
Africa Dir. 15%		7		8		8		23
Africa PA, 15%		4		5		5		14
Lat.Am.Dir. 15%		7		8		8		23
Lat.Am.PA 15%		4		5		5		14
Dir.Trng. 50%	25		26		27		78	
Dir.Eval. 15%		9		10	11		11	19
Agroforestry specialist, 25%	7		7		8		22	
Coor.WILD 25%	9		10		11		30	
Info Coord 15%		5		7		7		19
<b>TOTAL SALARIES</b>							<b>141</b>	<b>132</b>
b) Travel	11	7	18	6	12	6	41	19
c) Training	3	2	7	2	7	2	17	6
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>289</b>
<b>II. PROCUREMENT</b>								
a) Materials:								
WILD	0	0	5	0	3	0	8	0
Trng. Tools	5	5	8	5	6	0	19	10
Tech Info Service	10	10	10	10	10	10	30	30
b) Services								
Consultants	5		6		5		16	
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>III. EVALUATION</b>								
A) Annual Review	1	2	1	2			2	4
b) Final-								
consultants					12		12	
Travel		2	3	2	16		19	4
Misc. costs		1		1		2	0	4
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>HEADQUARTERS TOTAL</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>230</b>

IV. UGANDA COUNTRY BUDGET - three years

	AID	HPI	Total
<b>A. Salaries</b>			
Country Rep	23,750	70,250	
Training Coord.	13,250	39,750	
Accountant	8,000	24,000	
Secretary	4,250	12,750	
Off. Assistant	2,750	8,250	
Training Associate (new position)	30,000		
<b>Subtotal Salaries</b>	<b>82,000</b>	<b>155,000</b>	<b>237,000</b>
<b>B. Travel</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>45,000</b>
<b>C. Project Grants</b>		<b>300,000</b>	<b>300,000</b>
<b>D. Office (rent, copies, utilities, tel. etc)</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>25,000</b>
<b>E. Training &amp; Tech Assistance*</b>	<b>38,000</b>		<b>38,000</b>
<b>F. Publication of trng. materials</b>	<b>10,000</b>		<b>10,000</b>
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>155,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>655,000</b>

\*Training - Regional Workshop for capacity building for NGOs and grassroots organizations, = \$8,000

-Curriculum Development Workshop in Uganda = \$5,000

-Local consultants, trainers, writers, artist, for developing and writing training materials, and testing them \$50 day x 200 = \$10,000

-Trainings in project areas to train project leaders and members farmers in integrated systems of farming, leadership and management. ~~\$15,000~~  
11,000

-Gender Analysis and Integrating the Family Workshop = ~~\$1,000~~ \$500

V. BOLIVIA COUNTRY BUDGET - three years

	AID	HPI	Total
<b>A. Salaries</b>			
Country Rep (20,000 year)	30,000	30,000	60,000
Trainer (9,000 a year)	27,000	0	<sup>27</sup> <del>30</del> ,000
Extensionist (8,000 a year)	18,000	6,000	24,000
Extensionist (4,000 a year)	6,000	6,000	12,000
Office staff		45,000	
<b>Sub Total Salaries</b>	<b>81,000</b>	<b>87,000</b>	<b>168,000</b>
<b>B. Travel - attached</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>
<b>C. Project Grants</b>		<b>285,000</b>	<b>285,000</b>
<b>D. Office Expenses (rent, utilities, tel. etc)</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>13,000</b>	<b>23,000</b>
<b>E. Training &amp; Tech Assist*</b>	<b>42,000</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>F. Publications of trng materials</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>155,000</b>	<b>400,000</b>	<b>555,000</b>

Training\*

- One workshop a year for capacity building of local NGOs and grassroots organizations: \$5,000 each  
= \$15,000
- Curriculum Development (writers) workshop  
= \$5,000
- Develop & write a "Trainers Guide to Participatory and Sustainable Development" and other training tools, contract local writers, artist, technical specialists,  
\$50 day x 200 = \$10,000
- Trainings in project areas for project leaders and farmers in integrated systems, leadership and management. = \$10,000

## Appendix 2

# HPI UGANDA: An Assessment of the Training Program

January, 1995

Jerry Aaker  
Jim DeVries

An assessment of the HPI's training program in Uganda was carried out between January 23 -27, 1995. This is an important part of HPI's current effort to improve its overall training program with support from the AID Training Grant. The field work under this grant is taking place in Uganda and Bolivia.

### Method

The assessment started with discussions with HPI-Uganda program staff,<sup>1</sup> as well as administrative personnel. Meetings were also held with the personnel of Send-A-Cow, including Chris Ochen, Send a Cow (SAC) National Supervisor, Uganda, Fred Katende, Assistant National Supervisor, and Robert Vere, Overseas Program Director from the UK. Various meetings were also set up with funding and collaborating organizations, such as USAID, the Uganda Co-operative Alliance, the Church of Uganda, and Habitat for Humanity.

A workshop was conducted on January 24th in Kampala with participation of 25 persons who are connected in one way or another with the HPI program in Uganda. The purpose of the workshop was to solicit the input from various people who could critique the current training program and generate ideas for future improvements. The participants included extensionists from partner organizations, professional resource people from Makerere University, colleagues from similar programs, staff from SAC and HPI, both Uganda based and from the headquarters. The following was the agenda covered during this workshop:

- What results are we trying to achieve from training?
- Strengths and key vulnerabilities of the current program.
- Opportunities for improvement.
- Indicators of training effectiveness.
- Recommended actions for the future.

Finally, several project visits were made: Kirenya Woman's Project and Namerembe Diocese (both near Kampala), and the Bunyoro-Kitara Diocese project around Hoima (Western Uganda). In these visits we saw individual farmers as well as met with the groups and

---

<sup>1</sup>. Bernard Muyeya, Country Representative and Margaret Mukuru, HPI/SAC Training Coordinator.

project holder representatives, observing and asking about the impact of the overall project on their lives, with special attention to the training they have received.

The findings and recommendations arising from these activities are as follows:

**Major Findings:**

1. The current training program in Uganda is well coordinated by the HPI/SAC Training Coordinator, Dr. Margaret Makuru. Her main role is to supervise the overall training program, working principally with project extensionists. This includes planning, budgeting and monitoring the implementation of training and extension activities.
2. The Coordinator's time for training and supervision is allocated according to the needs and problems of the projects, including the preparations of project participants for pending shipments. Her time has been quite evenly distributed between HPI and SAC up to this point.
3. The training is packaged into units for the learning of skills and knowledge that the farmers are required to master, i.e. forage and pastures, shed construction, health and tick control, etc. Attempts are made to involve the farmers in their own learning through discussion and demonstrations. Some of the training for extensionists has included training methods, though it appears that the training skills of the various extensionists varies and continual upgrading in skills and knowledge is both needed and requested.
4. Training is carried out with groups (10 to 20 farmers is typical), and after a time "model farmers" are selected by the group as leadership and exemplary farming is demonstrated. These model farmers are meant to become local change agents, though more training seems to be needed with this specific group in order for them to function well in this role.
5. Training is done in local languages and by extension agents from the localities and culture of the people. These extensionists are key to the success of projects in all localities. The on-going support and sustainability of this aspect of the projects is an unresolved issue. There is currently no commonly shared and accepted strategy to attain this ideal - i.e. the sustainability of the development process once funding terminates.
6. Workshops for extensionists are the primary method to assure quality and standardization of the projects' approach and technology; the subjects for these training are selected by the extensionists themselves, and they appreciate these opportunities and ask for even more of these trainings.

7. Training new farmers to receive and manage improved or exotic dairy cows is given top priority, though coordinating the timing of training with the receipt of animals is often complicated. Though clearly it is impossible to plan for all contingencies, there is a need to continually coordinate between HPI, SAC, project holders and farmers, in order to decrease risks of failing to place cows in a timely manner.
8. Materials have been developed locally (list attached) with participation of HPI/SAC staff, extensionists, experts in animal husbandry, and farmers. Resource persons with skills in facilitation of training and design of participatory approaches have been used in the workshops, though no tools (booklets) have been published on this yet.
9. In the projects which were visited, the farmers demonstrated command of the skills and knowledge for successful small-scale dairying, using the zero-grazing system. Records are being kept, though they need help from the extensionists to fill in the forms. Indicators of social and economic benefit to the farm families was very evident, and even dramatic in some cases.

## **Recommendations**

### **Regarding The Training Approach:**

1. Produce new materials as defined by those working in the program, including the possibility of...
  - a. Video on zero-grazing,
  - b. Tools for gender analysis (i.e. role of women, labor division, etc)
  - c. Assess the need for a comprehensive manual on zero-grazing, though it is recommended to use the Tanzania manual for now for extensionists.
  - d. A participatory training approach manual (to be developed in conjunction with HPI Bolivia)
  - e. More handouts for farmers and flip charts for use in training,
2. Review and up-date current training materials in accordance with past experience, use, feedback from extensionists, and changing needs.
3. Study what other topics/issues should be incorporated into the training program, especially in the areas of sustainable agriculture, i.e. environment, soil conservation, etc.

### **Regarding Training and Motivation of Extensionists:**

4. Extension staff should be more aware of the details of budgets, and involved in management of projects.

5. Increase the frequency of extension training events, - the suggestion is to increase from the present two workshops to three or even four a year.
6. Sponsor some exchange visits to other projects in-country or in neighboring countries.
7. Do more training for extensionists in such areas as milk product processing and marketing, cottage industries, motivational and communication training techniques, etc.
8. Give training to extensionists in gender analysis to be sensitive to family involvement, labor divisions, etc.
9. Discuss with project holders the issue of remuneration of extensionists, including the sustainability of extension services over the long haul.

