

ISN-25155

13200 29/15 March 79

PDP/RD

3/19/79

PD-AAN-472

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-417

1. PROJECT TITLE <b>Heifer Project International DPG</b>			2. PROJECT NUMBER <b>932-0000</b>	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE <b>PDC/PVC</b>
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) <b>1</b>	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <b>77</b>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <b>79</b>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <b>79</b>	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ <b>721,000</b> B. U.S. \$ <b>721,000</b>	
			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) <b>10/77</b> To (month/yr.) <b>10/78</b> Date of Evaluation Review <b>November 1978</b>	
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
<p>With the completion of staffing of the evaluation unit under the DPG, no other unresolved issues have been identified.</p>		

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

<p>11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)</p> <p>Datta <i>[Signature]</i> Bergen <i>[Signature]</i> 12-7-78</p>	<p>12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval</p> <p>Signature <i>[Signature]</i></p> <p>Typed Name <b>Thomas H. Fox</b></p> <p>Date <b>12-7-78</b></p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

13. **SUMMARY** - The Heifer Project International evaluation project has four overall objectives: the design of an evaluation system, the testing of that system in four selected countries, the integration of an evaluation system into the structure and operation of HPI and the provision of training in evaluation for staff and selected members of the board of directors. An examination of the Logical Framework for this project (Attachment A) will reveal that at the present time the project is at the initial input phase of the work. Progress indicators include a preliminary design, a preliminary livestock dispersal analysis format, a process reporting instrument and a file information assessment instrument.

There are, however, several topics of importance which should be briefly discussed regarding the first year of the project. These are: activities to date, staff selection, country selection, and timing.

**A. Activities during the first year.**

The period from October 1, 1977 to May 1, 1978 was spent by HPI in the development of job descriptions for a new Executive Director and Program Director in addition to the selection of an Evaluation Director, Executive Director and Interim Program Director. The Interim Program Director, Mr. Charles Burwell, began work on April 1, and the new Executive Director, Mr. Terry Ford started his services on May 1, 1978. The Evaluation Director's employment began on the same date. Given the extraordinary demands on time involved in staffing, the delay in the implementation of the evaluation project is justifiable.

From May 1, 1978 to the present the Evaluation Director has been involved in liason with consulting firms and USAID personnel, literature review, development of prototype evaluation models and instruments and, most important, staff recruitment. A study of the available data in the HPI files has also been initiated.

As of July 17, the Team Leader has been engaged in data searches of target countries, system design, and development of a network of evaluation resource persons in the academic, business and private agencies.

**B. Staff**

The project proposal as approved calls for a professional staff of three persons. The proposal also stipulates that the Evaluation Director is to become a permanent position while the Team Leader and the Evaluation Associate positions terminate with the completion of the project.

4/

The Reverend Armin L. Schmidt was selected to serve as Evaluation Director. He holds Bachelors degrees in Biology from Heidelberg College and Agricultural Economics from the Ohio State University. His Master's degree in Rural Sociology was granted by the Ohio State University and his Bachelor of Divinity degree was earned at Eden Theological Seminary. His experience includes eight years of work in rural development in the Philippines, teaching sociology at the State University of New York at Cortland, and field representation and evaluation for A.D., a national church related magazine.

The Team Leader, Dr. Thanh D. Nguyen, has been seconded to HPI by Winrock International Livestock Research and Training Center for sixty per cent of his time for the life of the project. Dr. Nguyen is an animal nutritionist holding his undergraduate degrees from the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Veterinary Medicine in Saigon. His Doctorate was awarded by the University of Florida. Dr. Thanh brings to the staff wide experience in international livestock research and program evaluation in Indoneasia, the Philippines, Viet Nam, India, Afghanistan and France.

Mr. Gerald Aaker, the Associate Director of Evaluation, has been seconded to HPI by Lutheran World Relief for seventy-five per cent of his time during the life of the project. He is a graduate in sociology from Luther College and his Master of Social Work degree was granted by the University of Hawaii. He comes to this position directly from Honduras where he was engaged in organization and program evaluation for CEDEN, a national development agency. Mr. Aaker has also been involved in relief and evaluation work in Mexico, Peru, Nicaragua and Viet Nam.

