

15N 31836

UNCLASSIFIED  
CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Small Ruminants CRSP		2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-1328	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE S&T/AGR/AP
4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <u>23</u> <u>91</u>			
<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION			

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING (for initial period) A. Total \$ B. U.S. \$ <u>15,577,043</u>	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>78</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>Contd.</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>Contd.</u>		From (month/yr.) <u>10/1/79</u>	To (month/yr.) <u>9/30/82</u>

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite three items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Prepare Project Authorization and related documents to extend the SR-CRSP for one (1) year beyond September 30, 1983 (the operational year) with a funding level of at least 4.0 million for the 6th year. (Completed)	C.E. Haines and Management Entity of SR-CRSP (ME)	December 1982
2. Prepare documentation for joint Agriculture Sector Council/JCARD review for extending the SR-CRSP for three (3) years beyond September 30, 1984 (7th, 8th and 9th operational year) with funding levels of \$4.0 million per year.	C.E. Haines S&T Staff, Missions and Bureaus and ME	Sept. 1983
3. Phase out three (3) of the thirteen (13) original sub-grant institutions and establish systems to cover these areas of expertise by remaining subgrants. (Completed)	C.E. Haines, T.C., BIR, and ME Committees	Sept. 1983
4. Continue to promote standardization in management procedures for grants regarding travel requests, attendance at international meetings, mid-term R&R, family benefits, post allowances, etc.	C.E. Haines, ME and other USAID CRSP Project Managers	Continuous
5. Clarify the annual budget requirements for sub-grantees. (Budget process clarified and simplified for implementation completed.)	C.E. Haines, BIR and ME	July 1983
6. Improve briefing methods for mission and bureau staff on program problems and accomplishments. (Continued)	M.E. (UCD) All in-country scientists and site coordinators	Continuous

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) <u>Grant Agreement</u>	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change	
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or	
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C		<input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P		C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project	

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)		12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval	
S&T/AGR/AP, CEHaines <u>CC</u> Date: <u>8/14/83</u>	S&T/PO, FCampbell <u>FC</u> Date: <u>9/7/83</u>	Signature <u>J.S. Robins</u>	
S&T/AGR/AP, PWarren <u>AW</u> Date: <u>8/23/83</u>	S&T/AGR/AP, JMone <u>AM</u> Date: <u>8/29/83</u>	Typed Name <u>J.S. Robins</u>	
S&T/AGR, MZozynski <u>MZ</u> Date: <u>9/31/83</u>	S&T/AGR, ARBertrand <u>AB</u> Date: <u>8/31</u>	S&T/FA	
		Date <u>9/7/83</u>	

UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION

## PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Small Ruminants CRSP			2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-1328	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE S&T/AGR/AP
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY)	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>78</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>Cont'd</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>Cont'd</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION 6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING (for initial period) A. Total \$ <u>                    </u> B. U.S. \$ <u>15,577,043</u>	
7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION			Date of Evaluation Review	
From (month/yr.) <u>10/1/79</u>			<u>7/20/82</u>	
To (month/yr.) <u>9/30/82</u>				
8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR				
A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)		B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED	
7. Improve coordination between physiology and socio-economic components of SR-CRSP in order to provide research information to small farmers.		Principal Investigators (Foote, Nelson, and Deboer of Cal Poly, Utah State and Winrock in Peru and Brazil)	Continuous	
8. Establish coordination between animal health subgrants of Washington State, Colorado State and University of California via a workshop on animal health. Winrock Economics subgrant should also participate in integrated processes. (Successfully completed April 1983.)		Principal Investigators (McGuire, DeMartini, Olander and DeBoer of Wash State, Colo State, U. of Calif. and Winrock)	April 1983	
9. Transfer the SR-CRSP breeding component in Kenya from the University of California subgrant to the Texas A&M subgrant and establish a breeding component in Morocco with the University of California subgrant. (Successfully completed October 1982.)		Principal Investigators (Bradford and Cartwright of Univ. of Calif. and Texas A&M)	October 1982	
(continued)				
9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change	
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____	B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan	
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____		
11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)			12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval	
			Signature _____	
			Typed Name _____	
			Date _____	

CLASSIFICATION  
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-24

<b>1. PROJECT TITLE</b> Small Ruminants CRSP			<b>2. PROJECT NUMBER</b> 931-1328	<b>3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE</b> S&T/AGR/AP
<b>4. EVALUATION NUMBER</b> (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY)			<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
<b>5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES</b> A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>78</u> B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>Cont'd</u> C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>Cont'd</u>			<b>6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING (for initial period)</b> A. Total \$ _____ B. U.S. \$ <u>15,577,043</u>	
<b>7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION:</b> From (month/yr.) <u>10/1/79</u> To (month/yr.) <u>9/30/82</u> Date of Evaluation Review <u>7/20/82</u>				

**B. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR**

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
<b>10. Develop integration methodology between breeding subgrant of Montana State and the systems, socio-economic and range/forage subgrants in Peru. (Currently in process.)</b>	Hart of Winrock to coordinate and Principal Investigators (Blackwell, Cartwright, DeBoer and Bryant of Montana, Texas A&M, Winrock and Texas Tech)	Initiated August 1983

<b>9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	<b>10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT</b> A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project
---	---

<b>11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)</b>	<b>12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval</b> Signature _____ Typed Name _____ Date _____
---	--

## PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART II

### 13. SUMMARY

The stated objective of the SR-CRSP is to increase the efficiency of production of meat, milk, and fiber by sheep and goats in order to increase the food supply and raise the income of the smallholder. The program is expanding the body of knowledge and increasing the level of competence of US and LDC scientists to conduct research on small ruminants in smallholder production systems. This is facilitating the development and testing of appropriate technology and practices to improve small ruminant production in developing countries.

One of the most rewarding accomplishments of the SR-CRSP has been the linkages that have developed between institutions, scientists, and administrators in host countries. Many of these entities had little contact with each other for decades, until the SR-CRSP was on site.

Teaching and research at US institutions has materially changed as a result of the SR-CRSP. New courses, improved facilities, short courses and campus-wide interest have all been generated to a substantial degree. Moreover, the activities of the SR-CRSP have been made public at the national scientific meetings of scientists and producers alike so benefits accruing to the USA from this program can be quickly understood and implemented. Many U.S. scientists have provided specialized training in the U.S. and/or overseas to collaborators on both short and long-term assignments.

CRSP scientists have begun to publish their research findings. There have been over 40 papers presented at symposia, seminars and short courses, six papers at major scientific meetings and five papers were submitted for publication in scientific journals. In addition, some 26 internal publications have been developed.

This review documented that significant progress has been made and that the work plan and budget proposed for the sixth year extension are sound and should contribute to further accomplishments. Based on these findings, project funding for the proposed extension is recommended.

Comments, opinions and suggestions of the USAID Review Team on individual subgrants and general issues, which surfaced during the review, are presented in Attachment # 1, titled Evaluation Report. And, the precise issues identified in the AID Scope-of-Work are covered point by point in Attachment # 2. Proposed policies for publications are shown in Attachment # 3.

### 14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

S&T/FA recommended that A.I.D. team evaluations of CRSPs be performed every third year of their program and be coordinated with the normal activities of the permanent External Evaluation Panel (EEP). The procedure was suggested as a way to conserve the time of the host agency collaborators, allow for observations on the "modus operandi" of the EEP, and provide a convenient method for interactions between A.I.D. grant, subgrant, and institutional representatives (U.S. and host country collaborators).

In arranging the schedule for the A.I.D. team, consideration was given to: (1) making as many contacts with subgrantees and different institutions as possible (with and without the EEP); (2) accompanying the EEP team in its review of activities to the extent possible. A schedule to accommodate these matters and allow for interactions between the A.I.D. team and the EEP was accomplished during the month of July 1982. The evaluation included the progress of seven subprojects from presentations by Principal Investigators, inspection of facilities utilized for training, while visiting the respective universities, and information from the Project Manager on linkages between the Principal Investigators and their overseas collaborators. The A.I.D. Evaluation Team also reviewed the program with the Management Entity (ME) personnel during a visit to the University of California-Davis Campus. Comments on each of the subprojects visited by the AID Evaluation Team and general topics related to the SR-CRSP are shown in Attachment A.