**Regarding Farmer Training:**

10. Encourage farmer competitions (awards and recognition for "best farmer", etc.)
11. Farmers should have a strong role in project committees, and in monitoring their own projects.

**General:**

12. Carry out a project holders consultation (meeting) on the issues of development sustainability; leading to policy paper covering, among others things,
  - a. How can extension and training continue after external funding?
  - b. What should be HPI and SAC policy on the length of project support and phase-out of HPI assistance?
  - c. How and to what degree can farmers support their own training and extension needs?
  - d. Local fund raising possibilities to support training.
13. Hold a workshop on "HPI's Approach to Effective Participatory Training (PT)", in order to
  - a. Review and assess the draft of a guide on Participatory training being developed in Bolivia.
  - b. Get input from the experience of a variety of trainers from Bolivia, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, HPI Headquarters, SAC.
  - c. Agree on the essential elements of a participatory approach to training, and..
  - d. Generate material for inclusion in a PT guidebook, and a specific plan for its publication

## **Workshop Input**

### **Desired Results of Training**

The workshop participants produced the following list of important results of training. These could be used as the basis to set performance measures for the evaluation of training.

#### **A. Farming Practices:**

- Awareness of and use of new practices
- Ability to conserve natural resources on the farm
- Ability to manage an improved or exotic dairy cow
- Practicing good animal management and health care
- Cost-effective production,

#### **B. Human Development:**

- Creation of effective farmer membership organizations
- Cooperation and participation evident in the group
- Improved nutrition (of family members)
- Improved income and standard of living
- A "model" and demonstration for replication by others
- Self management of projects
- Equipping people to cope with change
- Achievement of gender balance

#### **C. Training Approach:**

- Development and documentation of the training approach
- Useful and effective training materials
- Trained and motivated extensionists

## **Indicators**

Though grouped somewhat differently from the above list of desired results, these indicators do cover all of the above.

### **A. Farming Practices: (integrated animal agriculture)**

- Production/yield of crops and animals
- Reproduction efficiency
- Incidence of disease in animals
- Quality and quantity of pastures and forage
- Existence of a good farm plan

### **B. Gender:**

- Ratio of attendance in training (male and female)
- Division of labor in the family (farm and home)
- Members elevated to leadership roles (project group, church, etc)

### **C. Cooperation:**

- Number of new groups/coops established and functioning
- Membership (decrease or increase over time)
- Annual dues (contributions of farmers)
- Active participation of members in training events
- Helping others in need (examples of sharing and caring)
- Frequency and results of meetings, and number attending

### **D. Nutrition and Income**

- Incidence of nutritional deficiency related diseases
- Number of liters of milk consumed by how many in the family

- **Morbidity and mortality rates in the area**
- **Number of children of school age going to school**
- **Number of families improving present house or building new house**
- **Number of people able to make and sell by-products**

**E. Environment**

- **Soil and water conservation practices implemented**
- **Number of trees planted and woodlots established**

**F. Training**

- **Number of trainings and number attending**
- **Materials written, disseminated and used**
- **Training approach written up and able to be replicated**
- **Training of trainers courses held**

**G. Sustainability (Self-reliance)**

- **# of survivals/mortality of animals**
- **Pass-on rate**
- **Level of re-investment in the venture**
- **Other projects (for income or not) started because of the project**
- **Cooperative societies and viable groups functioning**
- **Milk production in the area and marketing of excess**
- **Degree of self support of the farmers' group**
- **# of people in "model" roles, and # who have copied their example**

## **Strengths of the Current Program in Uganda**

The training is....

- effective in helping small holders adopt sustainable farming and animal production practices,
- actively involves farmers,
- is a practical approach (uses demonstration and hands-on approach),
- achieves gender balance (women are the primary targets),
- uses appropriate and proven technology,
- creates enthusiasm and maintains interest in the projects,
- brings about uniform standards,
- utilizes local human resources and expertise,
- promotes expansion of the project in the local areas,
- prevents and/or solves locally defined problems.

## **Key Vulnerabilities of the Current Training Program**

The training...

- may not adequately allow for illiteracy or cultural variables,
- suffers from lack of funding (at times),
- intervals between trainings of extensionists may be too long and follow up is sometimes not frequent enough,
- training of farmers and delivery of animals is sometimes out of sync,
- some project holders do not place high enough priority on training,
- sustainability of training is not assured,
- lacks a full range of teaching aids, i.e. video, handouts, flip-charts, etc.
- though the training approach is quite well developed, it is not yet documented and disseminated.

## **Opportunities**

- **Orienting, motivating and training extensionists on a continuing basis,**
- **Broad based funding, i.e. the new training grant as well as searching for ways to get local support, including farmers' contribution,**
- **More training and use of "model" farmers (though name may change) for spread of benefits,**
- **Development of materials that are still lacking,**
- **Cultural and gender analysis (training in and use of)**
- **Continual assessment of resource personnel to assure appropriateness and effectiveness.**
- **Introduction of new skills, topics and refresher courses.**
- **Assessing and proposing guidelines on remuneration of extension agents.**
- **Encourage more participatory methods and techniques.**

## Follow up Actions

To: Dan, Bernard, Margaret,

From: Jerry Aaker

February 7, 1995

The following ideas were discussed when we were in Uganda, though we did not make definite decisions of the specifics of each. I list these items as some of the things I think should be high on the "to do" list. The details and specific decisions will, of course, need to be concurred to by back and forth consultation.

1. Dan and field staff should react and comment on the report, and especially on what they plan to do or not do about each recommendation.

2. Training Video.

Uganda staff, in consultation with the Director for A/NE, should make decision on the need for a training video, probably on zero-grazing, and write a proposal, including budget for filming and editing in Uganda. If total production is not possible in Uganda, we will investigate how to help with production from the States. I would estimate that we can find \$5,000 to \$7,000 in the AID grant to cover this.

Before shooting in the field, a script should be written and reviewed by Headquarters staff.

Please give us your best estimate of schedule for this.

3. Write up the plan for workshops for extensionists and HPI/SAC staff for '95 and '96, and share with headquarters. Some of the workshop topics as possibilities would be: gender analysis, writer's workshop for additional training tools, environment/agroforestry

Jim also suggest that a workshop on participatory evaluation be done Uganda, like we just did in Tanzania, which will set the basis for a program review and project evaluations in the future. Jennifer or I would need to help with this.

I would like this workshop schedule by May 1, if possible, as I will need to include in the first year report to AID.

4. Contract Training Consultant.

Bernard and Margaret are of the opinion that it will be more efficient to hire a part time consultant (rather than a full time person) for the work of coordinating trainings and help with materials development.

We encourage them to proceed with this as soon as possible. Please share the finalized job description and budget with headquarters.

5. Continue to work on further assessment of current training materials and additional needs, and make up a plan, with targets for producing these. Of particular interest will be farmer level aids, such as flip charts.

I would also like to have at least a good draft of this plan by May 1.

6. The Training Grant implementation plan calls for a workshop in Uganda to review and work with the training guide being developed with Susan Stewart's help. (recommendation 13) This would be a "Trainer's Workshop" including staff and/or partner extensionists from Kenya, Tanzania, Bolivia and Headquarters.

I will have a better ideas of when it will be feasible to schedule this after my trip to Bolivia in March. But for now, I think the target suggested by Margaret, of March, 1996 is a good one to aim at.

7. Please react to the idea of a project holder's meeting on project sustainability (recommendation 12). A draft discussion paper would need to be written first and shared within staff, and it would be good if Dan Gudahl could plan to be at such a project holder's meeting.
8. Share the results of the workshop we held on the 24th of January with the participants. Whether that is done by distributing copies of this report or a summary report is up to Bernard and Margaret.

cc: JDV

## Appendix 3

### Evaluation Summary Report

The following is a summary of the evaluation of the training program carried on in Bolivia as a joint effort of HPI and Christian Veterinary Mission. Officially the training program is known PROPECO, (translated - Community Livestock Project). The project is structured under the Bolivian NGO, Integrated Development Foundation (FIDES)

The field data collecting phase of this evaluation was carried out in between March 29 and April 11, 1995 in Bolivia.

Evaluation salient results of the evaluation are categorized according to three main focus areas, 1) application of knowledge and skills learned in training, 2) the participation of women, and 3) the training methodology.

## APPLYING KNOWLEDGE

---

### 1. Grassroots [Level]

#### Production

In all the farms visited, we found components of improved production systems and other practices, such as:

#### Agroforestry Systems

- Improved pastures, grains and leguminous plants.
- alleys, live posts, natural forest reserve and windbreaks made with natural forest and trees introduced [to the area].

#### Animal Management

- Increased and improved production and animal reproduction with generally healthy animals.
- Vaccination, deworming, genetic control and use of salts.<sup>1</sup>
- Problems exist, however, in the integrated vision of the system and the application of some knowledge, such as castration and pasture and tree maintenance.

#### Organization

- In Berlin, vaccination and deworming activities are [carried out] in an organized, communal way – organization for production – as opposed to some communities in San Julián where it is [done] individually.

---

<sup>1</sup> Chemical compound, such as in acids and bases. Not related to common salt.

- The process followed in women's group formation has positively affected grassroots organizations by [providing]:
  1. Increased assistance to meetings by both men and women.
  2. Better quality meetings.
  3. Increased the participation of grassroots [members] in their own sustainability.
  4. Better management of the organization's resources.
- There are women's groups formed and others in process [of being formed].
- Some women's groups have adopted the participative method as their own.
- The level of meeting attendance, however, has a tendency to decline after their first objective is fulfilled, such as receiving an animal.
- In Berlin, more continuity and regularity in the organization's meetings are noticeable than in San Julian, which is also affected by the lack of resources, distance, leadership, varying planning levels and organizational structure.
- The percentage of members of the grassroots organization that regularly participate in the courses is high (more than 80%), having a positive influence on the improvement of decision-making and meeting planning.