An exhaustive search for a qualified secretary has resulted in the selection of Ms. Asha Sahita, a native of Bombay India currently residing in Little Rock. She has over ten years of experience as a secretary and bookkeeper in business and governmental offices.

It is felt that the composition of the evaluation unit will provide the complimentary and balanced combination of experience and professional orientation necessary to develop a valid and reliable evaluation system.

#### C. Selection of countries

Four countries were selected for field tests of the evaluation design: Ecuador, the Philippines, Guatemala and Tanzania. In addition to the criteria enumerated in the project proposal HPI also took into consideration the variety of models of HPI involvement in various countries. The countries selected represent four distinct patterns of HPI work.

3

5

D. Timing

Although this project was scheduled to begin in October, 1977 the staff recruitment process required more time than was anticipated. This process, however, has resulted in a stronger, more efficient national headquarters staff which enjoys higher levels of involvement, trust and cooperation with the Board of Directors. Three more national staff at the Associate Director level are to be added in the near future. This will have the effect of both improving and expanding the work of HPI.

The Evaluation Director accepted the position with the understanding that a full three year period for the completion of the project would be available under the grant funding. HPI is proceeding under this continued assumption.

14. Evaluation methodology

This evaluation is based on the review of HPI documents and interviews of HPI personnel by the appropriate AID personnel. Suggested date for the next evaluation will be sometime after 5/30/79 - the end of the first year of actual operation.

15. External factors

The major external factor affecting the project was the major changes in HPI executive staff. Goal, purpose and output assumptions have been strengthened as a result of this process.

16. Inputs

Inputs and project supporting activities are being delivered as projected. No change in design/funding to facilitate achievement of output targets is indicated.

17. Outputs

Output targets are being approached on project schedule. No change in output targets is indicated.

18. Purpose

The stated purpose of this project is the "Development and integration of an evaluation process within HPI".

Indicators at this level refer to the EOPS. It is too early in the life of the project to assess these indicators.

19. Goal

The stated goal of this project is to "Develop the capacity of HPI to evaluate and plan its project work."

Current progress toward goal indicators:

1. Project evaluation data is being gathered from on-going projects.
2. New project proposals are being assessed in the light of evaluation considerations.
3. Organizational structure is being modified to provide evaluation input.
4. Evaluation personnel participate fully in staff decision making process.

20. Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries are to be the low income persons in HPI project areas who will receive better service through improved project planning and implementation resulting from HPI project evaluations.

The indirect beneficiaries will be the participants in other PVO projects adapting and implementing the evaluation design and experience provided by this project.

21. Unplanned effects

None.

22. Lessons learned

It has been learned that the key to the success of a project of this nature is careful preparatory groundwork with the Board of Directors, donor groups, field and project staff, and beneficiary groups plus the selection of personnel with appropriate qualifications.

23. Special comments:

The HPI organization is giving full and enthusiastic support to the evaluation project. Expectations of practical and far reaching results are high. This is indicated by purpose level adjustments being initiated in anticipation of achievement of goal level targets. Levels of support in terms of funds and staff time are significant.

7

## SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

1. See attachment B.
  2. HPI program priorities now include provision for systematic monitoring, formulative evaluations and terminal evaluations.
  3. The AID grant has led to the inclusion of evaluation concerns in the committee structure of HPI and the integration of evaluation staff into the executive decision making system.
  4. Impact on the HPI communication system is not an immediate purpose of this project. However, improved reporting and project monitoring will facilitate improved communication throughout the organization.
  5. Improved fund raising is not an immediate purpose of the project. However, the enhanced capability of HPI, along with clear indications of project performance will further strengthen the credibility of HPI among present and potential donors.
  6. The necessity of securing new staff delayed the initiation of the project.
  7. Not applicable at the present time. Positive response to the sub-questions are anticipated by the end of the project.
  8. HPI plans to utilize to the fullest extent the evaluation system being developed under the grant.
  9. Progress to date:
    - a. Full evaluation staff has been assembled.
    - b. Work on design, methodology and data gathering instruments is in progress.
    - c. Preparations are being made for the first field test of the design and the first workshop.
- 6