#### 15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

The Title XII Act specified that A.I.D. administer and fund Title XII with money from their existing budget and authorized the President to create the Board of International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) to initiate implementation of the act. BIFAD appointed the Joint Research Committee (JRC) to oversee the research-related aspects of Title XII. It was their recommendation that Title XII-sponsored research be implemented through Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSPs) and among their suggested topics was small ruminants.

Forty percent of the world's sheep and 77 percent of the world's goats are in the LDC's, owned primarily by small pastoralists and farmers of very limited means. Despite their low production, these animals contribute very significantly to the economy and food supply in these regions and demand for their products exceeds the supply.

Improving the performance of small ruminants would directly improve the diet and standard of living of a great many people because the animals are inherently well suited to the needs of smallholders and the conditions prevailing in the LDC's. For example, they:

- o Have low initial and maintenance costs
- o Are able to use marginal and and crop residues
- o Produce milk and meat in small, readily usable quantities
- o Are easily cared for by any member of the family

The Small Ruminant CRSP (SR-CRSP) is now approaching the end of its fourth fiscal year. ~~The CRSP was the first CRSP, and therefore undertook much of the pioneering work associated with development and implementation of all future CRSPs. There was an incredible amount of groundwork to be done in establishing foreign worksites and educating many constituencies about the concept of Title XII in general, and CRSPs in particular.~~

The group of people towards whom the activities of SR-CRSP are directed are the limited resource producers in the LDC's like the smallholders and nomadic husbandmen. The programs unique to their situation make research overseas not

only appropriate, but essential if meaningful progress is to be made in improving small ruminant productivity under these conditions. Because the overseas research component of the CRSP was considered the cornerstone of the project, great care was taken to select appropriate overseas worksites which meet the following criteria:

- o Representative of the various ecozones and production systems encountered in the tropics. The applicability of CRSP findings should extend beyond the borders of any nation in which the research was conducted and be useful in other areas of similar climate and topography.
- o Countries in which the sites are located already have established agricultural institutions, staffed by scientists, trained personnel, and students with whom the CRSP investigators have an opportunity to collaborate. These institutions also provide the extension links which are pivotal to the implementation of CRSP findings. Current overseas collaborating institutions are:

-- Brazil : EMBRAPA  
 -- Peru : INIPA  
 -- Indonesia: AARD  
 -- Kenya : MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE  
 -- Morocco : HASSAN II UNIVERSITY

The individual projects were designed to help alleviate some of the major problems which severely hinder small ruminant productivity in the LDCs.

PROBLEM AREA

RESEARCH AREA

Inadequate year-round feed supply

Nutrition and Feeding

Improper grazing practices

Range Management

Poor reproductive performance

Research on reproduction  
in the male and female

Non-selective breeding

Genetic improvement of  
local breeds and  
crossbreds

Disease-Parasitism

Animal Health

Sub-optimum utilization of available resources

Management

---

Cultural constraints and lack of capital

Socioeconomic Research

Lack of coordination and integration in  
improvement of efforts

Systems Research

## 16. INPUTS

The Small Ruminant CRSP (SR-CRSP) commenced as scheduled and work under the project continues in an expeditious manner. Funds for the SR-CRSP have been committed by A.I.D. under the terms of Grant No. AID/DSAN/XII-G-0049 which requires a minimum cost sharing contribution of 25 percent from the participating U.S. institutions. The terms of the grant are favorable for a research program, always a long-term venture, providing a two-year funding horizon and five year planning horizon for participants. The SR-CRSP budget for the initial five-year funding period is 15 million U.S. dollars. The overseas host country collaborators are also supporting the program with direct funds and/or research services at a rate of over 15% - a very significant contribution to the program. U.S. institutions have matched A.I.D. funds at a rate over 60% according to an independent audit of all the participating institutions.

### THE ORGANIZATION OF THE SR-CRSP

#### o THE MANAGEMENT ENTITY (ME).

Seventeen research proposals were selected to initiate the SR-CRSP activities and UCD, one of the participating institutions, was designated the Management Entity (ME). A Program Director was appointed, and three committees, each of which play a distinct role in the function of the SR-CRSP, were established.

o THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (TC) is an executive committee of the SR-CRSP which develops and implements research projects in the U.S. and overseas. It includes each Principal Investigator (17 members)..

o THE BOARD OF INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES (BIR) is an executive committee of budget and policy. It consists of representatives from the administrations of each participating institution and members cannot be principal investigators.

THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION PANEL (EEP) is an advisory committee of the SR-CRSP responsible for review and evaluation of research activities and progress annually. It consists of a multidisciplinary group of eminent scientists from institutions not participating in the CRSP.

o THE OVERSEAS COUNTERPARTS. Host country collaborators have attended and contributed to the Technical Committee actions for every country. For example, in Kenya this is accomplished by a Program Administration Committee (PAC) which is composed of representatives of the Ministry, University, USAID Mission, and the U.S. principal investigators. ~~Similar organizations are active in Brazil (EMBRAPA), Indonesia (AARD), Peru (INIPA), and Morocco (MSP) to influence program directions.~~

## 17. OUTPUTS.

The five important units of the CRSP have all settled down to an excellent working relationship:

- The Management Entity
- The Technical Committee
- The Board of Institutional Representatives
- The External Evaluation Panel
- The Overseas Counterparts

Their work has been thoroughly documented and distributed to all constituencies. Annual workplans, budgets, and progress reports, by each principal investigator, are submitted to the ME for review and forwarded to both EEP and the BIR for evaluation and/or approval.

The SR-CRSP established Memoranda of Understanding or Initial Agreements with all five of the original target countries where work is now underway: Indonesia, Kenya, Morocco, Brazil and Peru. Excellent working relationships have been established with senior administrators and scientists in each country.

Probably the greatest single need, identified by overseas colleagues, has been that of high level technical input from US Principal Investigators to help design long-range plans for scientific research.

Perhaps, most significantly, it has been particularly exciting to see that the SR-CRSP has focused on the needs of the smallholder or limited resource farmer. In Indonesia and Kenya, almost all the effort has been conducted in baseline survey work at the village level in every discipline, backed up by relevant research programs at regional research centers. In Peru almost all the work has concentrated in the Central and Southern High Sierra working with cooperatives formed after land reform or with ethnic groups in isolated villages; and in Brazil the SR-CRSP has complemented EMBRAPA's newly established Sheep and Goat Research Center.

Site development overseas has been very significant. SR-CRSP resources have been used as seed money--the catalyst that has inspired substantial investment from local governments. Many lasting facilities are in place only because the SR-CRSP scientists collaborated with particular counterparts.

Several seminars, workshops, and short courses have been undertaken overseas including three in Peru, one in Kenya, one in Indonesia and two in Brazil. SR-CRSP scientists were much in evidence at the Third International Goat Conference in Tucson, Arizona, in January 1982..

SR-CRSP scientists have begun to publish their research findings. There have been over 40 reports presented at symposia, seminars and short courses, six papers at major scientific meetings and five papers submitted for publication in scientific journals. In addition, some 26 internal publications have been developed.

There is an excellent training program underway. There are or have been over 70 overseas students under training as follows:

- 9 PH D students in the USA
- 26 MS students in the USA
- 20 MS students supported in home-country programs
- 15 BS students supported in home-country programs

In addition, US students, including 8 PH D candidates, have collected data overseas and five others have utilized overseas data for dissertations. A number of long-term overseas residents have collected data while stationed on-site.

Teaching and research at US institutions has materially changed as a result of the SR-CRSP. New courses, improved facilities, short courses and campus-wide interest have all been generated to a substantial degree. Moreover, the activities of the SR-CRSP have been made public at the national scientific meetings of scientists and producers alike so benefits accruing to the USA from this program can be quickly understood and implemented.

Many US scientists have travelled overseas to provide specialized training in analytical procedures and facility development. Four overseas counterpart researchers have studied in the US in short-term, intensive instruction in advanced techniques.

The SR-CRSP has been publicized through a fold-out flyer, a comprehensive paper, six newsletters, a six volume Integrated Program Plan, a five volume Annual Report with complete budget reporting, and a descriptive brochure, all available from the Management Entity Office in Davis.

