```
*****************************************************************
*9311328                TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE                     *
*                       SMALL RUMINANT - CRG PROGRAM             *
*                       FY78 TO FY83                             *
*****************************************************************
```

PROJECT SUMMARY DESCRIPTION

GRANT IS PROVIDED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS TO IMPROVE THE SMALL RUMINANT PRODUCTION CAPABILITY OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS WILL ACT AS THE MANAGEMENT ENTITY FOR THE PROJECT, RECEIVING AND SUBALLOCATING AID GRANT FUNDS. THIRTEEN US UNIVERSITIES AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS WILL PARTICIPATE IN THE PROJECT, DEVELOPING AND TESTING APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGIES AND PRACTICES TO IMPROVE THE PRODUCTION OF SHEEP AND GOATS. THUS FAR, 17 RESEARCH SUBPROJECTS ARE PLANNED. A SUBSTANTIAL PORTION OF THE RESEARCH WILL BE CARRIED-OUT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES; AND TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, INPUT FROM LOCAL SCIENTISTS WILL BE OBTAINED. IN ADDITION, RESEARCH FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS WILL BE ESTABLISHED AT 4 OVERSEAS LOCATIONS. PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR AREAS OF RESEARCH WILL INCLUDE: CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA (REPRODUCTIVE PHYSIOLOGY), COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY (HERD/FLOCK HEALTH), MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY (GENETIC IMPROVEMENT), NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY (BY-PRODUCT UTILIZATION), OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY (FORAGE PRODUCTION), TEXAS AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION (SYSTEMS AND MEAT GOAT/HAIR SHEEP EVALUATION), TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY (RANGE/GRAZING MANAGEMENT), TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE (DAIRY GOAT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM), UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS (GENETIC IMPROVEMENT AND HERD/FLOCK HEALTH), UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI (SOCIAL CONSTRAINTS), UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY (RANGE/GRAZING MANAGEMENT AND REPRODUCTIVE PHYSIOLOGY), WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY (HERD/FLOCK HEALTH), AND WINROCK INTERNATIONAL (DAIRY GOAT MANGEMENT SYSTEMS AND ECONOMIC ANALYSES.

DESCRIPTORS

GOAT PRODUCTION	GOATS	APPROP TECH RUR	AGR TECHNOLOGY
AGR RES TRNG	AGR RESEARCH	SHEEP PRODUCTN	SHEEP

SUB-PROJECT NUMBER: 00 BATCH NUMBER: 97

931-1328
931132800/501

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) ~~PART I~~

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
CRSP - PROG Small Ruminants	931-1328	DS/AGR

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)

☐ REGULAR EVALUATION ☒ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 78	B. Final Obligation Expected FY cont'g	C. Final Input Delivery FY cont'g	A. Total $ ____ B. U.S. $ ____	From (month/yr.) Sept. 1978 To (month/yr.) December 1980 Date of Evaluation Review

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
I. SR.CRSP Required Action	Charles Haines	Jan. 81
A. Amend Grant Agreement to immediately provide the following: 1. Reduce number of Audits 2. Reduce number of copies of proceedings, minutes, audits, etc. 3. Use of EEP for DS/AGR internal review 4. An Associate Director 5. Update Log Frame 6. Technical Assistance to other Missions, LDCs		23p
B. Respond to UCD, Dr. Robinson's letter requesting additional funds. State funds not available within current DS/AGR budget. Request UCD, Robinson to submit list of projects to be reduced or terminated if funds not available to cover deficit.	Charles Haines	Jan 81
C. Seek additional funds to: 1. Cover current deficit in year 5 2. Roll forward to year 6 and 7 3. Expand grant to provide services to other LDCs to assist in establishing CRSP related programs 4. Cover program in Morocco	Charles Haines	Jan 81
Continued		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- [X] Project Paper
- [X] Financial Plan
- [X] Logical Framework
- [ ] Project Agreement
- [X] Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- [X] PIO/T
- [ ] PIO/C
- [ ] PIO/P
- [ ] Other (Specify) ____
- [ ] Other (Specify) ____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. [ ] Continue Project Without Change
- B. [X] Change Project Design and/or [X] Change Implementation Plan
- C. [ ] Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Name and Title)