## **1.2. Technicians' [Level]**

### **Production**

- The technicians (men and women) are fulfilling many of their communities' production needs [as well as the needs from other[communities], such as:
  - a. organize and carry out vaccination [campaigns], deworming, ledgers;
  - b. castration;
  - c. animal treatment;
  - d. individual training; [and]
  - e. genetic control of animals.

These activities result in healthier and more productive animals.
- The majority of technicians are accepted by a large portion of the population, giving them only moral support, not economical[support]. [This] demonstrates that both, technicians and the community, do not reflect on their [own] role.
- There is no uniformity in charges for community technicians' services.
- The majority of technicians apply their knowledge in their own farms, to demonstrate a more integrated vision of the systems.
- Technicians are facilitators and potential resources for local and area organizations.
- A considerable amount of the knowledge on organizational [aspects] is not applied in its entirety.

- For the most part, communities do not accept the technicians' role in the organizational aspect of their community.
- In some communities, [members] still do not value their young technicians' knowledge who [in turn] are not allowed to provide training to the community.
- Some professional technicians that work in the area do not value the knowledge of community technicians. The results are detrimental to the technician's image before the community.

## **2. Participation of women**

### **Production**

- The majority of the women stated that they participate with their husbands in planning the farm.
- All women participate in decision-making and implementation of animal production.
- The majority of the women participates in the process of applying improved production systems.
- Women's participation in training courses has resulted in better production and management of livestock resources and implementation of agroforestry systems.
- There is recognition of women's participation in livestock production.

### **Organization**

- The influence of women on community organization is noticeable after [they have] participated in the project's training process.
- The difference in administrative and productive work and problem solving is evident, such as in Berlin where women have made efforts dedicated towards organizational strengthening.
- The majority of women trained participate in their community organizations' meetings.
- Women organizations are in the process of consolidating [each of] their organizations.
- All women groups are stable within their organization.
- There are more advanced groups with excellent administrative and productive management [than] the women's groups of Berlin (San Jose) and San Julian (group 22).
- The majority of the groups direct their work to animal production.
- Forty percent of [all] technicians are women; and [this] has resulted in the rise of women leaders in the communities.
- Nonetheless, it is difficult to find women that would accept the commitment to work as promoters and technicians.

- Many women and men still do not understand their possible role in community organization.
- In some communities, women's participation in the *sindicato* (union) is not accepted, especially where the project has been working (for a short period of time).

### ***Training methodology***

Technicians and grassroots [members] accept the participatory methodology and appreciate the results because it has had a positive influence on production and how meetings are carried out.

- The use of participatory methodology creates the conditions for a more integrated development of the community.
- [This] methodology facilitates the producer's participation in recognizing his/her own problems and their solution.
- [This] methodology facilitates conditions for an exchange of ideas [as well as] an environment for solving community problems from within [the community].
- The methodology facilitates the conditions for women's training (baby-sitter, female promoter, in the community, native language, transportation).
- More than 50% of workshop participants are women.
- Women accept the slow training process necessary to develop their work and carry out objectives.
- Training is open to everybody without regards to sex or if [the person] knows how to read and write.
- Workshop planning, implementation and follow-up is systematic. There are order and levels in the flow of knowledge.
- The majority of technicians and promoters have the ability to solve problems using the process of: Observing, Analyzing, Acting; facilitating for them the application of their technical knowledge.
- For the most part, project facilitators recognize the importance of listening and respecting the statements [made by] participants in the workshops.
- The process of moving the training program to the associations still has application problems for being exclusive in its conception, linking training to animal credit.
- Many professional technicians do not accept participatory methodology for the work, time and resources it requires.
- The project's methodology is not well-known by other institutions and programs working in the area.

### ***Conclusions***

PROPECO's positive results in livestock training are based on the response to a real need: Good animal management, production and reproduction. This aspect is

included in an integrated perspective that considers: family participation (including women), recognition of individual's own experience and agroforestry systems. It is necessary to explore this last aspect.

- The livestock training program has had an impact by incorporating women's training — as they are very close to the work with the animals.
- The program facilitates the conditions for women's participation in the training process.
- Applying knowledge has improved animal production, resulting in higher income and increased consumption of animal products by the families.
- The methodology and circumstances under which the training program functions helps provide the necessary conditions for grassroots organizations' self-reliance and the formation of leaders.
- The preparation and coordinated planning of workshops assigns responsibilities to all [persons] involved in the program and forms local resources from within [the community].
- The use of the native language is important because it facilitates problem analysis and solution.
- There is no systematic program that supports the associations towards self-reliance.
- Increased communication and a formal program exchange with grassroots organizations and institutions working in the areas is needed.
- Training levels vary among grassroots people and the project cannot fulfill all training needs.
- The methodology includes the use of promoters to carry out training for grassroots people and technicians. These promoters become well-trained leaders.
- Traditional, theoretical training with hands-on practice is not sufficient. The use of participatory methodology supports the exchange of ideas, the integration of local knowledge and the XXXXXXXX

### ***General Recommendations***

Because of the results obtained:

1. PROPECO should continue and explore its women-oriented training program.
2. Prepare quarterly reports written for headquarter's meetings, associations and the interinstitutional committee.
3. Have a specific plan with materials and activities for training and methodology transfer for new promoters and professionals of other institutions. Include an analysis of the reasons for popular education methodology.
4. Study the possibility of fulfilling the real training needs of previous participants according to their progress and abilities.
5. The work with women requires follow-up and redefining, according to the conditions in the different areas and with the respective associations' [participation].

### Recommendations for Basic Workshops

1. **Basic workshops should give more emphasis to the following topics:**
  - a. Organizational topics;
  - b. Awareness on production vs. raising animals;
  - c. Gender;
  - d. Marketing; [and]
  - e. Agroforestry systems implementation problems.
  
2. **PROPECO should look for new areas where we should emphasize training work at the grassroots level.**

### Recommendations for Technical-Level Workshops

1. **Prepare a follow-up plan with the associations for trained technicians. This plan should include:**
  - a. The limit for project support and the initial project support the community or association will provide;
  - b. Technicians should set goals;
  - c. Analysis of the technicians role with the community; [and]
  - d. Analysis of technicians' charges.
  
2. **Continue with the training of community and grassroots technicians to increase the number of people trained and not to depend on the work of just one technician.**

### Recommendations for working with organizations

1. **PROPECO should set aside time to analyze and redefine the work with organizations in order to prepare a work plan. The analysis should include:**
  - a. A definition of "self-reliance;"
  - b. PROPECO's role;
  - c. Alternatives for possible structures (related to animal management, nature of the benefit, purpose of the associations, services that the associations can offer to their members);
  - d. Contents of basic workshops related to organizational [aspects]; [and]
  - e. Administration workshops.

### Recommendations for other programs

1. **In every training program, it is important to use the Popular Education methodology, respecting its steps, philosophy and principles.**
2. **The programming of [training] courses should take into consideration that the technical application is a part of an entire family production system, which has an influence on the community.**
3. **All training projects should fulfill a real need experienced by the majority of the population.**
4. **Workshop programming should be systematic and shared with grassroots organizations and associations, including a training plan for their members and the benefits from the animal.**

HEIFER PROJECT INTERNATIONAL  
UGANDA PROGRAM

REPORT ON TRAINING GRANT 1 SEPTEMBER 1994 - 31 AUGUST 1995:

INTRODUCTION:

This report covers the period 1st September 1994 to 30th May 1995 with a projection of planned activities from June 1st to August 31st 1995. By the time this grant was signed, several activities were already going on and have continued. However, there has been more emphasis on training for the target groups, especially using participatory approaches. In the training curriculum, more issues on sustainable agriculture and integrated farming have been incorporated. The idea has been to address increased soil fertility which in turn could lead to food production to cater for the increasing population. So far results especially in banana production are noticeable. Related to this has been the idea of addressing environmental protection which is in line with the Government policy.

On the animal production side, milk production is increasing steadily in some projects as more farmers get more animals, training and skills to manage them.

The Assistant Training Coordinator, A. Beinempaka has been recruited on this grant (17/3/1995) and has so far gone through office orientation, reviewing of the training curriculum, producing training implementation schedule and the associated budgets. A copy of the proposed budget is attached. He has also organised and coordinated three training workshops and also compiled proceedings, two of which are attached.

TRAINING ACTIVITIES IN THE COUNTRY PROGRAM:

The training activities fall in 4 categories:

- 1) **Start Up Workshop:** Bernard and Margaret attended the Training AID Grant start up workshop in Little Rock in October 1994. Margaret also attended the WILD Consultation/Conference on gender issues.

2) At Country level, organised by Training Coordinator:

- i. HPI/SAC Extension Staff Training Workshop 12/1/1995. This was a 3 day workshop for extensionists held in Mukono District Farm Institute. It was attended by 26 Extensionists (24 male and 2 female) and covered a range of topics. These included livestock integrated into farming, breeding problems, organic matter for sustainable agriculture, Role of Extension Staff, Review of report formats and developed training materials were also covered. The workshop also included a field visit to Kirinya Women Heifer Project and to a small scale demonstration unit at the District Farm Institute where participants saw a live example of what had been discussed.

The workshop was also used to review some of the already developed training materials and also make plans for 1995. Some useful comments were given on the training materials and the individual work plans coordinated.

Facilitation was done by HPI/SAC Staff (Margaret, Bernard, Chris). An external resource person Ms. F. Kenyi from the Ministry of Agriculture & Animal Resources was also involved.