It is already evident that the benefits to the United States sheep and goat industry are potentially enormous. Just one example is that US scientists have achieved direct "hands on" experience with the world's most prolific breeds of sheep (which all exist outside the US) and with animals characterized by resistance to disease and parasitism which could provide a fundamental understanding of the mechanisms involved and application in the US. Thus a program directed at the small practical producer in the LDC's may yet prove to have far reaching repercussions in our own industry in the USA.

The Management Entity has attempted to be not only fiscally accountable, but to be realistic in equating dollars awarded with performance. Five of the thirteen institutions have been targeted for budget cuts or termination by the ME based on either EEP recommendations or those of foreign counterparts. This has naturally led to conflict and stress at times--but also perhaps to a better SR-CRSP program in the long run because all have survived the resulting intense scrutiny of their modified program.

An independent audit completed the first comprehensive audit of the entire SR-CRSP and the results were excellent. There were absolutely no problems resulting from the audit.

## 18. PURPOSE.

The approved project purpose is to link institutions (including U.S., international and developing country agricultural institutions under the auspices of a Management Entity) having compatible interests for organizing research programs in small ruminant production. Developing these research linkages will aid in the mobilization and coordination of research talent to ameliorate world food nutrition and lessen problems associated with research activities in sheep and goats. The mandate of Title XII - Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger - is answered with the strengthening of capacities of U.S. institutions and supporting the application of science to solving food and nutrition problems of developing countries. The outputs set forth in number 17 of this document show consistent thrusts toward accomplishing the approved project purpose and the review was able to document significant progress in this endeavor.

## 19. GOALS/SUBGOAL.

The long range goal of the SR-CRSP is to increase the food supply and raise the income of small farmer units engaged in small ruminant production through collaborative research projects by U.S. and developing country institutions. Research programs have been designed by U.S. Principal Investigators and overseas counterpart scientists which mesh with the ideals of collaborating institution and complement host government's current development program. This review found a high level of cooperation among all of the projects participants in the U.S. and abroad. In many instances, research facilities and experimental animals, as well as data collection and dissemination are being adequately shared. An active exchange of graduate students, technical personnel and counterparts was very evident. Actual outputs concerned with achieving the stated goals are detailed in Section 17 of this document.

## 20. BENEFICIARIES.

The direct and immediate beneficiaries of the SR-CRSP activities to date have been the scientists of U.S. and host country collaborators through the development of improved research programs. The review found that many institutions had strengthened their capabilities for small ruminant research and production training components. Some of the U.S. institutions also reported an increase of student interest in sheep and goat undergraduate and graduate programs. Both the U.S. and overseas research collaborators are beginning to report their findings for dissemination to the actual producers. This accumulation of data is forcing the embryonic development of extension linkages in all countries. This latter trust has been emphasized through the sponsorship of short courses and field days and the promotion of seminars at varied locations. Most of the U.S. institutions are establishing long lasting relationships with developing country agricultural policy and planning administrators as well as collaborating scientists. The rapid expansion of activities in sheep and goat research by the SR-CRSP has also stimulated the interest of U.S. commercial producers in program support efforts.

## 21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS.

One of the most obvious unplanned effects from the SR-CRSP has been the sudden interest in Caprine Arthritis Encephalitis (CAE) uncovered in Kenya. The SR-CRSP scientists were responsible for bringing CAE to the attention of Kenyan collaborators who asked for assistance in controlling the virus in their country. The end results are that Kenya implemented procedures to eliminate CAE in the country and established policies to keep virus out through direct attention by the SR-CRSP scientists. Focusing attention on CAE by SR-CRSP efforts has also stimulated interest by the USDA and several U.S. institutions for additional research at U.S. sites on CAE. Reports on the CAE problem are now appearing more frequently in U.S. scientific and trade publication. The influence on the U.S. and world goat producers by this one unexpected condition is developing into a valuable contribution that was not anticipated.

## 22. LESSONS LEARNED.

The mode of operations for any CRSP are more complex than for standard USAID contracts which took years to develop. Adjustments have been implemented in ME procedures as per recommendations by the SR-CRSP internal bodies, BIFAD, JRC, EEP and USAID. The Principal Investigators have also had to modify some of their original workplans to better fit in with the objectives of host country scientists and upon the recommendations of the EEP, The Principal Investigators have also had to strengthen their procedures for selecting U.S. scientists to place in long-term positions overseas. It is suggested that Project Managers be better informed of the activities of other CRSPs so that experiences can be shared which might be helpful in management procedures.

## 23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS.

The caliber of scientists involved in SR-CRSP activities is continuing to receive the attention of coworkers. Two years ago a member of the EEP received the award as Outstanding Animal Scientist in the field of International Agriculture from the American Society of Animal Science. Last year, another member of the EEP was selected by the American Sheep Growers Association as the person contributing the most to the U.S. Sheep Industry. This year, one of the principal investigators is to receive the Outstanding Animal Scientist Award in International Agriculture from the American Society of Animal Science. The SR-CRSP program manager (ME) accepted an invitation to make one of the four presentations in a symposium titled Plans to Improve International Animal Agriculture. Our Senior Assistant Administrator, Dr. Nyle Brady, was one of the other speakers in that symposium held on August 11, 1982 in Guelph, Canada. Recently, another EEP member was awarded a chair in the Genetics Department of the Swedish Agricultural University at Uppsala, Sweden and the Chairperson of the Board of Institutional Representatives was one of six persons to receive the International Honor Award from the USDA.

The A.I.D. Review Team report included some topics which were not proposed in the Project Review Scope of Work. These additional subjects surfaced during discussions with individual Principal Investigators (PIs) and should be briefly mentioned here. More detailed remarks on these subjects, along with comments on the Scope of Work topics, are found in Attachment # 1 of these materials.

One review team member expressed concern about the recent elimination of two institutions, considered to possess limited resources, as subgrantees of the SR-CRSP, particularly when one of these institutions was performing very well. The reviewer felt that greater benefits could be realized by institutions having limited resources, than larger institutions, from USAID supported programs. Therefore, it was suggested that focus might be placed on helping smaller U.S.A. institutions in USAID grant programs of this type. With the mandate by the A.I.D. Administrator to decrease the number of participating institutions in the SR-CRSP and restricted funding levels it is difficult to see how many small type institutions can be added to the program unless presently active institutions (subgrantees) can establish complementary contracts with the smaller institutions.

Some of the PI's felt that certain A.I.D. officials do not completely understand basic inputs for livestock research projects and that they could also receive more briefings on CRSP modes. The major concerns were the lack of appreciation for the length of experiments required for valid results from livestock research and the costs associated with operating livestock projects. The fact that the results of all research will not guarantee economical gains for producers is not appreciated either.

Several comments were made by PI's about logistic problems between them and the ME. These matters included accounting systems, methods of drafting annual project reports and requests from the ME for detailed rapid information on assorted subjects (Exam.: role of women in project, number and status of students being supported, review of requests for contingency funds, news letters items, etc.). It appears that the ME is continuing to strengthen the SR-CRSP procedural matters as new problems are identified.

Discussions with PI's pointed out that there is a lack of uniformity on procedures or guidelines for long-term assignments overseas and in the support for graduate students, in the U.S.A., from host countries. At the present time, each situation is considered on a case by case basis which causes misunderstandings. Initial decisions were based on A.I.D. regulations for contracts until it was realized that the SR-CRSP could not sponsor and take advantage of established scientists on annual sabbatical leaves for overseas assignments as is now the practice.

There has been some dissatisfaction from scientists of the SR-CRSP stationed in host countries in regard to post benefits. A large portion of this is due to non U.S. citizenship of some of the SR-CRSP families. In some cases, one member of a family is a U.S. citizen while another is not a U.S. citizen, so services by the Embassies are affected. It was agreed that all Embassies and Missions, however, have been as helpful as possible within the limits of their authorities. In fact, assistance to SR-CRSP activities overseas has been exceptionally good.