DS/AGR: CHaines [signature] date 12/24/80 RHughes [signature]
JYohe [signature] date ____ DS/PO
JWalker [signature] date 12/24/80 FCampbell [signature]
MMozynski [signature] date 12/31/80

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature [signature]

Typed Name Tony Babb, DS/DAA/FN

Date

Continued PES Part 1

D. Blanket waiver for replacement vehicles	Robinson, UCD	Jan 81
1. Prepare Waiver Request	Haines, DS/AGR	

II. Amend CRSP procedures to:

A. Define role of A.I.D. project manager	F. Williams	
B. Simplify travel clearance process	M. Mozynski	Mar 81
C. Require planning grant identify LDC sites and obtain tentative agreement with LDC institutions	J. Yohe	
D. Provide a mechanism for roll forward funding	R. Jackson	

13. Summary

The Small Ruminant Collaborative Research Support Program was launched on September 30, 1978 when, following many months of planning, a Grant Agreement was signed. This agreement provided $15.58 million to the University of California, Davis (UCD) to act as the Management Entity (ME) on the behalf of all the participating institutions. This CRSP was the first of its kind and to a degree the ME and all the CRSP committees have been pioneering this new model to provide technological assistance to the less developed countries using a collaborative mode. At the time A.I.D. signed the Grant, the participating institutions had been identified and the CRSP structure and management relating to the U.S. components of the program had been well defined by the Research Triangle Institute, the consultant group assigned by the JRC to undertake the feasibility study. The major components that remained for the University community to implement were:

1. The development of an Integrated Program Plan of the 17 sub-grants made to the 13 participating universities and institutions;

2. The establishment of the various SR-CRSP Committees required under the terms of the Grant Agreement;

3. The creation of smooth working relationships with DS/AGR, the Regional Bureaus and Missions; and

4. The initiation and implementation of Overseas Regional Programs.

While the placement of any single one of the above components would be extremely difficult by any standard, the simultaneous placement of all the components together was a formidable task which the UCD accomplished successfully in a short period of time by the outstanding spirit of cooperation developed among the functional groups of the CRSP; e.g., the ME, the 13 participating universities, the Missions, the host countries involved, the DS/AGR staff, the Principal Investigators (PIs) who comprise the Technical Committee (TC), the Board of Institutional Representatives (BIR), and the External Evaluation Panel (EEP).

A total of 17 sub-grants were made to 13 Universities and institutions; e.g., Utah State, California Poly, North Carolina State, Tuskegee, Ohio State, University of California, Montana State, Texas A&M, Washington State, Colorado State, Winrock International, University of Missouri, and Texas Tech. The areas of involvement by each institution and the site locations are shown in Table 1 attached.

The participating U.S. Universities and Institutions are contributing matching funds at 38 percent, much in excess of the required 25 percent.

All of the SR-CRSP committees have been established and are working efficiently and effectively; i.e., TC, BIR, and EEP.

Excellent working relationships have been established between the ME and the A.I.D. and LDC staff, including the Project Manager, DS/AGR, the Regional Bureau (RB) desk officers and technical staff, the Missions and host country institutions.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) documents have been signed by appropriate government officials in Kenya, Brazil, Indonesia and Peru. In addition, negotiations are proceeding with officials of USAID Morrocco and the Government of Morocco for a future program. Site coordinators and long-term graduate students are in place in those countries where MOU have been signed. It should be noted that this SR CRSP has attracted exceptionally qualified scientists for site coordinators at a relatively low cost. See Table 2 for a detailed description of the cost for each of the established sites. Vehicles have been purchased for use in Indonesia, Kenya, and Peru. Each country site has been visited by the Principal Investigators. In addition, a successful Small Ruminants workshop was held in Kenya which was attended by 10 Principal Investigators and 20 LDC participating officials. A workshop has been organized for Peru. A JRC and BIFAD sponsored workshop was held in Washington, D. C. to review and evaluate experiences in planning, in organizational structuring, including management, and in the early implementation of the CRSP. Evaluation of these experiences concentrated on improving and strengthening the entire set of processes for future CRSP activities. The ME of this Small Ruminants CRSP assumed the responsibility of compiling, editing, publishing and distributing the proceedings of this workshop.