**HEIFER PROJECT INTERNATIONAL  
Evaluation System Development Project  
Logical Framework**

<u>GOAL</u>	<u>INDICATORS</u>	<u>ASSUMPTIONS</u>
<p>Developed capacity of HPI to evaluate and plan its field program &amp; projects</p>	<p>HPI organization routinely and systematically carries out program &amp; project plans</p> <p>Evaluation findings channeled into replanning and policy decision making process</p>	<p>Presence of felt need for an evaluation process by HPI personnel</p>
<p><u>PURPOSE</u></p> <p>Development and integration of evaluation process within HPI</p>	<p><u>EOPS</u></p> <p>Organization plan adopted and implemented.</p> <p>An evaluation system that has been tested and revised.</p> <p>Completion of training workshops for central staff, selected Board members and selected field personnel</p>	<p>Fulfillment of purpose indicators sufficient to meet purposes.</p> <p>Time and resources necessary for development of evaluation system not detrimental to on-going work of HPI</p>
<p><u>OUTPUTS</u></p> <p>Structural reorganization</p> <p>Evaluation system &amp; report.</p> <p>Review of HPI programs &amp; projects.</p> <p>Repository of base line data.</p> <p>Training workshops.</p> <p>Final evaluation plan.</p>	<p>Approval and implementation of reorganization plan.</p> <p>Initial and revised system designs.</p> <p>Four reports.</p> <p>Two review reports.</p> <p>Data bank.</p> <p>No. of workshops held &amp; no. of participants.</p> <p>Evaluation process plan.</p>	<p>Evaluation given priority status in staff and board work.</p> <p>Results of evaluation indicate clear policy and planning implications.</p> <p>Timing of workshops fits in with availability of non-staff participant.</p>
<p><u>INPUTS</u></p> <p>Staff and consultants.</p> <p>Travel &amp; per. diem support.</p> <p>Workshop support.</p>		<p>Competent staff and consultants can be found.</p>



P. O. BOX 808  
300 SPRING STREET  
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72203  
TELEPHONE: 501 376-6836  
CABLE: HEIFER

Attachment B

# HEIFER PROJECT INTERNATIONAL

## SHARING LIFE AROUND THE WORLD

HEIFER PROJECT INTERNATIONAL assists small farmers around the world to achieve a better living through more efficient use of human and natural resources.

This is done by introducing genetic improvement in livestock and demonstrating and teaching proper management.

Distribution of Heifer Project livestock is made without regard to race, creed or politics, and in a manner which requires recipients to share the increase.

Projects are designed so as to be self-supporting and perpetuating. To accomplish this HPI works with indigenous organizations.

A non-profit organization founded in 1944, HPI is supported by contributions from individuals, churches, businesses, farmers, foundations and others who believe in the objectives of HPI.

Over the years HPI has aided farmers in the following countries and states:

### AFRICA

Algeria  
Angola  
Botswana  
Burundi  
Cameroon  
Cent.African  
Republic  
Chad  
Egypt  
Ethiopia  
Ghana  
Kenya  
Liberia  
Malawi  
Morocco  
Nigeria  
Rhodesia  
Senegal  
Sierre Leone  
South Africa  
Sudan  
Swaziland  
Tanzania  
Togo  
Tunisia  
Ugana  
Upper Volta  
Zaire

### ASIA

Afghanistan  
Bangladesh  
China  
Hong Kong  
India  
Indonesia  
Japan  
Korea  
Malasia  
Mariana Is.  
Nepal  
Pakistan  
Philippines  
Ryukyu Is.  
Samoa  
Thailand  
Taiwan  
Vietnam

### MIDDLE EAST

Gaza  
Iran  
Israel  
Jordan  
Lebanon  
Malta  
Turkey

### CARIBBEAN

Antigua  
Bahamas  
Barbados  
Cuba  
Dominica  
Dominican Rep.  
Haiti  
Jamaica  
Nevis  
Puerto Rico  
St. Lucia  
St. Vincent  
Virgin Islands

### SOUTH AMERICA

Argentina  
Bolivia  
Brazil  
Chile  
Colombia  
Guyana  
Ecuador  
Paraguay  
Peru  
Venezuela