Attachments List

	Pages
1 - AID Review Team Report	10-18
2 - Memorandum on Evaluation and Scope of Work	19-25
3 - Response to Scope of Work Issues	26-28
4 - Publications Policy	29-31

August 5, 1982

---

EVALUATION REPORT  
of the AID Review Team for the  
Small Ruminant - CRSP (Project No. 931-1328)

Table of Contents

	Page
A. Comments on Individual Subprojects	11
1. California State Poly University - Male Reproductive Physiology	11
2. Utah State University - Female Reproductive Physiology	11
3. Utah State University - Rangelands	12
4. Washington State University - Animal Health	12
5. University of California (Davis) - Animal Health	13
6. University of California (Davis) - Animal Breeding	13
7. Montana State University - Animal Breeding	14
B. General Impressions for Consideration/Issues	14
C. Remarks on the External Evaluation Panel	16
1. Documents Utilized by the EEP for Review	17
2. SR-CRSP Related Activities by EEP Members	17

AID Review Team - Dr. Douglas W. Butchart, S&T/AGR/AP *DWB 10/8/82*  
AID Review Team - Dr. William P. Warren, LAC/DR *W.P. Warren 10/8/82*  
AID Coordinator - Dr. Charles E. Haines, S&T/AGR/AP *C. Haines*

Dates of Review - July 6-16, 1982

---

A. Comments on Individual Subprojects

1. California State Polytechnic University - Male Reproductive Physiology

Cal Poly SR-CRSP activities are being conducted in Brazil and Peru on sheep and goats and are highly coordinated with the Utah State University female reproduction SR-CRSP activities.

Cal Poly has been in a different situation than other SR-CRSP institutions because it has probably developed under this activity as much as it has helped the host country develop male reproductive physiology research. The enthusiasm expressed by the Cal Poly staff and support provided to SR-CRSP activities may be unmatched by other institutions in the CRSP. Utah State University also expressed the opinion that Cal Poly should be given more of a role in SR-CRSP activities than is now being allowed by the SR-CRSP policies.

In order to implement male reproductive physiology research, Cal Poly developed facilities on its campus as well as laboratory facilities in Peru. Cal Poly also provided technical assistance to the goat breeding subproject in Kenya by artificially inseminating a selected flock. Unfortunately, the conception rate was extremely poor. There was no interest to determine the cause of this failure in A.I. The evaluators didn't understand why there was not more enthusiasm among SR-CRSP scientists to study this researchable problem.

Cal Poly provides a respectable training component and has assisted in a variety of courses and seminars in Peru. However, coordination with other SR-CRSP activities in Peru is highly recommended. USDA annually funds a reproductive physiology short course at Cal Poly for selected foreign students.

Extension activities include international publications, seminars and short courses. These may not always be the most effective means of getting SR-CRSP generated information to small farmers. Coordination with socio-economic and systems components of SR-CRSP should help provide extension linkages to small farmers.

2. Utah State University - Female Reproductive Physiology

The USU SR-CRSP activities are being conducted in Peru and Brazil. The USU work on female reproduction has been highly coordinated with the Cal Poly work on male reproduction. USU appears to have done well in research and training. The LDC programs were developed in conjunction with the LDC scientists. Research in Brazil is conducted on goats primarily in producer flocks. Since producers are involved they are realizing the importance of better husbandry management for improving production.

USU research in Peru has been conducted primarily on Criolla and improved breeds of sheep. Some reproductive work has been done on alpacas since the alpaca is somewhat important to Peru. The USU stateside program has several activities that complement and support the LDC CRSP work. It appeared that USU staff were quite supportive of SR-CRSP activities.

USU is training people at MS and PhD levels at USU as they become available from both Brazil and Peru, and they also support some in-country MS students. Short courses and seminars have been conducted in Peru and Brazil. USU has provided several pieces of scientific equipment to laboratories and the appropriate training to technicians/scientists in Peru and Brazil on proper operational procedures. The above activities have included Cal Poly staff at all times.

USU cooperation with other SR-CRSP components have included breeding and some activity with economics and health. There appears to be a need for more coordinated activities among SR-CRSP components, however. Publication of information generated by SR-CRSP activities in Brazil is handled entirely by EMBRAPA. Short courses for extension workers have been provided as a means to reach small farmers. The research being conducted with producer flocks also provided a means to inform small farmers. Cooperation with socioeconomic components of SR-CRSP may help increase awareness of how to get research information to small farmers.

### 3. Utah State University - Rangelands

In Brazil, data on plant species preferences by browsing animals are being collected with esophageal-fistulated sheep and goats which along with other data are being used in determining the animals' daily digestible energy requirements. These results are essential to investigating nutrition and diet selection in areas important to small holders of sheep and goats throughout Brazil. The progress of this project is satisfactory both in research and training. The need for coordination with other disciplines and components in the SR-CRSP is presently being addressed in project planning. Excellent results are anticipated as a well coordinated effort evolves.

The Morocco component was late getting underway in establishing a working relationship with the Hassan II Agronomic Institute but is now moving forward. The Memorandum of Understanding has been signed and a Morocco scientific panel authorized to make decisions for the SR-CRSP without going through a central administrative agency. Research attention to rangelands in Morocco, because of their abundance, has a high priority with the Moroccan Government. Quite striking economic and ecological improvements in Morocco appear to be possible from the rather modest research inputs planned for this component of the SR-CRSP.

### 4. Washington State University - Animal Health

The review of this component leads one to the conclusion that the research priorities have been identified and training efforts have been productive. The health component in Kenya is of major importance and WSU relations with the Kenyans are good. Personnel problems and bad press on this SR-CRSP component have had a more negative propaganda impact than seems justified when results to date are analyzed. This project has had some of its successes overlooked especially regarding training and handling of the CAE disease situation in Kenya. In any case the baton has been passed to a new Principal Investigator at WSU as well as a new Institutional Representative.

Research plans appear well thought out and logical. In addition, it is well known that the animal health research component has a very high priority with the Kenyan Government. This appears to be an excellent component when one looks at it carefully and analyzes its potential impact in the next few years. A series of positive changes and developments are taking place.

5. University of California (Davis) - Animal Health

After considerable effort to gather disease survey data complicated by personnel problems on both the Brazilian and University of California sides (to some extent beyond the control of the institution), progress toward the identification of research priorities has been accomplished and a workplan developed. Two significant changes in approach are embodied in the workplan. The first involves phasing out the long-term U.S. Scientists in residence and expanding the visiting senior consultant approach and the second is a project maturation from a major emphasis on disease survey to more specific research areas. The new directions planned appear logical and certainly in spite of past problems, much knowledge of the small ruminant disease situation in Brazil has been gleaned by the work to date, enabling focusing of priorities and developing specific research areas on abortions and on death of animals between birth and four months of age. This SR-CRSP component should be coordinated with the animal health related activities of Washington State University and Colorado State University perhaps by convening a workshop on animal health with the above three institutions participating along with the Winrock Economics component.

6. University of California - Animal Breeding

UC-Davis is responsible for subprojects in Kenya and Indonesia and has trained several graduate students from these countries on the Davis campus. The students have been involved in the analyses of a good deal of sheep and goat reproductive data.

The component in Kenya was changed from original plans to introduce breeding goats from the USA to a focus on the use of Caprine artificial insemination because of the CAE disease situation. The new A.I. focus resulted in much poorer conception rates than were anticipated but open a whole exciting new research potential in Kenya to determine the cause of the low conception rate with imported frozen semen. Present plans, however, are that the University of California will drop out of the Kenya Breeding Research Component and pass that responsibility to Texas A&M University. No problem is anticipated in making this change. The present Principal Investigator at the University of California will assume the breeding component at the Morocco SR-CRSP site. Texas A&M has an excellent capability to assume the project responsibilities in Kenya.

The Indonesia breeding component with the University of California seems to be progressing well involving the comparison of fat and thin-tailed sheep types and reproductive efficiency of sheep.

## 7. Montana State University - Animal Breeding

The MSU SR-CRSP activities are being conducted in Peru. Some data from Colombia have also been utilized. The MSU situation can best be summarized as: top level people have done top level work but question if top level priorities received attention. MSU, like other CRSP institutions, had to develop CRSP research proposals without knowing in which country or location they would eventually work. Once on site, their proposal had to meld with the host country priorities.