The ME is now in position to carry out an extensive program in those countries that have signed a MOU. However, this CRSP does not provide assistance to other LDCs to assist in the development of CRSP related programs in their home countries. The other CRSPs that followed the SR-CRSP provided up to thirty person days annually of free consulting time to any country, LDC institution and USAID requesting assistance on problems related to the CRSP. The project manager will investigate the need for such service under this CRSP and amend the terms of the agreement accordingly.

14. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation of the SR CRSP involved the review and analysis of the various reports submitted by the ME, BIR, the TC and the EEP.

Several meetings and discussions were held to review the budget requirements of this project with the project manager, the AID/W Controller and Contract office and with the ME at the University of California, Davis. In addition, the AID Project Manager and the UCD program director were in constant communication regarding the budget requirements for future years.

15. External Factors

The ME recognized early on that the project would be slow in getting started as the planning phase of the program was incomplete at the time the Grant was signed. The program sites had not been identified nor tentative agreements reached with the cooperating universities and institutions. The ME established an orderly plan to deal with the problems using the following methodology:

a. Providing funds in the first year at approximately the budget year level, but stretching the program year to 20 months instead of 12 months. This provided time for the planning stage of the grant and resulted in a slower expenditure rate during the initial period of the Grant

b. Stretching the second program year to 16 months, but providing funds at the appropriate (16-month) level according to a new 'formula funding' process.

c. Using carryover funds saved from year one against the looming inflation factor for year three, a twelve month interval designed to mesh exactly with budget year four; and

d. Applying to A.I.D. early in the program, for additional funds to cover the anticipated deficit in the fifth year of the SR-CRSP.

The ME presented these proposals to the TC and the BIR and received their strong support to implement this strategy. Because of the delay in implementation during the first two years of the grant, UCD, TC and BIR all recommended that future CRSPs should not be signed until all of the planning has been completed.

Other external factors affecting the CRSP were:

a. Peru:

At the beginning of the negotiations with the Government of Peru, the ME encountered considerable difficulty in obtaining GOP clearance for the long-term technicians. Through the excellent effort of the Mission in Peru, this problem was resolved and the long-term technicians are now at the program site.

b. Brazil:

Changes in one of the Principal Investigators in Brazil resulted in some difficulty which delayed project implementation. This has been corrected and the program research is proceeding as originally planned.

c. Morocco:

The original plans were for only four sites, one in each Bureau. Morocco was to be one of the first sites, but the Mission and GOM officials were unable to give approval in the early stages of program development. After the negotiations were completed for the other four sites, the Near East Bureau requested that the SR CRSP program be extended to Morocco. The ME, as recommended by the BIR, has set aside $50,000 to initiate negotiations with the Government of Morocco for a MOU. The future of the program in Morocco will be dependent on the support from the Near East Bureau and DS/AGR.

16. Inputs

The CRSP is designed to place primary responsibility for the implementation of the projects in the hands of the ME to:

a. Receive the funds committed by A.I.D. and assume accountability for their use;

b. Provide funds to the participating institutions for SR-CRSP activities and ensure compliance with the terms of the Grant;

c. Provide a focal point for the interaction among the TC, BIR and EEP within the SR-CRSP and A.I.D., JRC and BIFAD outside the SR-CRSP.;

d. Execute the decisions of the TC and BIR, and to consider the recommendations of the EEP.

e Maintain liaison with Regional sub-programs through the Directors of the overseas collaborating institutions and Site Co-ordinators and to provide assistance to them in accordance with the terms of the MOUs; and

f. Generate the documents of the SR-CRSP including minutes of the TC., BIR, EEP, the integrated program plan, annual reports, the budget and the fiscal reports and provide them to AID and the external auditors.

While the role of the ME is clearly defined, the role of the Project Manager in DS/AGR is not. The JRC and BIFAD meet and discuss the program components and recommend changes to A.I.D. The BIR, TC, and the EEP meet and discuss the program components and the budgetary requirements with the ME. The ME is caught in the middle and finds itself responding to recommendations from sources which do not control the funds. The DS/AGR Project Manager has little to say about the implementation of the CRSP program, and yet he must respond to the people who control the funds. He is not sure of where his responsibilities begin and end. He must rely on the JRC and BIFAD for advice and consultation and on the EEPs evaluations. The evaluation team recommends that procedures be developed that clearly define the responsibility of DS/AGR Project Manager in the implementation of the program once the grant is signed.