### CENTRAL AMERICA

Belize  
Costa Rica  
El Salvador  
Guatemala  
Honduras  
Mexico  
Nicaragua  
Panama

### EUROPE

Albania  
Austria  
Belgium  
Bulgaria  
Czechoslovakia  
France  
Germany, East  
Germany, West  
Greece  
Italy  
Poland  
Russia  
Spain  
Sweden  
United Kingdom  
Yugoslavia

### UNITED STATES

Alabama  
Arkansas  
Arizona  
California  
Florida  
Georgia  
Kentucky  
Louisiana  
Maine  
Massachusetts  
Mississippi  
Montana  
New Mexico  
New York  
North Carolina  
North Dakota  
Ohio  
Oklahoma  
Oregon  
Tennessee  
Texas  
South Dakota  
Virginia  
Washington  
Wyoming

### CANADA

8

FACTS ABOUT HEIFER PROJECT INTERNATIONAL

World Headquarters  
P. O. Box 808 / 300 Spring Building  
Little Rock, Arkansas

1. Founded in 1944 as a non-profit, non-sectarian agency.
2. Purpose to help people produce food and income for themselves, and to expand livestock production to help overcome worldwide protein malnutrition.
3. Philosophy: A helping hand is better than a handout. Each person helped passes on his animal's first offspring to a needy neighbor.
4. Animals shipped: Cattle, both dairy and beef; goats; sheep; pigs; rabbits; honey bees; poultry.
5. Training in livestock care is provided by Heifer Project representatives, extension workers, agricultural missionaries, Peace Corps volunteers and others. Assistance in planning livestock development programs is also given, with attention to feed, disease control, breeding, management, and marketing needs.
6. Scope: During the past 3 decades, Heifer Project has sent more than 50,000 animals and nearly two million chickens to people in 101 countries and 25 states. Current programs are in 27 countries and 13 states.
7. Value: In recent years Heifer Project programs have averaged more than two million dollars in value annually. Less than 14% is spent on administration and fundraising.
8. Source of Income: Contributed funds and animals.
9. Annual Audit: Heifer Project accounts are audited annually by a Certified Public Accountant.
10. Accreditation: Heifer Project is a member of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service and of the International Council of Voluntary Organizations. Heifer Project is registered with the U.S. State Department and with the Internal Revenue Service. Contributions are tax-deductible.
11. Staff: U.S.A. - 10 Directors and 11 Support Staff; Program - 18 Representatives; Ranch - 8.
12. Board of Directors: Heifer Project is governed by a 32-member Board of Directors representing 11 church denominations, and other organizations.
13. Fourche River Ranch located about 40 miles West of Little Rock now serves as World Livestock Center for Heifer Project. It comprises 1200 acres of well-developed pasture land surrounded on three sides by the Fourche River. Here donated animals are received, maintained, selected and tested for shipment. A 500-head foundation herd produces animals for special needs and generates income for operating costs. Visitors are welcome.

Heifer Project International, Inc.  
Evaluation Project  
Fiscal Year 1977  
Financial Statement

Salaries	A.I.D.	H.P.I.
Evaluation Director	\$ 7,500.00	
Team Leader	3,300.00	
Evaluation Associate	879.75	
Secretary	708.00	
Technician (Part-time)	840.00	
<b>Benefits</b>		<b>\$ 3,075.65</b>
Consultants (U.S.)	1,484.20	
Domestic Travel	4,200.00	
Computer Programs	1,000.00	
Administration		
Telephone	637.40	
Rent	--	618.00
Copy Services	--	55.00
Clerical Services (1/3 time)	--	150.00
Postage	35.00	85.00
Supplies & Equipment	5,503.00	1,857.00
Staff Relocation	5,000.00	
Indirect Costs		
HPI Staff time: 60 man days @ \$82/day		4,920.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$31,087.35</b>	<b>\$10,760.65</b>

**Progress Report - HPI Dairy Training Program**

AID/pha-G-1189

PIO/T No. 932-0099-73/3279302

March 31, 1978

**SUMMARY**

During the first 6 months we have trained 15 individuals from Tanzania. These men have been mid-level management personnel who have returned to their home country to work on government-owned dairy farms.