In Peru, MSU is involved in some very good research on the improved breeds which is the emphasis of the GOP counterparts. MSU has also carried on a very good training program for Peruvians. The USAID/P recommended mid level (MS) training of Peruvians in Peru to work in Peru, and MSU has focused on this by supporting students at UNA and thesis research at UNA. MSU has supported one UNA faculty person at MSU in a PhD program.

Although the GOP research priorities have been on improved breeds of sheep, the question can be raised concerning the applicability of the improved breed research for small farmers who own only criolla sheep. It may be appropriate now that CRSP activities in Peru have "matured" somewhat, to re-evaluate research priorities.

MSU stateside programs have been very supportive of the overseas initiative. MSU staff, other than CRSP staff, appear to be very supportive and interested in the overseas work.

MSU cooperation with other SR-CRSP activities in Peru appear to be working well with breeding, health and reproduction components. Emphasis could now move to coordinating more with the systems, socio-economic and range/forage components of SR-CRSP in Peru. MSU realizes this and hopes the social-economic groups can help provide the linkages for developing extension activities which will reach the small farmers as information is generated.

## B. General Impressions for Consideration/Issues

1. AID has committed itself to utilizing the capabilities of the smaller USA educational institutions in the overseas programs. Many of these institutions have the capability to provide limited resources, particularly in conjunction with other institutions. SR-CRSP-ME should take this into consideration. AID provides strengthening grants to a multitude of U.S. institutions, some large, some small and some intermediate, in order for these institutions to be better able to become involved in planning and implementing AID programs. It doesn't appear that SR-CRSP institutions and the ME are keeping the above points in mind while implementing the SR-CRSP. It may also be necessary for more collaboration, cooperation and understanding among large and small institutions in order for all institutions to maintain a healthy relationship with AID.

2. Efforts should continue and probably be expanded to make AID officials more aware of requirements by research programs in general because it is felt

that many AID officials do not really understand how research programs should function and the methods used for achieving stated goals or objectives. One way to accomplish some of this would be the presentation of seminars and distribution of more information about CRSP projects.

3. It was felt that the PIs were hazy on the proposals of the ME for recently proposed changes in the sub-grants accounting systems. It was not understood exactly whether certain PIs did not understand the new proposals by the ME or if some of them had not had time to digest the information properly.

4. Reasons presented by the PIs for the variation in the length of recent annual reports were that they had too much material to condense into a few pages and/or the ME could have included another set of guidelines with the request for annual reports. (It seems that perhaps some of the PIs did not refer to the guidelines for last year's annual reports.)

5. Several of the PIs indicated that paper work connected with their SR-CRSP subgrants seemed excessive at times. Mention was made of the large amount of papers, reports and requests received from the ME. However, all PIs definitely respect the ME operations and think that the ME is doing an exceptionally good job.

6. There was general agreement that funding of the sub-grants should be made on the basis of the subgrant performance and progress now that all programs are in place. This would tend to diminish the use of guideline funding for subgrants and would tend to reward certain subgrants for exceptional performance.

7. There are problems with benefits and/or support that SR-CRSP employees overseas can receive from USAID missions or U.S. embassies. It is more complicated with this SR-CRSP because some of the employees are not U.S. citizens, some SR-CRSP overseas families have mixed citizenship and others are bonafide complete U.S. families. Support from missions and embassies can include APO and commissary privileges, medical attention, etc. Most statements from the State Department on these subjects use the language for contracts but the SR-CRSP is a grant and not a contract so this confuses the situation.

8. The USAID Project Manager feels that it is essential that some type of travel guidelines be established for long-term U.S. scientists placed overseas as well as host country scientists being sent to the U.S. for long-term graduate training. For example, maximum housing allowances for each overseas site could be established and if a resident scientist did not use all of the allowance, the difference would not be refundable. Other items for consideration would be the minimum length of tours between paid trips to the USA - whether dependents are included or excluded in mid-tour travel costs - R&R benefits provided for certain tour lengths and posts - amount of household shipping allowances, etc. There is a great lack of uniformity in procedures within posts which sometimes proves detrimental to morale.

9. Selection of U.S. scientists for overseas long-term assignments could be improved by some PIs. Other sub-grant PIs are doing an excellent job of selecting U.S. scientists for overseas duties. Both the professional capability of the scientist and his personality are essential for success in overseas assignments.

10. In regard to USAID operations, it was pointed out that AID has not provided the most desirable continuity in project leadership. Several PIs pointed out that three project managers have been responsible for AID leadership duties during the SR-CRSP program. Also, AID administrators who deal directly with policies of CRSPs and guide project managers have changed through the course of the SR-CRSP project. Another point is that decisions of USAID on future budgets and directives are sometimes tardy for forward program planning by SR-CRSP scientists (PIs). The PIs and ME have also experienced some misunderstandings with USAID Missions in host countries. However, at the present time there are no problems in this area. It is recommended that PIs or site coordinators plan a seminar on SR-CRSP for missions at periodic intervals.

11. The ME, EEP, PIs and others involved with this CRSP are a real pleasure to associate with. All PIs and sub-grantees visited on this trip showed excellent cooperation in attention to requests for information. For some sub-projects it was felt that time allotted to the discussion was sufficient but in other cases, additional time could have been advantageous to the AID review team. The review team and AID project manager also appreciated the cooperation of the EEP in completing this assignment and for their responses to the issues proposed in the memorandum from Donald R. Fiester of June 16, 1982.

C. Remarks on the External Evaluation Panel

The AID team was impressed with the members of the External Evaluation Panel's ability to effectively monitor the technical quality of the various SR-CRSP sub-projects. As a group made up of internationally recognized livestock experts, each trained within a different specialized discipline within animal agriculture, ranging through animal health, nutrition, breeding and livestock management, they are able to conceptualize with the various Principal Investigators involved, interact with them, and help them spot weaknesses in their research plans. At the same time the EEP members are very cognizant of the need for the sub-projects to evolve into a coordinated research effort to develop a useful package of technology that can be transferred to AID's mandated target group, i.e., the small producer. In addition the EEP shows a great deal of ability to interrelate the technical, social and economic considerations involved in the various research subcomponents designed to accomplish the SR-CRSP purposes and goals.

1. Documents Reviewed by the EEP

- a. Proceedings of the Prolific Sheep Workshop. October 25-29, 1981.
- b. Small Ruminants CRSP White Paper. Summary of accomplishments - the first three years. January, 1982.
- c. Minutes of the Technical Committee Meeting. January 8-10, 1982.
- d. The report of the Program Director to the BIR Executive Committee re: recommendations of the ME for Year 5 (1982-83). January 27, 1982.
- e. Minutes of BIR Meeting. March 5, 1982.
- f. Proceedings of the Small Ruminant CRSP Workshop - Kenya. March 15, 1982.
- g. Minutes of the TC Executive Committee. May 13-14, 1982.
- h. Beck-Mann Review of the Title XII Collaborative Research Support Program. May 17, 1982.
- i. Small Ruminant CRSP Progress Report, 1978-1982, prepared for the Joint Research Committee. May 18, 1982.
- j. The Blue Ribbon Committee on Systems Analysis report. June, 1982.
- k. Summary of major decisions taken at BIR Meeting. June 15, 1982. (The full draft of minutes are to be available by July 12.)
- l. Selected Research Reports from the SR-CRSP.

2. Activities of Members of the EEP - July 1981-1982

- a. Visits to selected U.S. institutions for subproject reviews in July 1981.
- b. Reviews of seven subprojects in Kenya by A. L. Pope, J.E. Rendel and W. M. Moulton during August 2-15, 1981.
- c. Review of eight subprojects in Brazil by A. L. Pope, R. L. McDowell and S. F. Baca from August 22 to September 4, 1981.
- d. Workshop for all five EEP members during October, 1981 to study subproject workplans and finalize opinions on subproject progress for a third SR-CRSP evaluation report draft.
- e. EEP members reviewed and edited final drafts of their third report, on an individual basis, in November, 1981.