During the past year, the ME attended every meeting of the TC, BIR, EEP and visited all five overseas sites for the purpose of executing the MOUs. Representatives of the ME have visited 6 of the 13 U.S. participating institutions and has represented the SR-CRSP at meetings of the JRC in Washington on five occasions, presented a series of written program reports (5) to the JRC and has been instrumental in the development of CRSP Liaison Meetings (6) sponsored by BIFAD . In addition, the ME is expected to give numerous presentations to selected groups on the SR CRSP. (A partial list of the talks given by Dr. Robinson is attached as Table 3.) These meeting, visitations, etc. have been a formidable task and has revealed the need for an Associate Director to assume some of the responsibilities of the Director and to carry on the program in his absence. The team recommends that an Associate Director be appointed to assist the Program Director, UCD.

17. <u>Outputs</u>

The program has not achieved the original targets due to the slow start-up and the need to identify and negotiate the sites in the LDCs. However, the program is now operating at full capacity and is achieving excellent progress under the superior management of the ME.

UCD notified A.I.D. that the total estimated cost of $23.6 million must be increased by $8.9 million to cover the projected deficit for year 5 and to fund year 6. Of this total, UCD requested that $7.5 million be funded by A.I.D. and the remaining $1.4 million be eventually funded from non-Federal sources of the participating universities and institutions. The project manager was instructed to respond to the ME that funds were not in DS/AGR's budget for an increase in the SR CRSP. The team verified that all outputs currently comtemplated by the ME, can not be achieved within the current budget. Additional funds must be received or certain programs must be cut back or terminated to stay within the approved level of the Grant Agreement. UCD requested a formal response to it's letter to bring the matter before the BIR. The project manager is to prepare a response to the UCD's letter.

At the evaluation review in November 1980, a considerable amount of time was spent discussing the need for the additional funds and the consequences to the program if the funds are not received. Dr. Robinson agreed to provide a listing of the programs that would have to be terminated,.reduced in size or not initiated if funds do not become available to cover the projected deficit.

DS/AGR and UCD will try to obtain additional funds from the following sources through discussions with the TPCA, JRC, Regional Bureaus, participating missions, U.S. and host country universities and institutions:

- Excess local currency
- Mission funding
- Regional Bureau Funding
- Host Country funding
- Increase in the CRSP budget
- Reimbursement funds

The Grant Agreement requires 100 copies of all reports, minutes, etc. This has proven to be an unnecessary expense. The project manager will review the reporting requirements and amend the agreement to provide only the number of copies required. This will be accomplished after consultation with other offices in A.I.D., BIFAD and JRC.

18. <u>Purpose</u>:

The purpose of this CRSP is to establish sites in the U.S. and LDCs to develop and test improved technologies and to enhance the abilities of developing country scientists to solve problems related to small ruminant management and production.

To date, 13 Universities and institutions are involved in 17 programs in 4 LDC program sites. The sites are now staffed with highly competent U.S. technicians who work directly with host country scientists on the research being undertaken. See Table 4 for the names of the personnel at each site and the participating universities.

19. Goal:

The Goal of this CRSP is to efficiently increase production of meat, milk and fiber from sheep and goats raised by the poor farmers of the LDCs. This is to be done by developing and testing improved technologies and by enhancing the abilities of developing country scientists to solve problems related to small ruminant production.

It is too early in the program to see any results towards the achievement of the goal.

20. Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries of the activities under this CRSP will be the host country research agencies and institutions that are collaborating with the U.S. university and institution scientists. The ultimate beneficiaries will be the small farmers as the technology is extended to them by the extension agents in the countries involved.

In addition, the increased production of meat and milk in the LDC and availability and consumption of these products by the local consumers will improve their nutritional status resulting in the improved well being of the local population.

Women in many countries of the world, assume full responsibility for raising small ruminant animals and these women will benefit substantially from the increased production. They will be able to feed their families at improved nutritional levels, sell the excess in the open markets, and use the profits to buy material items and thus achieve a better way of life for themselves and their families.

The improvement of range management practices will conserve grazing range, increase overall productivity and reduce the effects of erosion caused by poor management.

Improved management practices will also decrease animal losses due to diseases and parasites and lessen the severity and frequency of diseases transmitted to humans.