In most cases, these men have been eager to learn better methods of dairy production. Prospects are very good that the trainees can have a considerable positive influence on the dairy production systems in Tanzania which should provide milk for improved nutritional levels for the children of Tanzania.

Two major problem areas have surfaced: (1) the Government of Tanzania has failed to adequately prepare the trainees for international travel. They have arrived in the U.S. with one-way tickets, no money and practically no clothes. Some assistance from the Tanzanian government would be helpful. (b) We, at Winrock, have had difficulty in establishing the level of knowledge at the start of training and then again at the completion of training. There seems to be quite an individual difference between knowledge and understanding.

**EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

As previously mentioned, this is a troublesome task. To date this has been attempted through seminar type discussion, on-farm visits and observations in the U.S. and in-country visits with trainees in their home country. The most beneficial has been the Tanzanian visit in April-May of this year. Nine of the 15 trainees have been given promotions or been reassigned as a direct result of their training in the U.S.

### EXTERNAL FACTORS

It is difficult to assess the impact of external factors at this stage of the program. There is no apparent reason to believe that the validity of the original assumptions of this program has been impaired. No major changes of project setting have occurred.

### GOAL/SUB-GOAL

The goal of this program is to develop a model program for training people from LDCs in dairy production management. Emphasis is to be placed on the smallholder. As of March 31, only personnel from government parastatal farms have been trained. Smallholders will be trained in the next group of trainees.

The overall goal of increased dairy production is being further enhanced by continued input from Danish aid (DANIDA) and from increased importation of New Zealand dairy cattle. This is in addition to the HPI cattle and training.

A major input to the progress is the training program, which provides more competent production management. This allows more farms to improve simultaneously.

### PURPOSE

"The purpose of this Grant is to provide partial support to Heifer Project International to develop a model program for training LDC livestock smallholders in dairy production management.

Progress toward achieving the purpose has been good. One group of trainees was scheduled to be trained during the first year. We have been able to train two groups.

### OUTPUTS/INPUTS

No particular experiences are worthy of comment at this early stage.

### UNPLANNED EFFECTS

None to report.

### CHANGES OF DESIGN OF EXECUTION

None anticipated.

17

It seems to be wrong to have two groups of trainees from the same country in training at the same time. It was very difficult to retain the attention of any trainee when their mind was distracted by thoughts of home. This is a case of scheduling and can be handled better in the future.

#### SPECIAL COMMENTS & REMARKS

I am most optimistic, after my visit to Tanzania, that the U.S. training, is being put to good use in Tanzania. A general sense of confidence is present during conversations with top dairy management. I believe that this confidence is due, at least in part, because they have trained personnel in key posts. The need is great for additional trained people. Implementation of development plans hinges on the availability of competent management and labor force.

A critical part of the training program is the support which must be given these men. Trained laborers are a necessity, a continuing training of dairy personnel is desirable and improved knowledge of markets and marketing is absolutely essential. It is almost criminal to return the trainees to the knowledge vacuum that exists in most LDCs and expect miraculous results.

#### LESSONS LEARNED

It would be beneficial to have some input in the trainee selection process. Knowledge of background, education, and work experience of each individual would be most helpful in presenting material for study. Preliminary contact in the host country would help prepare the trainee for his/her U.S. training.

Understanding of English is a prerequisite of the program. However, it could be very helpful to have language understanding on the part of staff members (in the case of Tanzania, it would be Swahili).

**HEIFER PROJECT INTERNATIONAL**  
**Dairy Farming Production & Management Project**  
**CONTRACT PAYMENTS RECAP SHEET**  
**March 31, 1978**