- f. Third report of the EEP on the SR-CRSP distributed in November, 1981.
  - g. Attendance of A. L. Pope at BIFAD Workshop on CRSP Operations in Washington, D.C. on January 6-7, 1982.
  - h. Participation of R. E. McDowell in the Third International Conference on Goat Production and Disease and a Technical Committee Meeting in Tucson, Arizona on January 8-14, 1982.
  - i. Attendance of A. L. Pope at the BIR Meeting in Denver on March 5, 1982.
  - j. R. E. McDowell and A. L. Pope presented an EEP report to the full Joint Research Committee in Washington, D.C. on May 18, 1982.
  - k. Participation of A. L. Pope on special review committee for the Systems Analysis subproject in April and May, 1982.
  - l. Visit to Indonesia by W. M. Moulton and J. E. Rendel to observe and evaluate the four subprojects from June 20 to 28, 1982.
  - m. Special meeting between staff of the University of California (Davis) and the full EEP in Pullman, Washington concerning Animal Health subproject on July 8, 1982.
  - n. On site reviews of the Washington State University and Montana State University subprojects by the entire EEP on July 9-12, 1982.
  - o. Work sessions on July 13-15, 1982 in Bozeman, Montana to prepare a preliminary draft of the fourth EEP report.
-

JUN 16 1982

## ACTION MEMORANDUM FOR THE AGENCY DIRECTOR FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE, BUREAU FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

FROM: S&amp;T/AGR, Donald R. Fiester

*Donald R. Fiester*SUBJECT: Scope of Work, Team Evaluation for the Small Ruminants CRSP  
(931-1323), University of California at Davis

Background: Your approval is required to proceed with a team evaluation of the Small Ruminants CRSP to provide guidance to A.I.D. and the University of California regarding an additional three-year authorization beyond September 30, 1983 for years 6, 7 and 8.

This review will bring the Small Ruminants CRSP review schedule in line with your plans for conducting in-depth reviews of the CRSPs during the third year of program operation.

Recommendation: In order to carry out this team review, your approval is required both for the Scope of Work and for the travel costs of the team.

Attachment:  
Scope of Work

APPROVED: *JSP*

DISAPPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 6/23/82

## Clearances:

S&T/AGR/AP: CHaines *hw* Date: 6/16/82  
 S&T/AGR/AP: DButchart *DW* Date: 6/16/82  
 S&T/AGR/AP: JMyche *JM* Date: 6/16/82  
 S&T/AGR: MMydzynski *MM* Date: 6/17/82  
 S&T/AGR: JWalsh *JW* Date: 6/17/82  
 S&T/FC: FCampbell *FC* Date: 6/20/82

---

**Best Available Document**

S&T/AGR/AP: JMyche:hw 6/16/82

## PROJECT EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

PROJECT TITLE: : Small Ruminants CRSP (SR-CRSP)  
PROJECT NUMBER: : 931-1323  
NAME OF GRANTEE: : University of California/Davis  
GRANT NUMBER : : AID/DSAN/KII-G-0049  
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: : Dr. David Robinson  
REVIEW DATES : : July 6-16, 1982  
TYPE OF REVIEW : : In-depth Review  
TEAM MEMBERS : :  
: Dr. Douglas W. Butchart  
: Livestock Specialist  
: S&T/AGR/AP  
: Agency for International Development  
: Washington, D.C. 20523  
: Dr. William P. Warren  
: Animal Nutritionist  
: LAC/DR  
: Agency for International Development  
: Washington, D.C. 20523

**Best Available Document**

#### A. PURPOSE AND RATIONALE FOR A.I.D. EVALUATION:

S&T/FA recommended that A.I.D. team evaluations of CRSPs be performed every third year of their program and be coordinated with the normal activities of the permanent External Evaluation Panel, (EEP). This procedure was suggested as a way to conserve the time of host agency collaborators, allow for observations on the "modus operandi" of the EEP, and provide a convenient method for interactions between A.I.D. grant, subgrant, and institutional representatives (U.S. and host country collaborators). Since an A.I.D./Small Ruminants CRSP team evaluation was conducted three years ago and the EEP will be meeting next month, S&T/AGR is recommending a team to be coordinated with the EEP evaluation.

In arranging the schedule for the A.I.D. team, consideration is given to: (1) making as many contacts with subgrantees and different institutions as possible (with and without the EEP); (2) accompanying the EEP team in its review of activities to the extent possible. A schedule to accommodate these matters and allow for interactions between the A.I.D. team and the EEP is shown on Attachment A.

#### B. TEAM COMPOSITION:

1. Dr. Douglas W. Butchart: As S&T/AGR subprogram leader for livestock, Dr. Butchart has long experience as a practicing veterinarian and as a livestock specialist for A.I.D. in all areas of livestock production, health and management.
2. Dr. William P. Warren: Dr. Warren, an Animal Nutritionist in the Latin America Bureau, has been a member of the JRC and is fully acquainted with the goals and objectives of the CRSP, from the Agency's perspective. He has experiences with world-wide livestock programs and will make an excellent contribution to this evaluation.

#### C. OTHER PARTICIPANTS:

1. Dr. C.E. Haines, S&T/AGR. As project manager of the SR-CRSP, will participate in all evaluation exercises and coordinate team activities with the EEP, Principal Investigators at participating institutions, and the Management Entity.

#### D. DATES AND PLACES OF EVALUATION:

1. See Attachment A.

#### E. COST ANALYSIS FOR EVALUATION:

1. Travel and per diem for Drs. Butchart and Warren	\$2,600
2. Travel and per diem for Dr. Haines, under RSSA funds	\$1,300
TOTAL	<u>\$3,900</u>

**Best Available Document**

## F. BACKGROUND:

The SR-CRSP was the first Collaborative Research Support Program to be initiated under the Title XII support act. The Grant Agreement was accepted and signed by the University of California/Davis in September 1973 for a five-year period. Funds for the SR-CRSP have been committed by A.I.D. under terms which require a minimum cost sharing contribution of 25% from participating U.S. institutions. It was also anticipated that overseas collaborators would contribute substantial resources for SR-CRSP research activities.

The long range goal of the SR-CRSP is to increase the efficiency of meat, milk, sheep and goat fiber production in order to increase food supply and raise the income of the small holders in developing countries. Seventeen research subprojects were selected to initiate activities and the University of California/Davis was designated the Management Entity (ME). Thirteen U.S. institutions are responsible for providing leadership to the subprojects and are actually subgrantees of the SR-CRSP. Five LDCs were selected as collaborators in the research subprojects and Memoranda of Understanding were established with them. The host countries have established agricultural institutions, staffed by scientists, trained personnel and students with whom the SR-CRSP investigators would be able to collaborate. These institutions also provide the extension links which are pivotal to the implementation of CRSP findings. The sites are representative of the various ecozones and production systems encountered in the tropics and include Peru, Brazil, Morocco, Kenya and Indonesia.

The SR-CRSP is midway through its fourth fiscal year with certain accomplishments to report and a few problems to resolve. The U.S. institutions have matched A.I.D. funds at a rate of more than 60% and overseas governments are matching A.I.D. funds at approximately 15%. Five important units within the SR-CRSP have established excellent working relationships to assure adequate progress in research and administrative procedures. These five units providing the detailed check and balance system are the ME, Technical Committee (TC), Board of Institutional Representatives, IEP and the Overseas Collaborators. There are, or has been, over 70 host country students receiving research training. Several seminars, workshops, and short courses have been conducted in host countries including three in Peru, two in Kenya, one in Indonesia, and two in Brazil. The SR-CRSP scientists have begun publishing the research findings with over 40 papers presented at symposia, seminars and short courses, six papers at major scientific meetings and five papers submitted to scientific journals. In addition, some 26 internal publications have been developed. Although the SR-CRSP has focused on the needs of the small holder, benefits to the U.S. sheep and goat industry is also evident. As one example; U.S. scientists have achieved direct "hands on" experiences with the world's most prolific breeds of sheep (all exist outside of the U.S.) and with animals characterized by resistance to disease and parasitism which could provide a fundamental understanding of the mechanisms involved and application in the U.S. A cost/benefit analysis of the SR-CRSP mode of operation may well reveal that CRSPs are the most effective and cost worthy forms of research ever devised by A.I.D.