Increased animal production will produce more jobs in many local areas; i.e., processing and marketing of milk, hides, fiber, animal slaughter.

21. Unplanned Effects:

The project was slow in getting started as the sub-grants with the U.S. universities and institutions had not been made at the time that the grant agreement was signed. In addition, the program sites in the host countries had to be identified and a program negotiated with the government officials involved.

The non-availability of U.S. vehicles made it necessary to obtain waivers for the purchase of non-U.S. vehicles which took many months to process in AID/W. This delayed implementation at certain program sites due to the inability of the site coordinators and other scientists to get out to the research sites in the field. The UCD and DS/AGR will seek a blanket waiver for future procurement of replacement vehicles.

The Grant Agreement calls for an annual audit. This has put an unnecessary burden on the ME to prepare for the audit, review the audit recommendations with the auditor, and to implement the audit recommendations. By the time one audit is completed, plans are already underway for the next one. In addition, the ME must publish the audit reports. DS/AGR plans to submit a recommendation to the JRC, BIFAD and DAA/DS/FN to approve a biannual audit or an audit at a strategic point in the program.

The current approval process for scientists and experts to travel has institutionalized an incredibly complex and unsatisfactory arrangement. At present, there are nine steps required to obtain approval for a traveler to leave this country under the CRSP program. This has lead to considerable delay for the travelers, as well as, additional expense in the processing of the travel clearance. For additional information, please refer to page 3, paragraph 4 of the Trip Report which is attached as Tab A. UCD and DS/AGR will initiate action to simplify the travel clearance procedures along the following lines:

1. UCD will contact its site coordinator(s) who will contact the Mission (or Embassy in the case of Brazil) at least 30 days prior to the scheduled travel. The traveler(s) will be named the purpose of trip and the date and time of arrival given.

2. Simultaneous with the contact to the site coordinator(s), the A.I.D./W project manager and the Missions will be notified.

3. After clearance is received, the site coordinator will simultaneously notify the Management Entity, and A.I.D./W that the Mission and/or Embassy has been informed and that clearance has been obtained.

22. Lessons Learned:

The assumption that the project can immediately begin with the signing of the grant agreement is invalid. This is especially true in the case of the CRSP programs. It is recommended that all planning be completed, including the sites selected and tentative agreements reached with LDC institutions prior to the signing of the CRSP program grants.

The BIR consists of 13 members, one for each participating institutions. The involvement of 13 institutions at the BIR meetings created a formidable task for the ME to bring order and to keep the BIR members from seeking the vested interests of their institution. In the case of the SR CRSP, the members have become aware of the problem and have taken the necessary corrective action. The BIR members in the new CRSPs may not be as cooperative and willing to change as those in the SR CRSP. Therefore, it is recommended that the numbers of the BIR be kept to an absolute minimum of no more than 5 to 7 members.

The budget for all new CRSPs must be in line with the budgetary projections for the Office of Agriculture. They must be reviewed annually by a responsible person handling the budget allocations of the DS/AGR program. The procedures followed at this time are for the various committees (JRC, BIFAD, BIR, TC and EEP) to meet and recommend to the ME that certain programs be implemented and how much money to set aside for these activities. Yet the funding allocation in the DS/AGR budget may not be large enough to carry out these recommendations. The ME is often placed in a difficult situation and must make sound decisions. For the SR CRSP, the deficit is over $1.0 million for the first five years and $1.5 million for the sixth year over the projected requirement in DS/AGR's budget. It is essencial that the project manager assures that the level of effort for the CRSP program is consistent with the budgetary allocation.

It is agreed among the DS/AGR CRSP project managers that there is an excessive amount of evaluative activities required for the CRSP programs. The CRSPs are reviewed and/or evaluated by the JRC, BIFAD, BIR, TC, EEP, Auditors, etc. on a continuous basis. The Internal A.I.D. evaluation is just another step in the evaluation process. While DS/AGR feels that the internal A.I.D. evaluation is essential to good management, we are recommending that A.I.D.'s evaluation should take advantage of the other reviews and evaluations. The EEP is the proper place to piggy back on an existing process. The ME and Project Manager, DS/AGR should forward to the EEP a list of issues and recommendations to be covered in the external evaluation to meet the requirements of the ME and A.I.D. Other issues, problems, etc. which the EEP deems appropriate should also be included in the review by the EEP.