	<u>Contract Budget Amount</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount Billed</u>	<u>Current Amount Billed</u>	<u>Cumulative Billed to date</u>	<u>Amount Remaining</u>
Trainee Selection Process	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
Training Staff Salaries	54,000.00	26,597.25	4,193.09	30,790.34	23,209.66
Start-up Cost, Phase I	12,000.00	8,384.00	-0-	8,384.00	3,616.00
Training Program & Materials Development - Phase I	30,000.00	6,635.10	1,245.78	7,880.88	22,119.12
Training Program & Materials Development - Phase II	24,000.00	-0-	-0-	-0-	24,000.00
Post Training, In-country Technician Support & Evaluation	24,000.00	4,119.87	-0-	4,119.87	19,880.13
Trainee Expenses	<u>150,000.00</u>	<u>46,055.43</u>	<u>2,274.35</u>	<u>48,329.78</u>	<u>101,670.22</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u><u>300,000.00</u></u>	<u><u>93,791.65</u></u>	<u><u>7,713.22</u></u>	<u><u>101,504.87</u></u>	<u><u>198,495.13</u></u>

19  
Report of Paul Schumacher  
May 31, 1978

As you are aware, I have recently returned from Tanzania. During my visit, I had occasion to visit with 9 of the trainees who have been in the U.S. in the past year and 2 previous trainees. I also had the opportunity to closely observe the overall dairy production activities in Tanzania and I also visited Kitulo Farm and the HPI Cattle there. I would like to share my observation with you.

A. TRAINEES

My travels were somewhat restricted because of cholera quarantines.

I was unable to travel to Zanzibar where 3 of the trainees are living. One of them (Nassor) was on leave. I had both telephone and personal conversations with Sam Williams (HPI volunteer) which indicated some reluctance on the part of trainee Othman to work on Bambui Farm. He is concerned about snakes around his small children.

Trainee Shamte is working on Mtoni Farm, mainly caring for the calves. He reportedly is doing a good job. He needs more experience which he is getting.

Present plans are for Nassor to manage Bambui if Othman does not. Nassor was trained on an outstanding Jersey farm in California and should be capable of doing the job.

We visited Rongai Farm on the west slope of Mt. Kilimanjaro where 185 head of native cows are being milked.

The manager of Rongai Farm is Ernest Mwakasege who trained in the U.S. in 1976. This farm had a profit of about 1 million shillings in 1977, the highest of any DAFCO Farm.

15

Ismail Khalifa is a recent trainee (1978) who is assigned to Rongai. He was on leave at the time of my visit. He is the foreman of the milking activities and will probably be manager of the new parlor now under construction.

I visited Ruvu Farm on 2 occasions. Trainee Bernard Muyeya is the assistant farm manager and is in charge of the milking herds. There are about 150 head of native cattle and a herd of water buffalo which show promise in the coastal area of Tanzania. Muyeya is working very closely with the buffalo.

I was very pleased with the willingness and enthusiasm on the part of Muyeya. I did not think he was aggressive enough in the U.S. where he trained with Hurley Couchman in California.

He is a good man and could go far in the dairy industry in Tanzania.

Trainee J. J. Bidadile was transferred from Ngerengere Farm just a few days before I visited. His transfer and promotion came as a direct result of his training in the U.S. He is presently assigned to Ihimbu Farm near Iringa which has only recently been acquired by DAFCO. His supervisors think he can handle the dairy unit and I concur.

Ngerengere Farm consists of about 12000 acres of land, 800 head of dairy animals, 1600 head of beef animals and about 1600 swine. Trainee Edward Kasawa (1977) is the acting farm manager and seems to be doing an excellent job.

21

His promotion is a result of his training in the U.S.

Kasawa is ably assisted by 2 other trainees: Godfrey (1977) and Martin Shem (1978). Godfrey is in charge of the new milking parlor where 200 head are presently being milked. Production is about 6 liters daily with native cattle. Sanitation was excellent, fly control good, the baby calves looked extremely good and his records were impeccable and used.

One noteworthy thing is taking place at Ngerengere. Through the efforts of Kasawa and Godfrey, 4 good bulls, sons of HPI donated cattle, are being used in the breeding program. They should give production a real lift. I am sure that more of this same action will be forthcoming on other farms which have trainees who have been in the U.S.

Martin Shem (1978) has only recently been assigned to Ngerengere. He has had responsibilities for some large cattle shipments within Tanzania and has the confidence of his supervisors. He will manage the new parlor now under construction.

My travels took me to Iwambi Farm near Mbeya. There are 3 trainees working at Iwambi.

Trainee Edwin Fungo (1977) is in charge of herd health. A bad beating since his return to Tanzania seems to have made him very timid. I hope time will heal some of his problems.