- ii. Training Needs Assessment 24th January 1994: This was a one day workshop held in Kampala and attended by 25 participants (23 males and 2 females) most of whom were project extensionists. Other participants came from partner organisations and colleagues from similar programs. It was also attended by Jim and Jerry as facilitators together with HPI/SAC Staff. (Margaret and Bernard)

The workshop looked into the HPI current Training Program with a view to generating ideas for future improvements. This was done by soliciting input from various people who could critique the current training programme. The field visit carried out also helped to assess the impact of the training farmers had received. Some useful observations and recommendations were put forward, some of which are already being implemented in an effort to improve the overall training program with support from AID Grant.

iii. **Leadership Skills and Project Sustainability Workshop**  
**28th April 1995:**

This was a one-day workshop for project holders, project leaders and extensionists held at Namirembe Guest House-Kampala. A total of 32 participants attended (22 males and 10 females). Facilitation was done by HPI Staff (Bernard, Margaret, Sam, Athanasius) and Dan Gudahl on Country visit.

The workshop focussed on Reports and Project Sustainability. It was intended to sensitize participants about the need to keep proper records and write good timely reports. It was also to pose a challenge to participants to start thinking hard about strategies for making their projects self-sustaining.

Experiences were shared and delays in report submission and how far some projects had gone in an effort to seek alternative sources of funds to support their activities. It also served as a start up for yet a more in-depth workshop at a later date to explore these issues further. A report on the Workshop Proceedings is attached.

iv. **Leadership Skills and Sustainability Workshop**  
**22-26 May 1995:**

This was a 3-day training workshop organised as a follow-up for the one held earlier. It was also attended by Project Holders, Project Leaders, Extensionists and HPI/SAC Staff at Mukono District Farm Institute.

The major topics were Records, Reports, Funds utilization and control, project sustainability. 50 participants (32 males and 18 females) attended the workshop.

Participatory Training Approaches were employed during the workshop and there was reasonable interaction. Issues concerning problems in record keeping, report writing and late submissions were exhaustively discussed and possible solutions arrived at. Practical exercises on recording and report making using the existing formats were carried out by participants to improve on their skill. Strategies for local funding and sustainability of projects were discussed in detail and those already in existence reviewed.

Resolutions were made and an action plan agreed on.

Facilitation was done by HPI/SAC Staff (Margaret, Sam, Chris, Athanasius). An external resource person, Mr B. Nsubuga, a Cooperative Officer from Ministry of Trade & Industry facilitated on Project Sustainability. A copy of the workshop proceedings is attached.

v. **Communication for Participatory Development Workshop  
12-17 June 1995:**

The 4 day workshop was organised for HPI/SAC extensionists at Mukono District Farm Institute and was attended by 25 people (23 males and 2 females). Major emphasis was on communication and participatory training techniques and how these could be used in the field to improve on the extension services. In addition, improvement of livestock production through improved dry season feed preservation, feed mixing, pasture improvement and fodder tree seedling production were discussed. Demonstrations, hand-on-exercises and field visits were used in training. These participatory methods are to be used in farmer training by the Extensionists.

Facilitation was done by HPI/SAC Staff (Bernard, Margaret, Chris and Athanasius). Mr Busulwa from FAO Dairy Project and Mr. Lulyawo, a prominent model farmer served as our resource persons also.

A timetable for the Workshop is attached and the report of the proceedings will follow soon.

3) **At Project level: Organised & Coordinated  
by the Training Coordinator:**

i. **Leadership Workshop for Kiyenje Coop. Dairy Heifer  
Project 28th December 1994.**

This was a one day training intended for project beneficiaries. A total of 81 participants (28 men and 53 women) attended.

The training focussed on group organisation skills and project sustainability, savings and credit scheme and animal management for increased production.

Margaret facilitated together with two cooperative officers from the Ministry of Trade & Industry (H. Tuhirirwe and Rwekururwe)

ii. **Leadership Workshop for Rukungiri Women's Heifer Project  
29th December 1995**

This was also a one day training workshop for 45 participants (8 men and 37 women). The focus was as for (i) above, in addition to stressing the importance of keeping records and conflict resolution in cooperative society.

Margaret with 2 Cooperative Officers (H. Tuhirirwe and F. Tiwangye) from Ministry of Trade & Industry were the resource persons.

iii. **Leadership Workshop for Central Region  
31st December 1995**

This one day workshop brought together 44 farmers and zonal leaders from the COU Projects in Central Region and Kirinya Women Heifer Project. The main emphasis was on group dynamics, cooperative societies, and record keeping. Expected outcome was improved leadership and project management skills.

Facilitation was done by Margaret and two Assistant Cooperative Officers from Ministry of Trade & Industry, C. Lule and F. Kanya.

4) **At Project level: Organised and conducted  
by Extensionists:**

These were carried out at an agreed place within the project area, depending on the nature of the topic and the activities involved. A summary of the trainings so far done and those to be done by August 31st is presented on pages 7 & 8. The topics covered throughout fall under 4 major areas:

- i. **Animal Husbandry Practices** - Introduction to Zero-grazing
  - Feeding/Animal Nutrition
  - Calf/Heifer Management
  - Shed Construction
  - Animal Health & Hygiene
  - Pasture Establishment & Management
  - Feed Conservation
  - Reproduction
  - Clean Milk Production

- Tick Control/Disease Control
- Fodder Trees
  
- ii. Environmental Protection/  
Integrated Farming
  - Tree Planting
  - Soil & Water Conservation
  - Compost Manure Making and Application
  
- iii. Leadership Skills
  - Group Formation
  - Project Management
  - Record Keeping
  - Cooperation
  - Time Management
  
- iv. Project Sustainability
  
- v. Farm Planning

SUMMARY OF TRAININGS AT PROJECT LEVEL  
DISAGGREGATED BY SEX

		S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J
1. COU LIP Kigezi Diocese	Men	-	-	57	-	62	-	-	32	22	30	36
	Wom.	-	-	24	-	32	-	-	19	15	15	17
	Days	-	-	5	-	7	-	-	4	2	3	3
Wamala Kageye	Men										50	55
	Wom.										20	30
	Days										4	4
Mukono Diocese	Men										30	30
	Wom.										30	30
	Days										3	3
Mityana Diocese	Men	-	47	20	-	-	-	75	27	60	-	-
	Wom.	-	45	22	-	-	-	115	55	60	90	70
	Days	-	4	3	-	-	-	7	3	3	4	3
Namirembe Diocese	Men	-	47	20	-	-	-	75	27	60	-	-
	Wom.	-	75	66	104	-	10	62	70	67	60	65
	Days	-	4	4	5	-	1	4	4	4	4	4
2. Bunyoro Kitara	Men	-	-	71	-	-	-	-	4	6	4	4
	Wom.	-	-	98	-	-	-	-	15	9	15	20
	Days	5	3	4	4	-	3	4	4	4	4	4
3. U.C.S	Men	38	13	22	20	-	25	28	23	18	19	23
	Wom.	58	33	39	35	-	30	53	50	44	40	40
	Days	5	3	4	4	-	3	4	4	4	4	4
4. MTI Kiyenje Coop. Heifer Project	Men	-	-	48	43	-	-	-	-	-	-	50
	Wom.	-	-	42	45	-	-	-	-	-	-	40
	Days	-	-	4	4	4	5	6	6	5	4	4
Rukungiri Women HP.	Men	1	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
	Wom.	19	-	26	40	-	36	-	-	-	40	40
	Days	2	-	5	4	4	2	6	5	4	6	5
5.MTI Kakoro Livestock Project	Men	20	-									15
	Wom.	18	-									20
	Days	4	-									2

6. Bugusege L. Project	Men	34	14	24	32	-	37	23	20	54	50	73	70
	Wom.	58	26	42	33	-	39	30	30	78	70	70	90
	Days	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	4	3	4	2
7. YWCA Mbale H.P	Men	29	3	9	-	-	35	-	15	17	41	18	20
	Wom.	55	11	47	-	-	151	-	48	30	63	30	25
	Days	5	1	3	-	-	7	-	3	2	2	2	2
8. Kirinya W. Heifer Project	Men	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Wom.	53	38	120	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Days	3	2	4	1	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
9. Kisinga Dairy Goat Project	Men	-	3	-	4	2	-	-	1	-	-	2	2
	Wom.	28	40	35	45	19	36	44	38	38	40	36	39
	Days	3	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

- NB:** i) Every training takes one day. So the number of days corresponds to the number training carried out.
- ii) For some projects where no training has taken place so far, it is either because they have had no full time extensionist or trainings have been done informally.
- iii) In almost all cases, the trainings were carried out by Extensionists, except in some cases where external facilitators, specialised in certain fields were invited.
- In all cases, the trainees were the project beneficiaries who already had goats or cows or who were preparing to receive them.
- iv) Staff contracted during the period was A. Beinempaka for the post of Assistant Training Coordinator. Interviews were done at the end of January 1995 and he reported for duty on 17 March 1995.

Projects Supported by HPI in the Country during the Period

These are listed in the table below, showing the number of families assisted with animals the program (Sept. 1994 - August 1995)

Project	Animals distributed		Animals to be distributed		Totals
	Originals	Pass-ons	Originals	Pass-ons	
<b>1. COU - LIP:</b>					
Kigezi Diocese		5		5	10
Wamala	14	6	20	6	46
Mukono Diocese			10	3	13
Mityana Diocese	10	15	22	15	51
Namirembe Diocese	15	9	10	9	54
Kampala Diocese					
<b>2. Bunyoro Kitara</b>		4	10	4	15
<b>3. U.C.S</b>	40	11	20	16	36
<b>4. MTI:</b>					
Kiyenje	19	18	10	8	55
Rukungiri	9		10	3	22
<b>5. Kakoro</b>			10		10
<b>6. Bugusege</b>	15	2		6	23
<b>7. YWCA Mbale</b>		4	10	1	15
<b>8. Kirinya</b>	20	3	10		33
<b>9. Kisinga WDG</b>	40		18	15	73
<b>Totals</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>456</b>

REPORT ON THE OVERALL COUNTRY PROGRAM

- (A) In addition to training the HPI Staff have been involved in
- i. holding meetings with the farmers at Project level
  - ii. Compiling and Submitting of reports, both progress and financial
  - iii. preparing farmers to receive animals either originals or pass-ons
  - iv. Inspecting farmers and selecting the ready ones to receive animals
  - v. Receiving Shipment of animals and organizing allocations, transportation and distribution to the farmers

In the reporting period, three shipments have been received from Bothar-Ireland and SAC-UK.