G. PROBLEMS AND ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE TEAM:

The following specific items should be considered by the team and the EEP. The impression from the EEP will include more host country flavor than anticipated from the A.I.D. team since the latter will not have the benefit of host country inspections. Also, variations of opinions about effectiveness could result from the fact that the two evaluation groups will have visited several of the participating U.S. institutions at different periods of project development. Some of the issues which each group should consider during their evaluations are listed below:

1. Has the monitoring of the subprojects in the U.S. and in the host countries been adequate? Several groups such as the EEP, ME, TC, Missions and A.I.D. are involved in varied aspects of this function. Are there marginal activities that should be deleted from the program?
2. What impact has the SR-CRSP had on host country and U.S. institutional research activity priorities, government policies, agricultural extension services, farmers, and students?
3. How have host country and U.S. institutional collaborators become involved at the subproject work sites? What are the feelings of these collaborators about the impact of the subprojects and the overall SR-CRSP?
4. What has been the progress made in training of students and technicians both overseas and in the U.S.? Which areas of speciality need more focus?
5. How many publications have been produced by grant activities and what is the quality of these publications? Are they the right type of publications for the intended audiences?
6. Have the SR-CRSP subprojects strengthened the capabilities of U.S. institutions for better serving host country needs? Are strong links being established between U.S. institutions and their overseas collaborators in the related fields of expertise?
7. Are the subprojects directed toward their objectives and reaching their goals as established in work plans and progress reports? Have directions shifted in some of the subprojects toward more realistic goals? If so, were reasons valid for these changes?
8. Do certain A.I.D. regulations tend to hinder or assist the program logistics? Have they been detrimental to program progress? If so, cite some examples and also make suggestions for alternations in existing conditions.
9. Has the SR-CRSP been responsive to suggestions for improving procedures in host countries and in the U.S.? These suggestions could have originated from A.I.D., Mission, host country representatives or SR-CRSP committees.
10. Is the SR-CRSP too complex for efficient management? Can any recommendations be made to institute more efficient management for this CRSP or future CRSPs?

**Best Available Document**

Schedule for Evaluation of Small Ruminant-CRSP in July, 1982

<u>Dates</u>	<u>USAID Team*</u>	<u>EEP Members**</u>
July 6, 1982	AM	LV Wash, DC for CA
	PM	Visit CA Poly (Physiology)
July 7, 1982	AM	LV CA Poly AR Davis
	PM	Visit U. CA (ME)
July 8, 1982	AM	Visit U. CA (Breeding)
	PM	Visit U. CA (Health)
	PM	LV Davis AR Pullman AR Pullman
July 9, 1982	AM	Review Wash. State (Health)
	PM	Review Wash. State (Health)
	PM	LV Pullman AR Bozeman LV Pullman AR Bozeman
July 12, 1982	AM	Review Montana S. (Breeding)
	PM	Review Montana S. (Breeding)
July 13, 1982	AM	LV Bozeman AR Logan Bozeman-Report Drafting
	PM	Visit Utah S. (Range Mgt.) Bozeman-Report Drafting
July 14, 1982	AM	Visit Utah S. (Physiology) Bozeman-Report Drafting
	PM	LV Logan AR Bozeman Bozeman-Report Drafting
July 15, 1982	AM	Eval. Round Table Eval. Round Table
	PM	Eval. Summary Eval. Summary
July 16, 1982	AM	LV Bozeman AR Wash., DC LV Bozeman-Home

\*Butchart, Haines and Warren to visit 7 subproject and ME sites plus contact with entire EEP.

\*\*Pope (Wisconsin), McDowell (Cornell), Moulton (USDA), Randal (FAC), and Baca (Mexico) to visit 2 subproject sites and have contact with ME.

**Best Available Document**

## Attachment A

Schedule for Evaluation of Small Ruminant-CRSP in July, 1982

<u>Dates</u>	<u>USAID Team*</u>	<u>EEP Members**</u>
July 6, 1982 AM	LV Wash, DC for CA	----
PM "	Visit CA Poly (Physiology)	----
July 7, 1982 AM	LV CA Poly AR Davis	----
PM	Visit U. CA (ME)	----
July 8, 1982 AM	Visit U. CA (Breeding)	----
PM	Visit U. CA (Health)	----
PM	LV Davis AR Pullman	AR Pullman
July 9, 1982 AM	Review Wash. State (Health)	Review Wash. State (Health)
PM	Review Wash. State (Health)	Review Wash. State (Health)
PM	LV Pullman AR Bozeman	LV Pullman AR Bozeman
July 12, 1982 AM	Review Montana S. (Breeding)	Review Montana S. (Breeding)
PM	Review Montana S. (Breeding)	Review Montana S. (Breeding)
July 13, 1982 AM	LV Bozeman AR Logan	Bozeman-Report Drafting
PM	Visit Utah S. (Range Mgt.)	Bozeman-Report Drafting
July 14, 1982 AM	Visit Utah S. (Physiology)	Bozeman-Report Drafting
PM	LV Logan AR Bozeman	Bozeman-Report Drafting
July 15, 1982 AM	Eval. Round Table	Eval. Round Table
PM	Eval. Summary	Eval. Summary
July 16, 1982 AM	LV Bozeman AR Wash., DC	LV Bozeman-Home

\*Butchart, Haines and Warren to visit 7 subproject and ME sites plus contact with entire EEP.

\*\*Pope (Wisconsin), McDowell (Cornell), Moulton (USDA), Randel (FAO), and Baca (Mexico) to visit 2 subproject sites and have contact with ME.

**Best Available Document**

Actions on the AID Review Scope of Work

The team composition and review schedule conformed to the recommendations proposed in the memorandum dated June 16, 1982 from Donald R. Fiester to the Agency Director for Food and Agriculture, Bureau for Science and Technology. Drs. Butchart and Warren formed the AID review team and Dr. Haines as Project Manager, participated in evaluation exercises and coordinated the team activities with the EEP, Principal Investigators and the Management Entity. These three persons visited leaders and associates of seven (7) of the seventeen (17) subprojects, received briefing at the Management Entity Office, and collaborated with the full External Evaluation Panel at two of the subgrant institutions during their annual deliberations on the entire SR-CRSP progress and future directions. The complete duty required 11 full days.

Responses to the twelve (12) precise issues, as set forth in the memorandum from Donald R. Fiester to the Agency Director for Food and Agriculture have been summarized below. Additional unplanned issues that surfaced during the review are covered in Attachment #1 along with greater detail on some of the listed issues.

1. The monitoring of the subprojects in the USA has been adequate, however, there are two host country programs that need on-site evaluations next year by the EEP. A way in which evaluations might be improved would be to have Mission staff participate more thoroughly in program evaluations.

2. The SR-CRSP has had a visible impact on host country U.S. institutions by promoting improvements in research facilities and more refined training programs. Training programs are beginning to reach not only scientists but also extension service personnel, local farmers, and students. In a couple of the U.S. institutions new course offerings have been developed with emphasis on overseas conditions.

3. Host country and U.S. collaborators have become more committed to project objectives as goals become more clearly defined. Some project objectives have been redefined or modified which has meant changes in scientists to better match expertise needs with fields of competence.

4. Over 70 students, both U.S. and host country scientists, have received or are receiving advanced degree training. In some cases, the foreign scientists have been supported at U.S. institutions while in other incidents the advanced degree programs are undertaken in home country institutions. U.S. graduate students have received on-site training in host country conditions. Although the training component has recorded excellent progress overall, a few specialty areas like Nutrition and Systems Modeling could stand more emphasis.

5. The grant activities has fostered a multitude of varied publications. Number of publications by classification, is stated in #13 and #17 of the PES. Titles of every publication are listed on pages 1-23 in the Appendix of the report submitted to the JRC in May 1982. At the present

**Best Available Document**

time, preliminary guidelines have been drafted by an SR-CRSP subcommittee to improve uniformity in future publications. (See attachment 4.) The ME has developed a standard cover to encase publications and a numbering system so that reports can be referenced. Variations in report construction indicate that the information produced is suitable for audiences of varied backgrounds.

6. Yes, the SR-CRSP subprojects have strengthened the capabilities of the U.S. institutions to better serve host country needs. Strong links are being established between U.S. scientists and their overseas collaborators in professional programs. Facilities for research and training have been improved on U.S. institutions' campuses and at research centers in host countries. Research techniques have also been strengthened on overseas sites.