23. Special Comments and Recommendations:

It is the consensus of the team that the ME is performing at a extremely high level in spite of the severe problems in getting started during the first and second years of the grant. During the first year the ME: 1) established a system to coordinate all facets of the project; and 2) signed 17 sub-grants with 13 institutions to be implemented at 4 sites, Peru, Indonesia, Kenya and Brazil. The fifth site, if approved, will be in Morocco.

All of the committees are functioning efficiently and effectively. There is excellent coordination and cooperation within and between the various committees, the cooperating U.S. Universities and Institutions, and the Missions and host government officials.

At the time the SR CRSP was approved, a log frame was not prepared. It was later prepared by the ME and is included in the Integrated Program Plan, Part I, Background papers. The project manager should review the log frame and up date it to reflect changes in the project design.

This CRSP has served as a model for the CRSPs that followed.

DS/AGR:MMozynski
12/15/80

TABLE I

Subject, Institution, and Location of Active Projects (SR/CRSP)

Study	School	Peru	Brazil	Indonesia	Kenya
Range	Texas Tech	X			
	Utah		X		
Forages	Ohio	X			X
Byproducts	N.C.S.U.		X	X	
Health	U.C.D.		X	X	
	Colorado	X			
	Washington				X
Breeding	U.C.D.			X	X
	Montana	X			
	Texas A&M		X		
Management	Tuskegee		X		
	Winrock				X
Reproduction	Utah/CalPoly	X			
Economics	Winrock	X	X	X	X
Sociology	Missouri	X	X	X	X
Systems	Texas A&M	X	X	X	X

October, 1980

TABLE 2

Estimated Annual Costs for Maintaining Site Coordinators*

Full time Position - $000

ITEMS	BRAZIL	PERU	INDONESIA	KENYA
Salary	25	25	25	25
Benefits	5	5	5	5
Allowances**				
Moving	2	2	2	2
Vacation Lv.	1	1	1	1
Transportation	2	2	2	2
Schooling	5	5	5	5
Post Differ'l	-	-	-	-
Clerical Assist.	7	7	7	7
Equipment				
Vehicles	20	20	20	20
Typewriter	1	1	1	1
Gas/Services	2	2	2	2
Supplies	2	2	2	2
Communications	1	1	1	1
Travel				
International	2	2	4	3
Domestic	2	2	2	2
Sub-total	77	77	79	78
UCD Overhead (19.7%)	14	14	14	14
GRAND TOTAL	91	91	93	92

*Source of funding; AID/DS, Non-federal funds and host country agencies.

**Dependent upon family size.

October, 1980

TABLE 3

Talks by D. W. Robinson on the Small Ruminant CRSP

1978	Report to the Joint Research Committee (November).
1979	Report to the Joint Research Committee (April).
1979	Report to the Joint Research Committee (July).
1979	American Society Animal Science, Phoenix (August).
1980	Report to the Joint Research Committee (June).
1980	Talk to International Agriculture Development (April).
1980	Talk to Animal Science UCD Seminar (March).
1980	American Society Animal Science, Cornell (August).
1980	Talk to International Program Seminar UCD (November).
1980	BIFAD Seminar -- Washington, DC (June).

TABLE 4

Personnel on Overseas Sites (Small Ruminants CRSP)*

Country	Title	Name	Institution
Kenya	Site Coordinator	Yves Berger	All
	Research Coord.	Timothy Quick	Ohio
	" "	Morgan Job	Winrock
	" "	Paul Sayer	Washington
	" "	Michael Sands	Winrock
Peru	Site Coordinator	Benjamin Quijandria	All
	Research Assoc.	Robert Cochran	Ohio
	" "	Albert Schlundt	Texas Tech
	" "	Edward Lotterman	Winrock
	" "	Gary Sides	Utah
Indonesia	Site Coordinator	Neil Thomas	All
	Research Coord.	Joel Levine	California
Brazil	Site Coordinator	Thomas Miller	All
	Research Assoc.	Robert Kirmse	Utah
	" "	James Pfister	Utah
	" "	Joao Queiroz	Utah
	" "	Noel Guttierez	Winrock

*As of October 3, 1980 and includes families in many cases.