28/9/1994 -71 Heifers:	Namirembe - 12
	Kiyenje - 12
	UCS - 25
	Rukungiri - 9
	Kirinya - 13

9/12/1994 - 58 Dairy Goats:	Kisinga - 58
61 Heifers	Namirembe - 2
	Bugusege - 15
	UCS - 15
	Kirinya - 7
	Kiyenje - 10
	Wamala - 12

19/6/1995 - 22 Heifers from SAC-UK	COU-Mityana- 22
---------------------------------------	-----------------

- v. Receiving visitors and facilitating their visits to individual projects

10-15/12/1994 Visit by Oswald & Elaine Goering of Rotary Club - USA - Visited Kigezi Diocese Heifer Project and Church of Uganda Wamala Dairy Project.

4-11/9/1994 Visit by Bothar Donors led by Archbishop Clifford visited UCS Projects, Kirinya Women Heifer Project, Church of Uganda Namirembe and Wamala Projects and Kisinga Dairy Goat Project.

9-12/12/1994: Visit by 4 people accompanying the December Bothar Shipment and visited UCS Heifer Projects, COU Namirembe, Wamala Projects and Kirinya Women Heifer Project

- 21-27/1/1995: Visit by Jim DeVries & Jerry Aaker visited Kirinya Women Dairy Heifer Project, Namirembe Diocese Heifer Project and Bunyoro-Kitara Diocese Heifer Project. Robert Vere, UK Overseas Director was also around.
- 15-19/4/1995: Visit by 13 members of the East African Study Tour Group from HPI-USA - visited Kisinga Women Dairy Goat Project, Kiyenje Coop Dairy Project and COU Kigezi Diocese Heifer Project.
- 19-29/4/1995: Visit by Dan Gudahl and Cindy Walla visited Rukungiri Women Heifer Project and UCS Heifer Project.

(B) At individual project level:

- Most projects have more or less been running the same type of program and activities. In a few projects, however, a few events took place.
  - i. UCS - a Savings & Credit Scheme was started
  - ii. COU - Wamala Kageye and Bunyoro-Kitara recruited new Extensionists.
  - iii. Rukungiri, Kirinya, YWCA Mbale Branch, Wamala and Bunyoro-Kitara had their extensionists attending an A.I. Training course at Makerere University Buyana Livestock Station

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PROJECT RESULTS

1. (a) Specific Outputs achieved:

- i. 182 families have received original animals  
74 families have received pass-ons  
160 families are to receive original animals by August.  
91 families are to receive pass-ons by August.  

---

456 families will have been served by the end of the reporting period.
- ii. 342 one-day trainings will have been carried out in the 14 projects by August 31st.
- iii. There is an increased number of farmers attending the trainings. Women are still more than men.

- iv. There is increased adoption for tree planting by the farmers for environmental protection.
- v. Training needs for the extensionists as well as for farmers have been identified through workshops, surveys and field visits.
- vi. Training curriculum for extensionists has been reviewed and more topics on sustainable agriculture and integrated farming incorporated.
- vii. Monitoring of project activities has been carried out by Country Representative, Training & Extension Services Coordinator and through reporting by extensionists and project holders.

**(b) Effect on Target Groups disaggregated by Gender** ▣

- i. **Women:**
  - have been empowered through participating in trainings, meetings, cross visits and through exposure and interaction with other people.
  - have been able to take up some leadership roles especially within their grassroots groups.
  - have now a role to play in planning for and use of family income resulting from milk sales.
  - have benefitted from integrated farming by using manure and NFTs to improve their soils and hence crop production to feed their families.
- ii. **Men:**
  - are now employed by participating and contributing to family labour.
  - have got some additional income with which they are able to support their families better than before, and even starting some small income generating activities e.g. local retail shops.
  - have now had their status in society raised as a result of the above benefits.

(c) Problems encountered

- i. High degree of illiteracy especially with women. This has been to some extent addressed through training using hands on activities, use of visual aids and demonstrations. There is still more to be done to develop these training materials.
- ii. Lack of enough audio visual devices to supplement other teaching aids. For some trainings we have hired some of these (e.g. video, slide projector) where possible. In some cases this has not been possible.
- iii. There has been a problem of breeding animals because Government AI Services have not been effective.  
  
Some extensionists however have been given training in A.I. and facilitated with A.I. Kits.
- iv. Low milk production for some of the farmers. This is mainly being addressed through more training on pasture management and feeding program.
- v. Means of transport: The available field vehicles and Motorcycles are getting old and as such need frequent repairs which are proving to be expensive.

(d) Impact on local institutions, local policy and people outside the project.

- Through diffusion process, there is evidence of some organised groups being formed and starting up livestock activities.
- There is also multiplier effect noticed in some areas where farmers have copied partially or completely the zero-grazing activity by individuals and groups.
- Milk availability in local institutions and local communities has also increased.
- AI Services have also been extended outside the project area.
- Soil and Water Conservation practices, and agroforestry have also been picked up by some people.
- In the dairy goat project, people outside have also adopted culture of consuming goats' milk.

(e) Unintended Effects - None have been noticed so far

2. i. Comparison of actual accomplishments with those originally proposed.

What had been planned for this period was all accomplished as reported.

ii. Anticipated problems in meeting final project objectives.

Budget Deficit - The Uganda Budget for the 3 year AID Program is in excess of the Headquarter Budget. The Program will have to readjusted in case of failure to get additional top up funds.

Marketing Milk Products:

- As milk production increases in some of the projects, marketing will become a problem especially in areas where the infrastructure e.g. needs is poor and the peoples' purchasing power low. Projects have however been challenged to look into other possible ways of addressing this problem e.g. forming cooperatives and selling milk in bulk to cooling centres.

CONCLUSION:

So far there has been smooth integration of the on-going HPI Training and Extension Services with those planned in the AID Training Grant. In order to strengthen the training further, more effort is to be put in production and publication of training materials and regular follow ups of the trainees to assess the impact of training and also identify other possible training needs. The target group will also be encouraged to participate in the various activities at different levels for the success of this program. It is hoped that with proper documentation and regular reporting on the progress of the planned activities, it will be easy to monitor and evaluate the success of the program.

## Appendix 5

### Bolivia Program Data for AID Annual Report

In Bolivia HPI works with two modalities in terms of project partners; 1) projects with partner NGOs, and 2) project work with *campesino* (farmer) associations in the tropical lowland areas of Eastern Bolivia.

Training takes place in each project according to plan and budget. The main themes of training are: livestock management, care of newborn animals, nutrition and feeding, animal health, breeding and reproduction, forage trees, agroforestry systems, sustainable agriculture/development, use of manure, human nutrition, record keeping, farm management, leadership, and book keeping. HPI has a collaborative arrangement with Christian Veterinary Mission (CVM) and a local NGO, the Foundation for Integral Development, (FIDES) to do training with the farmer associations.

The following is data on the numbers of families and organizations worked with during this period. The animals distributed come from purchases in country and pass on offspring from other beneficiaries. These are only the numbers directly benefited, not the total number of families being followed and served by the program from past years. The reports reflect data from the second semester of 1994. Reports for the first semester, 1995 are not included in this report as they are not due until August 31 at headquarters.

Note: # of families means means number receiving livestock.

#### I. NGOs:

Name of Organization	Species	# of families	# in Trainings	# of Trainings
1. KECHUAYMARA.	guinea pigs	133	131	5
	llamas	80	303	14
2. Methodist Church	cattle	1		
	guinea pigs	61	393	8
3. SONU	goats	200	70	2
4. CAIZA "D"	goats and poultry	580	231	8
5. UNAPEGA	cattle	113	28	2
6. PDAI, Beni	cattle	22	42	4

**Bolivia Report, continued**

<b>II. Farmer Associations</b>		<b># of families</b>		
1. APGB - Berlin	cattle	20	40	training done in partnership with CVM
	sheep			
2. ASOPEGA, San Julian	cattle	26	64	"
	sheep			
	goats	25		
3. ASPACH	cattle	70	28	training done directly by HPI
	sheep			
4. Yucumo	cattle	50		training done by Veterinarians without Boards & CIMCA

**III. Training the Associations**

<b>Type of course</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Participants :</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
"Basic Courses" with farmer associations	18		75	225
Advanced Courses for <i>tecnicos</i> & animators (animal health, project planning, leadership, training skills)	11		106	54
<b>Totals</b>	<b>29</b>		<b>181</b>	<b>279</b>

## Appendix 6

### KISINGA WOMENS DAIRY GOAT PROJECT SURVEY AND EVALUATION DEC 1994 - JAN 1995

The St. Claire Women's Development Association was formed in 1989 under the leadership of Mrs. Peregia Bwambale in an effort to increase literacy and primary health education in the community. In 1991, with the help of Heifer Project International and Bothar, they started a dairy goat project in Kisinga and surrounding villages in the western part of Uganda in order to increase the nutritional intake of their families, especially the children, and to involve women in income-generating activity. Eighteen does and two bucks were purchased in England by Heifer Project International, shipped to Kisinga, and distributed to eighteen women farmers. A second shipment of twenty-six does and four bucks was sent from Bothar in Ireland in December 1992, and another shipment of thirty-six does and five bucks was sent this December.