7. Most of the subprojects are continuing direction toward original objectives and following established work plans. However, a few of the work plans of subprojects have and/or are now changing procedures to comply with changes in emphasis. In some cases, previous EEP findings have recommended changes in program objectives while in other cases the host country collaborators have requested shifts in objectives from initial work plans. In all situations, the few modifications in subproject work plans have tended to promote program progress. Also, some subprojects have only changed procedures such as shifting from serving host country needs via short courses and consultants to posting full-time U.S. specialists in the host country. The reverse procedure has also occurred -- changing from long-term scientists at post to short-term consultants. All of these modifications indicate the ability of the subproject leaders to adjust to changing conditions.

8. Perhaps, unfortunately, some of the USAID regulations do not apply to CRSP management because handbooks pertain to contractors and not grants. In regard to travel, post benefits, lengths of tour, attendance at professional meetings, benefits for host country trainees, etc., the CRSP participants are not governed by AID regulations. Therefore, each situation is handled on a case by case basis which makes management more difficult. Also, due to the fact that each institution has their own policies has caused greater variances in procedures. Standardized guidelines for all CRSPs should improve AID management procedures. These points are also emphasized on page 15 in Attachment #1.

Overall, the regulations imposed by AID on CRSP projects have been accepted and implemented. It is also felt that the ME and other SR-CRSP entities are finding it easier to live with AID policies as they become better understood. To some extent, AID has been at fault by not providing continuity to the SR-CRSP management. The present AID Program Manager is the fourth person to assume this duty.

9. Yes, the CRSP has been responsive to recommendations for improving procedures in host countries and in the U.S. The recommendations implemented have come from the EEP via the ME, the Technical Committee and host country collaborators. AID Mission staff have also provided suggestions and guidance for in-country procedures and have often assisted the SR-CRSP scientists.

**Best Available Document**

The Board of Institutional Representatives have often deliberated at great lengths before establishing a policy or not approving a recommendation forwarded to their attention. Unfortunately, several emergency situations, requiring immediate action, have required assemblies of committees which resulted in additional expenditures.

10. We do not believe that the SR-CRSP is too complex for efficient management.. The management will be effective to the degree that the components intermesh. In some instances, three components (subgrantees) will ensnare one another while in other situations fifteen components might work together in complete harmony. A striking example has been the change in the attitude prevailing in the SR-CRSP committee meeting. Initial meetings, four years ago, were much more spirited and consequently longer than are meetings conducted this year; so accomplishments are swifter as the components have learned to work together toward common objectives.

11. It appears that the SR-CRSP scientists are still learning how to select the most appropriate long and short term specialists for overseas assignments. Some of the subproject leaders are giving considerable attention to their selection processes by observing an individual for a year before placing him/her at an overseas post. (One of the subprojects which practices this system has not had any trouble with the 4-6 long-term scientists placed overseas.) Other subprojects seem to have problems with some of the long-term scientists sent to posts. In general, additional attention could be given to this item by the principal investigators. Other comments on this subject are presented on page 16 in Attachment #1.

12. The overall program might reach its maximum effectiveness in 10 years from its initial starting date but various individual subprojects will require longer attention due to the fact that some of the subprojects did not start on as firm a foundation as others. In other words, the capabilities of the host countries for implementing some of the subprojects were a lot stronger than for other recommended subprojects. It is also true that all of the subprojects in a particular host country did not start up at the same time. Likewise, the Memoranda of Understanding between the host country and the SR-CRSP were signed at different dates thus some of the host countries have been on board longer than others.

It would probably be more realistic to consider a termination or phase out period of 15 years from the signing of the AID grant because we must also consider the fact that other appropriate LDCs are now requesting this type of assistance. Therefore, it is probable that the activities of the SR-CRSP will proceed to diminish in some of the present host countries so that expansion to these other LDCs can take place. With the present funding levels it is impossible to include more deserving collaborating countries in the SR-CRSP unless activities are further restricted in the countries presently receiving attention.

**Best Available Document**

## PUBLICATION POLICY FOR THE SR-CRSP

It is considered essential that the publication policy for the Small Ruminants CRSP should not be restrictive. The intent is to insure accountability and to encourage quality publications at all levels.

The sheep and goat research projects supported by Title XII funds and carried out within the Small Ruminants CRSP will involve participating institutions within the continental United States and institutions in several other countries.

Within the U.S., state, private, and federal institutions or agencies will be involved. By nature of the program, these research projects will be highly interrelated and publication resulting from this research will often involve joint authorship by scientists in more than one institution. A substantial part of the support for domestic research in this program will come from state, federal, and grant funds (non-Title XII) available to the separate research institutions. Thus, publication accountability will be required by several funding sources in addition to AID.

Publication of results from Title XII research efforts will have the same high priority as that of any other research effort. Publication media normally available to researchers in state experiment stations and private agencies will be acceptable. There will be an obligation to make available the results of research to the collaborating host countries and to the other developing countries. The use of publication media appropriate to their needs will be necessary. This will likely require an additional dimension to our publication responsibility and experience, including translation to other languages from English.

An internal publication within the Small Ruminants CRSP has been suggested as an important mechanism for communicating information to scientists working in the program, both domestic and foreign, and to inform AID, BIFAD/JRC, and our own institutions. Such a publication would contain progress reports and transmit preliminary or unpublished findings to the group for their use in research planning. It would not be expected to have wide general distribution. More than one type of internal publication may be needed. News releases regarding the work under Title XII probably should also come under this publication policy.

Recommended Policy

## 1. Journal Articles.

Review and publication approval for articles to appear in referred journals will be that required by the institution(s) represented by the author(s). Since these publications undergo extensive peer review prior to acceptance by the scientific journals, it is expected that the manuscript when finally approved for publication will be of such quality to merit sanction by the Small Ruminants CRSP. For purposes of information, copies

**Best Available Document**

of the manuscript should be made available to members of the technical committee through the Program Director's office when it is first submitted by the authors for their institutional publication approval. If members of the technical committee wish to comment on the manuscript, that opportunity will thus be available to them. Mandatory review by the technical committee will not be required.

2. Other major technical publications (bulletins, review articles, monographs, etc.)

This class of publications that does not normally receive substantial peer review outside the author's institution(s) should be reviewed within the technical committee. For each such publication, the Chairperson of the technical committee will appoint an ad hoc review committee consisting of three members of the technical committee with the Program Director serving as ex-officio member. In addition, the manuscript will be made available to all members of the technical committee who may comment on it if they wish. Review by the committee should be as expeditious as possible.

3. Review in host institutions.

It is expected that there will be joint authorship of publications involving both U.S. and host country scientists. In these cases, publication policy of the host institutions will need to be included as a part of our publication policy. This policy should be a clearly stated part of the agreement between the host institution and the Management Entity for Small Ruminants CRSP. Uniform language should be used in each such agreement if possible.

4. General distribution.

Provision will be made for the Small Ruminants CRSP to publish such material as is deemed appropriate for wide general distribution, using publication media to be developed or acquired for the CRSP. An investigation of AID's publication policies, funding support, and distribution mechanisms will be made to determine if these publication needs of the CRSP can be met through existing AID procedures.

5. Internal publications.

Provision for internal publications that serve as a medium of communication among the principal investigators, AID, BIFAD/JRC, Board of Institutional Representatives, and External Evaluation Committee will be developed by the Program Director. A subcommittee of the technical committee may be appointed to assist the Program Director in this effort. This subcommittee will also serve in an advisory capacity to the Program Director on publication matters as required.

**Best Available Document**

6. Acknowledgment of support.

Appropriate acknowledgement of support (financial and other) will be made on all publications. A suitable statement will be obtained from AID that is acceptable for this purpose as regards Title XII funding. (Statement draft follows.)

Footnote title of publication as follows:

"This research was carried out as a part of the United States Agency for International Development Title XII Small Ruminants Collaborative Research Support Program under Grant No. AID/DSAN/XII-G-0049, in Collaboration with (List the Name(s) of overseas institution(s) with whom the Memorandum of Understanding is signed, for example - Instituto Nacional de Investigacion Agraria, Peru, or Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuaria, Brazil)."

Each author's institution should be listed and referenced to identify author and institution.

7. News releases.

A standard format to acknowledge funding by AID under Title XII, the contributions made by host institutions of foreign countries, and our own institutions will be developed for use in local news releases.

---