TABLE 5

POSSIBLE REORGANIZATION OF THE SR/CRSP

Discipline	Participating Institution	
Physiology	UTAH STATE CAL POLY	FUNDED AS ONE PROJECT
Nutrition	NORTH CAROLINA TUSKEGEE OHIO	FUNDED AS ONE PROJECT
Breeding	CALIFORNIA MONTANA TEXAS A & M	
Health	WASHINGTON CALIFORNIA COLORADO	
Socio-Econ.-Syst.	TEXAS A & M WINROCK (Prod. Syst) WINROCK (Econ.) MISSOURI (Sociology)	
Range	TEXAS TECH UTAH STATE	

October, 1980

Trip Report - University of California at Davis
Davis, California

November 19, 1980 - November 21, 1980

Team Members: John Yohe, Acting Division Chief, CP
Charles Haines, Project Manager
Mary Mozynski, Program Analysis Officer
James Neilson, BIFAD
Morton Darvin, SER/CM

Objectives:

1. To discuss the current status of the Small Ruminants CRSP program with the Management Entity;

2. To review the budget expenditure rates and to project future requirements under the CRSP;

3. To inform the Management Entity of the need to stay within the budget requirements; and

4. To discuss the need to amend the travel requirements under the CRSP.

Contacts made at the University of California at Davis:

SR-CRSP Program Director	David W. Robinson
Dean of Graduate Studies & Research	Allen G. Marr, Dean
GS&R Research Coordinator	Jonellen Goddard
SR-CRSP Business Manager	Richard M. Waters
SR-CRSP Receptionist	Yolanda G. Ferguson
SR-CRSP Staff Research Associate	Helaine J. Burstein
SR-CRSP Administrative Assistant	Michele E. Lipner

Results and Observations:

The following paragraphs relate to the objectives above and are listed in that order:

1. The representatives of the Management Entity presented a briefing on the current status of the program and the problems which they are encountering. They indicated that 'Memorandum of Understanding' documents have been signed with the Governments of Kenya, Brazil, Indonesia and Peru and that the site coordinators are in place. The site coordinators are doing an excellent job in each of the four countries. Considering the level of performance and the qualifications of the staff, the cost of each site is relatively low in comparison to the cost of keeping A.I.D. direct hire employees in the field.

In addition, the Government of Morocco has requested that the Small Ruminants CRSP program be implemented in Morocco. The Management Entity has set aside $50,000 for this purpose and the Near East Bureau must add another $35 - $50,000 to initiate the program. The DS/AGR team pointed out that at this time, an increase in the CRSP budget is not possible to initiate a program in Morocco. If the Morocco program is funded, an increase in the total budget would have to be made. A request should be made to the Near East Bureau and Mission for funds to initiate this program which now has the Mission's and the GOM's support. In addition, DS/AGR will seek approval to increase the funding level of the CRSP once the total Mission and Near East Bureau's contributions are know. However, it should be pointed out that the chances of obtaining additional funds for the DS/AGR program are slim.

The External Evaluation Panel has completed the second evaluation and the report was published in July 1980. This report will be used as a basis for the Project Evaluation Summary on the Small Ruminants CRSP.

2. The A.I.D. team pointed out that money is tight and that the chances of obtaining additional funds over and above the $15,577,043 in the original grant are very slim.

The Original Budget	$15,577,043	
UCD requested Revised Budget	$16,987,193	
Additional Requirement		$ 1,410,150
The proposed 6th year funding		
UCD proposed budget	$ 4,960,629	
Original DS/AGR projections	$ 3.100,000	
Additional Requirement		$ 1,850,629
Total Additional Requirement		$ 3,260,779

3. A.I.D. is to respond to UCD budget proposal stated in Robinson to Darvin letter dated July 8, 1980 which requested the additional funds. The following alternative will be covered:

   a. UCD will reduce the current budget to stay within the terms of the original agreement by using the following methods:

      - a straight line reduction across the board;

      - reduce all projects by using a percentage factor;

      - reduce or terminate sub-grants; or

      - no new sub-grants will be initiated.