#### Part 1: Information on Family Structure and Holdings

Eighty-eight women farmers holding dairy goats through the HPI Kisinga Womens Dairy Goat Project were interviewed over a four week period, including thirty-six women who received goats on 11-12-94 from Ireland. Two additional farmers who had relocated were not visited due to time and distance constraints. A farmer who had recently lost her goat was also included in the survey.

#### Family Structure:

Sixty-eight of the women visited are currently married and living with their husbands. Of the twenty-two women without husbands, thirteen have been widowed, seven have divorced and two have never married.

The project families have an average of six children, the range extending from none to fourteen. A majority of these (66%) are school-age (7-18 year old). 17% are below school age, demonstrating a trend of declining number of children per family over the previous decade.

Eighty-nine children (16%) are above school age. Of these, twenty-four (26%) are currently completing college or university. Of the remaining sixty-five, 49% are employed. Most of those who are not employed are either daughters who had been married or sons who are living at home and helping with cultivation. 44% of these sixty-five children are living at home.

In addition, each family supports an average of two dependents, or people outside of the nucleus family. Of these dependents, fifty-eight (30%) are adults, mainly parents of the husband or wife. The other one hundred and thirty are children, thirty-five under school age and seventy-six of school age.

#### Education:

The average level of education obtained by the husband was Primary 7 - only five have not received any schooling and twenty-four continued their education through secondary school or higher.

The average level of education obtained by the women in the project was Primary 5. Twenty-two of the women have not received any formal education. Only twelve continued to secondary or higher education.

Four hundred and forty-seven children of these eighty-nine farmers were at or above school age. Of these, 349 have received or are currently receiving primary education. Another 90 have continued or are continuing with secondary education. 29 children have attended or are currently completing university or college education. 14.5% of children who are currently school-age are not attending school (this includes 20% of school-age dependents). The main reason cited is lack of money for school fees.

#### Health:

A number of different health complaints were cited. By far the most common was malaria. Twenty-five of the families interviewed claimed someone in their family who was currently suffering from and under treatment for malaria. Some other health complaints of the adults included ulcers (3), dental problems (2), eye problems (2), and rheumatism (2). The health problems reported among the children included scabies (3), typhoid (1), filariasis (2), osteomalacia (2), and tuberculosis (2).

#### Assets:

##### A) Land

The project farmers hold an average of 4.6 acres of land (range 0-30). Twenty-seven farmers (30%) have two or less acres, forty farmers (45%) have between two and five acres, and twenty-one farmers (23%) have more than five acres. The main crops cultivated are coffee, matooke and cassava. Other crops frequently grown are groundnuts, cotton and timber trees (eucalyptus). In addition, most farmers produce vegetables (cabbage, tomatoes, maize, beans, etc.) and fruits (pineapple, passionfruit, mango, avocado) for home consumption/petty trade.

Most of the land is owned by the farmers. Nine farmers rent a total of 23.5 acres of land (average 2.6 acres) - most use this rented land for cotton production.

All but a few farmers work the land themselves - only six farmers hire/ trade for labor to aid in cotton production.

Most farmers cultivate on all their land. Only eighteen farmers have land left uncultivated - in most (13) cases this is less than two acres. A few farmers have large amounts (20/25 acres) of land left uncultivated in anticipation of starting cattle projects.

##### B) Livestock

Sixteen people (18%) own no livestock other than their HPI goat. The other 82% own an average of 1.4 pigs and 2 (indigenous) goats. Three people own a sheep. One person owns a cow; another owns two cows.

##### C) Other Property

Thirty-one people (35%) own bicycles for transport. Three people own vehicles. Two men involved in photography own

photographic equipment and three people working as tailors own sewing machines.

#### D) Income

A majority of the farmers report agricultural products are providing their major source of income. Coffee is the most important income-generating crop - 66 farmers (74%) rely on it for a major part of their income. Fourteen farmers generate income from cotton production. Nine farmers report matooke also contributes substantially to their income. Fourteen farmers report income from petty trade of fruits and vegetables. Two people receive their income from sale of timber.

Some farmers report livestock as contributing significantly to their livelihood. Six people report that their pigs generate a substantial amount of money and eleven people report that their goats offspring and milk provide a major source of income.

Eighteen people receive a salary. Fifteen are husbands - most working either for the government or local administration, for Kagando Hospital or as teachers. Three of the women receive salary - two work as nurses and one as a teacher.

Six people have brick-making projects which are generating income for them. Four men hire themselves out as laborers. Four people (2 men and 2 women) are tailors. Two men are photographers and make some money selling photographs. Two men are fishmongers.

## Part 2: Information/Assessment of Goats

### Shed:

The overall condition of the goat sheds are very good. Most of the sheds are of adequate size and good construction. A few farmers need to repair parts of the floor and reduce spacing between boards so that the goats will not get their legs caught in these gaps. A few farmers also need to repair some parts of the roofing.

Fourteen farmers have constructed milking chutes to facilitate milking of their goats and eleven farmers have built fenced-in exercise areas for their goats around the shed.

Most farmers are using either wooden troughs or plastic buckets as feed troughs. Five farmers need to obtain a feed trough instead of placing fodder on the flat boards where the goat pushes a majority of it to the ground while feeding.

Most are using plastic buckets as water troughs. These buckets are good but in some cases need to be placed more securely in place so that the goat does not keep tipping the water over and thus making more work for the farmers. The water bucket and the food trough should both be placed outside of the shed to as to minimize fecal contamination of the food and water, which will help in disease and parasite control.

Shed hygiene is very good - most farmers are keeping the sheds very clean. There were only three sheds visited which could use substantial improvement in shed hygiene.

### Feeding:

A majority of the farmers (75) were feeding their goat on napier or guatemala - most everyone had chopped it adequately. 22 were also including fodder trees in the feed, 16 had some legumes in the food trough with the napier, and 16 were using matooke peels. At two farms visited there was no fodder in the feed trough.

Twenty of the goats visited had no water available. It is important to keep water available to the goat at all times, especially considering the hot climate and the fact that these are dairy animals.

Most of the goats also did not have access to mineral licks. Eleven farmers had bought commercial mineral block and an additional eleven farmers were using the local mineral rock.

### Environmental Protection:

Most farmers are practicing very good environmental protection methods. Almost all the farmers have planted trees and are practicing mulching, and all but fifteen have made adequate contour bunds.

Many farmers have made manure pits and are utilizing the manure to fertilize their pastures. thirty farmers, most of them being new farmers who have just received their goats, have not yet constructed manure pits.

### Pasture:

All but four farmers have planted pasture to feed their goat from. Most have planted their pasture very near to their shed which facilitates feeding. Nineteen farmers have, due to various land constraints, planted their pasture far from the shed.

Most farmers have planted between 1/4 and 1/8 acres of pasture (33 had 1/4 or more acres planted and 33 had between 1/8 and 1/4 acre planted). Nine farmers had little (<1/8) or no pasture planted.

Most all farmers have planted napier. Some are not cutting it properly as the extension agent has trained them to do. Thirty-nine of the farmers have little or no legumes planted, but the extension agent was selling "lab-lab" seeds at the training sessions and many farmers bought seeds to plant.

All but six farmers have planted fodder trees. Most popular is sesbania (47) - 21 farmers have planted pigeon pea, 28 have planted leaucenea and 14 have planted calliandra. There is currently a problem with the leaucenea plants in this area succumbing to disease and not growing well.

A few pastures were in need of weeding, but most looked very well cared for.

### Health:

Most of the goats are doing very well and staying healthy. The average body condition is between 2.5 and 3. Only one goat has a body condition score of less than 2.

The farmers have Bayticol for tick control and are applying it weekly to the goats. The incidence of tick-borne diseases is quite

low - there have been five cases of heartwater reported (2 fatal).

The other major health problem occurring in the goats is a hind-limb paresis. Four goats have been affected - one died despite antibiotic treatment, one recovered, and two are still currently suffering.

In addition, three goats have developed mastitis (1 died, 1 recovered, and 1 is currently being treated). Two goats are suffering from foot rot. In total, ten goats have died since arrival from Europe.

#### Reproduction:

Eleven farmers are currently caring for various European-breed bucks to be used to breed the project does. When the farmer notices that her goat is in heat, she taking it to one of these bucks for breeding. The optimum breeding goal for these does is a seven month lactation with a two month dry period before kidding. The goats should therefore be kidding every nine months, or about three times in a two-year period. The average kidding interval of the goats thus far is fourteen months. There is therefore much room for improvement.

Two goats have aborted, both during their fourth month, and one goat developed a pseudopregnancy. One goat developed metritis and subsequently recovered. Reproductive problems are thus so far minimal.

One goat arrived from Ireland pregnant and gave birth to a doe which was passed to Elizabeth Bitswamba on 1-30-94. This goat #6 has an enlarged clitoris with a tumor-like growth and exhibits buck-like behavior. It has never been seen in heat and refuses to stand for breeding. This is very characteristic of a pseudohermaphrodite goat, a genetic condition seen when one polled goat is bred to another. This goat will never produce an offspring, and should be sold for slaughter and replaced with another goat.

#### Kids:

Seventy-eight goats have given birth to one hundred and eleven kids since the beginning of the project. Forty-four have produced singles, thirty-three have produced twins, and one produced triplets. The average litter size is thus 1.4, or a fecundity of 140%. These goats in the literature have a reproductive rate averaging from 150-200% under optimal conditions.

The average number of kiddings for goats received in 1991 was 2.1; for those received in 1992 it was 2.05 and for those received in 1993 it was 1.3. Two of the 17 goats passed in January 1994 have kidded.

Eighteen of these kids (16%) have died before reaching a year of age. The cause of death was in most cases not certain. One goat arrived from Ireland pregnant and produced a kid which was brachygnathic - this kid should be sold for slaughter and not bred since this is a heritable trait.