17

Trainee Foya (1978) will be in charge of Unit 2, the new parlor which is nearly finished. He is very eager for the challenge which will be presented by about 175 New Zealand heifers. Foya is a very able young man and should be capable of doing the job.

Trainee Mnembuka (1978) is in charge of milking at the present facility. I was present during milking and the procedures were fine with one serious exception: overmilking. I emphasized with Mnembuka during my visit, and will reiterate my concern by letter, the seriousness of severe machine overmilking. Some of the heifers from the most recent shipment were at Iwambi awaiting transport. I was surprised and concerned that some of the animals still had horns. It would be much better to remove the horns in the U.S. where we have facilities and medications to minimize animal stress from dehorning

I also visited Kitulo Ranch where there are 3 trainees, Joshua Willy (1977), Kapingo (1977) and Mwakasus (1978). Mwakasusa was on leave and will probably be assigned to another farm upon his return.

Joshua Willy is presently the foreman of Unit 1 where 221 head are milked by hand. He is assisted by Steve Wood, HPI volunteer. It was obvious to me that Joshua needs supervised experience which he is getting. Average production was 10.7 liters which is encouraging.

Kapingo will be the manager of Unit 2 which is nearing completion. He presently does the breeding and is super-

vising construction of more employee housing.

Erwin Kinsey is pushing to finish the "Newton" barn where cows will be milked in June. Cement is on hand to finish the project. Transport and lack of materials have been quite a problem. Kinsey is doing an exceptionally good job.

**PROJECTED TIME LINE  
Evaluation Project  
Second Year**

**1979 May**

6 months progress and disbursement statement due at USAID. Data from first country is analyzed and a report on findings is submitted.

**June**

Preliminary results from first country evaluation presented and reviewed. Possible programmatic implications are discussed.

Original system design is revised in light of indicated need.

**July**

Implementation plan and arrangements undertaken for work in second group of countries. Preparation of annual report and Budget Request for USAID prepared and submitted.

**August**

Implementation plan and arrangements for second group of countries finalized.

Arrangements and design of second workshop for national and regional staff and selected Board members is completed.

**September**

Second workshop for staff and Board Members is held. Evaluation Team begins work in second group of countries.

**October**

USAID YR III begins. Evaluation Team continues work in second group of countries.

November

Six months progress report due.  
Interim field review conducted.  
Work in second group of countries continues.

December

Evaluation Team completes work in second group of countries.

1980

January

Data from second group of countries completed.  
Analysis begins.

February

Data analysis continues.  
Planning on workshop design of field workshops is begun with help of consultant.

March

Report of findings from second group of countries is submitted.

April

Report on results of evaluation for all countries visited is presented, reviewed and discussed for planning implications.

May - HPI Year III begins

**PROJECTED TIME LINE  
Evaluation Project  
Third Year**

May HPI Year III begins.

6 months report submitted to USAID.

June

Plan for training workshops for field personnel is submitted and approved.

July

Report and budget request submitted to USAID.  
Report on final recommended design for evaluation system is presented and reviewed.

August

Preliminary plan for implementation of a full evaluation program is prepared.

September

Preliminary plan presented and discussed.

October - November - December

Work is continued on introduction of planning changes in ongoing work of HPI.  
Evaluation system ready for implementation.

1981 January

Set of field training workshops at 3 overseas locations is completed.

February

Collection of Base Line data on continuing projects begins

March

Base line data on all continuing projects is received and compiled.  
Final workshop for staff and Board members is held.

April

Final evaluation report on grant is completed and submitted to USAID.

SEQUENCE OF PROCEDURES

HPI Field Testing of  
Prototype Evaluation Design

1. Secure active support and participation of field personnel in the preparation and planning of the evaluation process.
2. Preliminary visit of the Evaluation Director to participating project for orientation, discussions with project personnel and others for clarification of the evaluation process, identification of possible in country team members and consultants.
3. Preparation of central office file data, data gathering instruments and forms.
4. Data gathered in the field.
5. Evaluation review session conducted in the field at the end of the study period for:
  1. Discussion of the evaluation process itself.
  2. Sharing of preliminary findings, insights and suggestions.
6. Analysis of Data.
7. Submission of Draft Report to field personnel for review and suggestions.
8. Preparation and Submission of Final Report.