UCD indicated that a list will be submitted to DS/AGR shortly covering the priority programs that will have to be terminated, reduced and/or revised and new activities which cannot be funded if the budget is not increased as requested.

b. DS/AGR and UCD will try to obtain funding from other sources:

- Excess local currency from excess currency countries that have a CRSP SR program;

- Mission Funding of the CRSP program;

- Regional Bureau funds;

- Host Country funding of the local cost; and/or

- Dollar cost on an reimbursement basis.

c. Increase DS/AGR's future year budgets by obtaining the DSB and the Administrator's approval.

4. UCD has requested that the travel clearance process be simplified to expedite the processing of travel requests. The current requirements have institutionalized an incredibly complex and unsatisfactory approval system. At present the following steps must be taken:

a. Request by principal investigator to the Program Director, UCD in writing specifying dates, duration, air fares, per diem, reasons for travel, and contacts to be made;

b. Request by the Program Director UCD to the Project Officer, DS/AGR;

c. Request by Project Officer, DS/AGR to the appropriate Regional Bureau Officials and to the Mission staff;

d. Request by in-country mission of host country counterparts;

e. Host country counterparts reply to USAID Mission;

f. USAID Mission reply to Desk Officer in Washington who notifies the DS/AGR Project Manager;

g. Project Officer, DS/AGR replies to Project Director, UCD;

h. Program Director, UCD forwards an approved travel request to the Principal Investigator; and finally

i. Principal Investigator obtains approval of the travel from his institution.

The above steps outlined are so complex that they literally add many man-days at each level of the clearance process and result in a significant increase in costs and lead time for the travelers.

UCD is proposing a simple, straightforward approval system which is consistent with the terms of the grant agreement, will cut down on the number of clearances required and will result in a budgetary savings. The proposal is outlined below and is proposed for all travelers:

a. UCD will contact its site coordinator who will contact the Mission (or Embassy in the case of Brazil) and identify the travelers, and the date and time of arrival at least 30 days prior to the scheduled travel;

b. Advanced notification of such travel will be made simultaneously to A.I.D. missions and A.I.D./W at the time that the notification is sent to the site coordinator.

c. After clearance is received, the site coordinator will simultaneously notify the project Officer, the traveler and the Management Entity that the Mission or Embassy has been informed and clearance has been obtained.

DS/AGR agrees that the above procedures could improve the efficiency of the operations and save limited funds for other priority activities. Steps will be taken in the near future to seek approval to change the travel clearance requirements.

While we were discussing the budgets, it became apparent that the following areas involved a considerable amount of time which could be saved if changes are made:

1. Audits.

The current grant requires an annual audit review. This places an unnecessary demand on the management entity to arrange for the audit, print the reports, etc.

DS/AGR will recommend that the audit of the ME accounts be made on a bi-annual basis or at strategic points of the Grant. Audits of the sub-grants will still be the responsibility of the ME.

2. Publications.

The current grant calls for 100 copies of each publication be sent to A.I.D./W. It is apparent that 100 copies are an excessive amount and are not required. DS/AGR will review this requirement for all CRSPs and make its recommend based on the results of this review.

3. Vehicle Waivers

In the past, UCD has prepared waiver requests for the purchase of vehicles on an individual basis at the time that they are needed. This single waiver procedures has consumed a considerable amount of time on the part of the site coordinators, ME, DS/AGR staff, GC, SER/CM, etc. For future vehicle requirements, DS/AGR will investigate the possibility of obtaining blanket waiver approval for replacement vehicles in those countries where the SR-CRSP has established sites.

Clearance: DS/AGR/AP: John Yohe [signature] date 11/26/80
Charles Haines [signature] date Nov 25, 1980
Mary Mozynski _____ date _____

DS/AGR: MMozynski
11/24/80

Distribution: Dr. David Robinson, Program Director
Small Ruminant CRSP - Management Entity
University of California, Davis, Calif. 956116

Dr. James Nielson, Director for Research
Board for International Food and Agricultural
Development, Room 2246 NS

Dr. Fred Johnson, Executive Secretary
Board for International Food and Agricultural
Development, Room 2246

Dr. Worth Fitzgerald, NE/TECH/AD
Room 6484

Dr. Hugh Popenoe, Director of International Programs
2001 McCarty Hall
University of Florida
Gainesville, Fla. 32601

DS/AGR: James Walker
Kenneth McDermott
Richard Hughes
John Yohe
Charles Haines
Mary Mozynski

DAA/DS/FN: Tony Babb

SER/CM: Morton Darvin