The farmers all report giving 1/2 liter of milk to each kid per day, and starting them on fodder at 2-3 weeks of age. Ten farmers also report supplementing the kid's diet with concentrates.

**Milk:**

The average milk production of these dairy goats is 2.5L per day during peak lactation (range 1L - 4L). On average, the family consumes 1.2L per day and sells .75L per day, although many women make the choice to either sell all the milk at the expense of family consumption, or to save all the milk for family.

**Expenditures:**

The women who have received their goats in 1991 have spent an average of \$29.70 on preparation for and maintenance of the goats (use average conversion of \$1=1000 Ugandan schillings). Those receiving goats in 1992 have spent an average of \$23.40, those receiving in 1993 have spent an average \$16.00 and those receiving this year have spent \$21.70.

In most cases, the expenditures included purchase of materials (nails, wood, etc.) for the construction of the shed and \$4.00/year to the organization for veterinary care. Once the shed is constructed and the pasture planted, monetary inputs are minimal.

**Income:**

Income is generated from the goats through sale of milk and offspring. Income from the goats is thus contingent on the goat's successful reproductive performance. The goats received in 1994 have therefore not generated any income yet. Women receiving goats in 1993 have earned an average of \$47.60 and goats received in 1992 have generated an average \$60.00. Goats received in 1991 have generated an average \$131.80 for the farmers over the past three years. It is thus possible for the farmers to generate a net profit from the goats even after one kidding.

The bulk of the income comes from sale of offspring, for which the farmer receives in most cases \$100.00. The average income generated from these goats per lactation from sale of milk was \$15.70, but this is highly variable (range 0 - \$70.00) based on the amount of milk sold versus consumed.

**Pass-Ons:**

The farmer who receives a goat is responsible for raising the first-born female offspring and then giving it to another farmer chosen by the organization. So far, twenty goats have been successfully passed to new farmers.

**Training:**

Two training sessions were held for the new farmers by the extension agent while this survey was being completed. The new farmers were divided into two smaller groups and the training session was repeated twice. The topics of this training session were feeding of the dairy goat and tick control. The extension agent first delivered a lecture on the importance of proper nutrition and tick control. He utilized specimens of the different types of fodder and explained how the goat benefitted nutritionally from each. Next he demonstrated proper techniques for cutting and chopping the forage and application of the Bayticol, and he picked

women out to demonstrate to him that they understood how to do this properly.

The training sessions were very well attended, and in visiting the farmers, it was evident that most were trying to put into practice what the extension agent had taught them.

### Part 3: Conclusions and Suggestions

On the whole, the farmers in the Kisinga Dairy Goat Project are doing an excellent job of caring for their goats and their pastures. A few suggestions to help make these goats even more productive for the farmers and their families:

1) The goats should have water available to them at all times. Although goats are relatively very good at conservation of water, adequate and free-choice water will enable them to more easily produce the quantities of milk desired by the farmer. The water should be placed outside of the shed, so that it is not easily contaminated with feces and urine.

2) Minerals are also an important part of the goat's diet, and each goat should be supplied with a mineral lick. The organization should make these licks available for purchase by the farmers.

3) The manure from the goats is an important resource and should be utilized. Those farmers who have not yet built manure pits should be encouraged to do so and to begin utilizing the manure.

4) Most farmers have adequate pasture and are maintaining it very well. Those farmers who have no or small amounts of pasture are encouraged to continue planting more.

5) On the whole, the goats are adapting very well to their new environment and are experiencing very few health problems. However, four goats have developed a problem of hind-end paresis - two are still suffering and one has died. All four were adult goats that had been shipped from Europe. Since most diseases which cause these symptoms in the goat (nutritional imbalances, caprine encephalitis-arthritis virus, P.tenuis migration) usually affect young (<5 mo.) goats, this outbreak is very puzzling and merits further investigation.

6) Goat #6 - the hermaphrodite - should be culled and replaced with another pass-on.

7) The average kidding interval for these goats is 14 months. Since ideally one would like a seven month lactation with a two-month dry period, these goats should be kidding every 8-9 months. Only two farmers have achieved this. This is an important area for improvement since the income generated by the goat is based on producing a kid in the shortest time interval feasible and

minimizing the non-lactational periods. The farmers should watch their goats closely for signs of impending heat and take them for service as long as they remain receptive.

8) Kid mortality in these goats so far has been 16% - this is quite high, especially considering that, due to the warm climate and hand-rearing, the major causes of pre-weaning mortality, ie. starvation/mismotherment/exposure, should not be a significant problem. Although symptoms are often vague and a cause of death often can not be established on post-mortem examination, an effort should be made to solve this problem and reduce the number of kids dying. A special record could be kept on each kid which died, indicating age at death, any symptoms or clinical signs, any post-mortem changes, and husbandry and environmental conditions at the time (ie. what was the kid being fed, where was it kept, what was the weather like, etc.).

9) Few farmers are using concentrates at this point to increase nutrition to the kid and to the pregnant and lactating doe. This is primarily due to the cost constraint of the concentrates, as purchased through Kagando Hospital. Perhaps HPI could assist these women in finding a way for them to produce their own concentrates or obtain them at a lower cost. The concentrates could be especially beneficial to the kids in reducing the pre-weaning mortality rate.

10) Another problem faced by the farmers is a lack of a market for the offspring, especially the males. HPI should be made aware of this need.

11) It could be beneficial in the long term if breeding records were kept for the bucks. It would be relatively simple to log each mating in a "breeding book" and this record could then be used for selection programs to determine which bucks are producing offspring with the highest milk production.

Addendum:

I would like to extend thanks to HPI for making this evaluation possible. I would also like to express my gratitude to the women of the Kisinga Women Dairy Goat Project, and especially the chairperson Mrs. P.Bwambale, for their gracious hospitality and their cooperation. Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the extension agent for the project, Emilio Musubaho Mali, for all his help and dedication and for a job very well done.

-Completed January 27, 1995  
by Wendi Loi Rekers  
Cornell DVM candidate 1995

**Heifer Project International  
Logical Framework  
Integrated Farm Family Development**

Matching Grant  
FY 94 Application

Narrative Summary	Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p><u>Goal:</u></p> <p>Enable families to feed themselves, care for their land, &amp; profitably integrate livestock into regenerative agriculture.</p> <p>Enhance HPI's training program worldwide, and strengthen both HPI field staff and those of partner NGOs to plan and manage sustainable development programs.</p>	<p>-Production gain used for nutritional benefit to the families</p> <p>-Use of sustainable ag. practices</p> <p>-Profit from livestock and crop enterprises</p> <p>Demonstrable skills and knowledge in management, training, and evaluation by HPI field staff and partner organizations.</p> <p>A comprehensive training model with corresponding training tools, materials, and audiovisuals.</p>	<p>-Project level records</p> <p>-Sample surveys</p> <p>-HPI database</p>	<p>Relative political stability in target countries.</p> <p>Inflation is reasonable and prices paid for ag produce make profit feasible.</p>

Narrative Summary	Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p><u>Purpose:</u></p> <p>Help 1,900 farm families to profitable production, family well-being, and improvement of the land through ecologically sound agriculture in Bolivia and Uganda.</p> <p>Train 100 community level leaders (M&amp;F) to organize, teach, and demonstrate sustainable development practices and principles to others.</p> <p>Equip managers and trainers of HPI country offices and 15 partner organizations to strengthen their capacity to plan, manage, train, and evaluate sustainable development projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Number of farm families helped directly with livestock enterprises.</li> <li>-Number of community level leaders that use, demonstrate and teach others sustainable agriculture practices.</li> <li>-Increased capacity of partner organizations and HPI in-country staff to plan and manage sustainable development projects.</li> <li>- A participatory training model that HPI can apply worldwide, using appropriate training tools written and tested in target countries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Project reports</li> <li>-Project level ledgers</li> <li>-Country Program reviews in Bolivia and Uganda</li> <li>-Fina' external evaluation.</li> <li>-Case study or surveys of projects, using HPI's cornerstones as criteria.</li> <li>-HPI database</li> </ul>	<p>Farmers will have adequate land security to warrant investment in time and money. No major prolonged drought.</p> <p>That training and animal inputs will make a measurable impact on the quality of life of families.</p>

<b>OUTPUTS:</b>	<b>INDICATORS:</b>	<b>MEANS:</b>	<b>ASSUMPTIONS:</b>
<p>A. HPI in-country staff and staff of 15 partner organizations (NGOs) in two target countries &amp; at least two neighboring countries trained in planning, management and evaluation of sustainable development projects.</p> <p>B. 2,000 farmers (both men and women), community leaders, and elected promoters will have gained skills and knowledge in sustainable agriculture models and practices, including animal production, agroforestry, soil conservation, zero-grazing, pasture improvement, and inter-cropping.</p> <p>C. 100 leaders and promoters benefit from training, technical information, and observation of results of sustainable agriculture projects.</p>	<p>A.1 Staff understand and have skills in planning, management and evaluation of sustainable development.</p> <p>B.1 Number of farm families who are direct participants in sustainable development projects and benefit from profitable crop/livestock production.</p>	<p>A. Six month reports. Field visits. Evaluations Meetings with staff</p> <p>Project reports, field visits, and trip reports</p>	<p>Local NGOs make a commitment to networking and training in sustainable development and all personnel to participate in training.</p> <p>Climatic and weather is not extreme, (droughts/floods, et</p> <p>Costs of production and prices of products make it feasible to make a profit.</p> <p>A high degree of motivation on part farmers to improve quality of life for their families and rationally use their natural resources.</p>