628  
 726  
 226  
 362  
 16  
 6  
 3-2-67  
 24

**HPI PROJECT EVALUATION DESIGN****(Draft Outline)****I. Beginning of Project Status**

- A. Geographical Area.
- B. Topography and Climate
- C. Socio-economic Situation in the Area
- D. Conditions to be Changed by the Project.
- E. HPI Involvement in the Area
- F. Cooperating Agency.
- G. Beneficiary Group.
- H. Other Programs and Agencies at Work in the Area.

**II. Background Considerations.**

- A. Reasons for Initiating the Project.
- B. Assumptions Underlying the Project.
- C. Stated Purposes of the Project.
- D. Anticipated Duration of the Project.
- E. Type of Organization Envisioned.

**III. Project Analysis**

- A. Process Analysis
  - 1. Activities and effects.
  - 2. Decision making.
- B. Inputs
  - 1. Herder Project
    - a. personnel
    - b. livestock
    - c. commodities
    - d. funds
    - e. training
    - f. other
  - 2. Cooperating Agency
    - a. personnel
    - b. livestock
    - c. commodities
    - d. funds
    - e. training
    - f. other

- 3. Beneficiary Group
  - a. personnel
  - b. livestock
  - c. commodities
  - d. funds
  - e. training
  - f. other

- C. Outputs
  - 1. Animals
  - 2. Products
  - 3. Organization
  - 4. Distribution System
  - 5. Trainees
  - 6. Other

IV. Results

- A. Expected
- B. Unexpected
  - 1. Beneficial
  - 2. Detrimental

V. Unanticipated Factors Influencing Project Results.

- A. From within the Project.
- B. From outside the Project.

VI. End of Project Status

- A. Area Actually Covered by the Project.
- B. Socio-economic Situation in the Area
- C. Conditions Altered by the Project
- D. HPI
- E. Cooperating Agency
- F. Beneficiary Group
- G. Other Programs and Agencies in the Area.

VIII. Findings and Recommendations.

## NOTES ON PROCESS ANALYSIS

The Process Analysis component of the evaluation design is based on the assumption that most HPI projects go through a series of stages or phases during the lifespan of the project. In reality we can expect that not all projects go through all of the phases. We can also expect that the timing or sequence of the phases will vary from project to project. However, most if not all of the following phases will be found in the life of a HPI field project. The phases include:

1. Project Planning
2. Project Initiation
3. Preparation
4. Input Arrival
5. Input Management
6. Training
7. Output Management
8. Livestock Distribution
9. Follow-up.
10. Project Termination.

Some of these phases will be recurrent, e.g. training, distribution and follow up.

The purpose of Process Analysis is to recount in a roughly chronological way what various people did during each phase of the project and how they were affected during each phase by their own activities and by those of other people.

Process Analysis stems from the recognition that our primary concern is with the increased welfare of persons and groups of persons. Therefore the impact of their participation (or non-participation) at various stages in the life of the project is of great importance.

A sample Process Analysis worksheet for the planning phase of a project is attached. Similar worksheets are to be prepared for all major phases of projects being studied.

The Activities column of the worksheet provides space for recording information regarding who did what and when.

The Effects column provides space for summarizing the impact these activities had on the individuals and groups concerned.

The second page of the worksheet calls for a brief description of the major decisions and the decision making process during each phase of the project. Some phases of a project could involve a number of major decisions. Others could involve none at all.

Project \_\_\_\_\_

Reporter \_\_\_\_\_

Duration. From \_\_\_\_\_ To \_\_\_\_\_

PLANNING  
Process Analysis

Group	Activities	Effects	
		Immediate	Long Range
HPI Personnel			
Cooperating Agency			
Beneficiary Group			
Other			

28

34

Project \_\_\_\_\_

Reporter \_\_\_\_\_

PLANNING DECISION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

1. Condition or situation calling for a decision.

2. Decision reached

Date.

3. Who participated in the decision making process?

4. How was the decision reached?

5. How was the decision communicated?

6. What was the response to the decision?