<p>D. Training resources, technical backstopping, and information provided to local NGOs and HPI country staff</p> <p>E. 15 to 25 practical technical information and training tools produced (i.e. posters, handouts and case studies) on animal production and health themes.</p> <p>✓ F. A comprehensive set of videos on animal production and health collected and made available upon request to country programs.</p> <p>G. A training manual for developing, managing and evaluating integrated livestock projects using participatory "popular education" approaches produced</p>	<p>C.1. HPI country offices staffed by competent technical &amp; administrative staff working directly with local NGOs and networks of development institutions</p> <p>Consultancy and training in silvo-pastoral practices, forages, and nitrogen fixing tree made available to HPI country staff and partner organization staff.</p>	<p>Management and activity reports, annual meetings with field reps and program directors, and field visits.</p> <p>Copies available for review; observation of training and field work</p> <p>Annotated listing of videos, and system to copy and distribute them</p> <p>Published materials and articles</p> <p>Training and meeting ledgers, project reports</p> <p>Report on the events.</p>	<p>High level of interest in networking and collaboration between NGOs, both locally and internationally.</p> <p>HPI's long term strategy of support for country offices and competent national staffing in each of them.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>H. 8 local NGOs and community organizations in the target countries with increased capacity to carry out gender analysis and work with Women in Development projects,</p> <p>I. Evaluations and reports of sustainable and ecologically sound livestock projects completed, published, and disseminated.</p>	<p>Two major training events and consultations on gender and family issues</p> <p>Local NGOs with increased consciousness and skills to analyze, plan and implement projects with women's organizations.</p> <p>Self-evaluations by each project annually,</p> <p>County Program review in Bolivia and Uganda</p> <p>Two published case studies with accompanying slide presentations,</p> <p>Final external evaluations</p>	<p>Evaluations</p> <p>Project Proposals,</p> <p>Project and field visit reports.</p> <p>HPI Program Reports,</p> <p>Reports from projects, and HPI country office</p> <p>Published studies and slide shows,</p> <p>Final Report</p>	<p>Local NGOs are or will become interested in more effective work with women and families.</p> <p>Local consultants and trainers available,</p> <p>HPI reporting and evaluation system is practical and helpful to local staff.</p>
---	--	---	--

<p><b>INPUTS:</b></p> <p>A. HPI resident representation in each country</p> <p>B. Equipment, supplies and livestock</p> <p>C. Training materials - videos, posters, manuals</p> <p>D. Funding for 26 long term, sustainable development projects through local NGOs and grassroots organizations</p> <p>E. Local and international consultant services</p> <p>F. Training events and consultations in countries and in the regions for in-country staff, project personnel and colleague NGO staff.</p> <p>G. Training manuals based on participatory model provided by HPI.</p> <p>H. Evaluation training and consultation.</p> <p>I. Publish and EXCHANGE and WiLD newsletters 4 Xs a year, and distributed.</p>	<p>Presence of full time country representatives,</p> <p>Effectiveness of extension and technical staff in the field</p> <p>Effectiveness of administrative personnel in each country</p> <p>Cost effectiveness of funded projects</p> <p>Administrative and professional staff time for management, monitoring, and follow up.</p> <p>Initial workshop with headquarters program management and field reps for strategy and goal clarification.</p> <p>Two gender workshops of consultations.</p> <p>Two curriculum development and training model workshops.</p> <p>Two consultations of training workshops on silvo pastoral practices</p>	<p>Annual meetings and field visits by program directors to monitor programs, review goals and strategic plans for each country.</p> <p>HPI financial reports</p> <p>Personnel contracts</p> <p>Project financial and progress reports</p> <p>HPI data base and files</p> <p>Reports from country program reviews by staff</p> <p>Final evaluation reports of the matching grant</p>	<p>HPI is able to raise matching funds from private sources.</p> <p>Governments and indigenous NGOs provide the contacts and networks with which to work.</p> <p>Printing and mailing costs do not increase drastically in cost</p> <p>HPI will be able to recruit and contract a competent person for grant management and monitor</p>
--	---	--	---

Appendix 8  
Financial Profile of Heifer Project International

A. <u>Program Expenditures</u>	Dec. 31 <u>1993</u>	Dec. 31 <u>1994</u>	Dec. 31 <u>1995 &lt; Ext. &gt;</u>
International Development	\$4,194,202	\$4,590,219	\$4,892,284
Education	1,752,661	1,648,018	1,798,634
Training	<u>395,230</u>	<u>486,805</u>	<u>503,618</u>
TOTAL WORLDWIDE PROGRAM	\$6,342,093	\$6,725,042	\$7,194,536
B. <u>Sources of Funds</u>			
A.I.D. Matching Grant	\$ 0	\$ 44,026	\$ 253,800
A.I.D. Subgrants	111,140	322,971	796,200
OFR	5,321	\$ 0	\$ 0
Private Contributions:			
Cash	6,486,556	6,821,891	6,619,400
In-Kind	651,579	747,752	691,000
Other Revenue	<u>744,975</u>	<u>512,341</u>	<u>559,600</u>
TOTAL	\$7,999,571	\$8,448,981	\$9,020,000

Ⓢ

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Expiration Date: 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

Project Type	Project Number	
Organization	Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code
Project Officer	Key 1	Key 2

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization Peifer Project International		Grant/Contract Number FAO 0158-A-00-4026-00
Start Date (MM/DD/YY) August 19, 1995	End Date (MM/DD/YY) August 19, 1997	AID Project Officer's Name Mary Herbert

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

AID funds provide support for a portion of the following positions in HPI headquarters: Director of Training-50%, Coordinator of Women in Livestock Development-25%, Program Information Assistant-20%, and Director of Evaluation-10%. All positions are filled. Coordination of the cooperative agreement rests with the Director of Training. The grant has made it possible for HPI to plan for overall strengthening of its training capacity.

**Status**

Work on the participatory training manual is going ahead in Bolivia. Training sessions for partner organizations are proceeding on schedule. Evaluations of the training programs in each country have been carried out with assistance from headquarters.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country USA	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) Little Rock, AR
PIO Representative's Name James De Vries, Director/Int'l Programs P.O. Box 808, Little Rock, AR 72203	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency N/A

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Aug '94-May '95			
AIDS	59			
PVOS	172			
INKIND				
LOCAL				

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Expiration Date: 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type		Project Number	
Appropriation		Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code	
Project Officer	Key 1	Key 2	

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization Heifer Project International		Grant/Contract Number FAO 0158-A-00-4026-00
Start Date (MM/DD/YY) August 19, 1995	End Date (MM/DD/YY) August 19, 1997	AID Project Officer's Name Mary Herbert

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description**

Small-holder, zero-grazing, dairy cattle development is the primary emphasis of the HPI Uganda program. Farmer education is being strengthened through curriculum development, extension staff training, training materials development, short courses, and field days. Training staff has been augmented to achieve grant objectives.

**Status**

The HPI Uganda program is growing. Milk is in high demand and in short supply. The zero-grazing management system is well established, replicable, and accepted by project holders. HPI networks with the Church of Uganda, Catholic Secretariat, YWCA, and the Ministry of Cooperatives and Marketing to provide project services. Currently supporting 14 sub-projects in the country, mostly with dairy cows, though several use dairy goats as primary input.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country Uganda	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) Luwero
PVO Representative's Name Bernard Muyeya	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency Church of Uganda, P.O. Box 14123 Kampala

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Aug '94	May '95			
AID \$	25				
PVO \$	697				
INKIND					
LOCAL					

**PVO PROJECT REPORTING INFORMATION  
ON AID SUPPORTED PVO PROJECTS**

OMB No. 0412-0630  
Expiration Date: 03/31/89

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

PVO Type		Project Number	
Proprietary		Level	
Country Code	Fund Type	Technical Code	
Project Officer	Key 1	Key 2	

**PROJECT INFORMATION (PRIMARY)**

Name of Organization Heifer Project International		Grant/Contract Number FAO-0158-A-00-4026-00
Start Date (MM/DD/YY) Aug. 20, 1994	End Date (MM/DD/YY) Aug. 19, 1997	AID Project Officer's Name Mary Herbert

**AID OBLIGATION BY AID-FY (\$000)**

FY	AMOUNT	FY	AMOUNT

LOP

**Activity Description** Heifer Project Bolivia provides living loans in the form of livestock that are managed by organized campesino grassroots organizations. All projects have an approved plan with objectives, training, time lines, and budgets. Animals are a primary component but all projects are required to demonstrate an integrated farming systems approach that is environmentally sound. Agroforestry and soil conservation are a vital part of each project plan. The primary beneficiaries are small land holding campesino families that are largely subsistent farmers initially but who gradually market surplus farm products as they improve their farming methods. Women are a vital part of all project activities.

HPI Bolivia currently has 11 active project agreements with 10 non-government rural development organizations. Four of these organizations are newly formed grassroots campesino associations of men and women to implement sustainable mixed farming systems that include livestock and agroforestry components. To strengthen these project agreements, HPI Bolivia has numerous relationships with other NGO's as follows: Mennonite Economic Development Association (MEDIA), Lutheran World Relief (LWR), Mennonite Central Committee (MCC), Veterinarians Without Borders, Bolivian Methodist Church, Agroforestry Network of Santa Cruz, Foundation for Integral Development (FIDES), CIPA (Roman Catholic Church Development Organization), British Tropical Mission Society (International Technical Assistance Agency of Britain), and the University of Gabriel Moreno.

**COUNTRY INFORMATION (SECONDARY)**

Country Bolivia	Location in Country (Region, District, Village) Tropical Lowlands-E. Bolivia Highlands, "Altiplano" (Province)
PVO Representative's Name Roger Hinojosa Proyecto Heifer Bolivia, Casilla No. 434 Santa Cruz, Bolivia	Local Counterpart/Host Country Agency HPI Bolivia is registered with the Ministry of Sustainable Development

**COUNTRY FUNDING INFORMATION (\$000)**

YEAR	Aug '94	May '95			
AID \$	31				
PVO \$	90				
INKIND					
LOCAL					