

CITIZENS NETWORK FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS
AGRIBUSINESS VOLUNTEER PROGRAM
IN WEST NIS

*Funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development
Under the NIS Farmer-to-Farmer Program
Cooperative Agreement No. FAO-A-00-99-00017-00
Project No. 938-0705*

**Report on Activities during FY 2001
(October 1, 2000-September 30, 2001)**

November 2, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
I. Program Goal.	1
II. Program Objectives	1
III. Overall Program Results	1
IV. Country-by-Country Program Results.	5
V. Issues and Problems.	20
VI. Administration, Personnel and Finance.	21
VII. Lessons Learned.	21
VIII. Volunteer Statistics for FY 2001.	22
IX. Public Outreach.	24
X. AVP Expenditures.	25

Appendices

- A. Annual AID Indicator Tables
- B. Project Impact Assessments and Host Profile Updates
 - 1. Belarus
 - a. BFU Project
 - b. Lesnoy Tsar Project
 - 2. Moldova
 - a. Milk Coops Project
 - b. Mindria Albinii BK Project
 - c. NFS Project
 - d. Tiglau Project
 - 3. Ukraine
 - a. Agro Dairy Project
 - b. Crimea PFA Project
 - c. Donetsk BK Project

- d. Holma Project
- e. Khmelnytsky Coop Project
- f. Lviv MGA Project
- g. NACU Project
- h. Odesa BK Project
- i. Sambir BK Project
- j. UDU Project
- k. Zakarpattia Project

C. Sample Newspaper Articles from NIS volunteers

- 1. "Dairy Farming in Moldova", Illinois Holstein Herald
- 2. "Moldova", American Bee Journal

I. PROGRAM GOAL

Private farmers and agribusiness entrepreneurs increase their incomes from market-oriented activities.

II. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Strengthen the ability of formal and informal private farmer associations to improve the incomes and businesses of their members.
2. Increase the incomes of private farmers by helping them create viable cooperative businesses based on the Western cooperative model.
3. Strengthen private agribusinesses that contribute to the development of the private food economy and rural areas.
4. Increase the access of private farmers and private agribusiness entrepreneurs to credit by deepening their understanding of financial planning and management.
5. Stimulate the development of entrepreneurial initiative within collective agricultural enterprises (former collective farms).

III. OVERALL PROGRAM RESULTS

A. Program Development

CNFA is committed to making the USAID Farmer-to-Farmer program as strong and effective as possible. Given that FTF is a long-term program, CNFA is working on an ongoing basis to evaluate outcomes and develop Best Practices that can be implemented systematically to improve the program's performance in the future.

Fiscal Year 2001 was a busy year for CNFA in the area of program development. CNFA launched overlapping initiatives to strengthen its program in two important areas:

- Improving the rate of successful volunteer assignments; and
- Improving documentation of success.

- 1. Improving the rate of successful volunteer assignments:** The FTF program has two fundamental points of focus: the volunteer and the host. FTF's basic task is to *bring volunteers and hosts together in a way that consistently provides value and satisfaction to both*. Volunteers who are taking time away from their families and jobs count on CNFA to put that time to good use. Since FTF is about exchange of ideas, it is essential that hosts want to learn from the volunteers. Prospective hosts may have other priorities, for example, "getting the rich American to give them money." In CNFA's view, FTF's greatest challenge is to *locate and select hosts who will value the volunteer's time and seek to obtain as much information as possible from him/her*. Success in finding good hosts will ensure a high rate of successful, fulfilling volunteer assignments.

CNFA has over the years concentrated more and more on (a) getting to know and understand the host and his/her enterprise; and (b) monitoring the host's performance both during and

following volunteer visits to assess his/her interest in the ideas and recommendations provided. In 1998, CNFA introduced an Integrated Project Design and Evaluation System (IPDES) in part to help achieve these objectives. At the beginning of FY01, CNFA implemented a *new, improved version of IPDES*.

The new IPDES has three elements beyond traditional FTF volunteer assignment scopes of work that CNFA has concluded are essential for assessing hosts and ensuring consistently fulfilling volunteer assignments:

- (1) *Host Profile*: The HP records essential information about the host and his/her activities relevant to the training to be provided. CNFA prepares the initial HP prior to the first volunteer assignment to a host first to enable CNFA to evaluate the host and reach a preliminary conclusion that he/she will value the volunteer's training (the HP also serves to provide prospective volunteers a full picture of the host in preparation for their assignment, and to provide CNFA a baseline against which to measure host development and FTF impact over time). Annual updates of the HP provide quantitative data on the host's activities in areas related to volunteer training, i.e., confirmation of the extent to which the training is producing positive impact.
- (2) *Volunteer Trip Reports and Volunteer Assignment Report*: CNFA requests each volunteer to submit a report following his/her assignment summarizing what happened and listing recommendations both for the host relative to his/her future development and for CNFA relative to management of future volunteer assignments to that host. Based on the volunteer's report and their debriefing of the hosts following the assignment, CNFA field staff prepare a brief Volunteer Assignment Report documenting the achievements of the assignment and listing possible impacts from it.
- (3) *Project Impact Assessment*: Prepared one year after the initiation of training in conjunction with an update of the HP (and annually thereafter), the PIA analyzes the data in the HP and assesses the extent to which the FTF project has changed people's lives. The PIA refers to the update HP to determine the extent to which the impacts that were predicted prior to and immediately following the volunteer training (documented in a Project Strategy, Volunteer Assignment Scopes of Work, volunteer trip reports, and Volunteer Assignment Reports) have been achieved.

- 2. Improving documentation of impact:** It is essential that any development program self-monitor and document its performance and results. USAID has recognized this imperative in the FTF program for the past several years by requiring implementers to complete a set of *Indicator Tables* annually providing information about impact. CNFA has been working steadily to establish a *system* for generating data on host development to support estimation of impact and completion of the USAID Indicator Tables. CNFA's introduction of the new Integrated Project Development and Evaluation System at the beginning of FY01 was the culmination of years of experience with and deliberation about effective impact assessment in the FTF program. As described above, IPDES aims to strengthen CNFA's ability to select good hosts for its volunteer assignments. In addition, however, IPDES is a comprehensive system for planning, directing, and assessing FTF volunteer assignments and generating

empirical, verifiable impact data. Although CNFA is still in the process of standardizing its procedures in regard to preparation of PIAs and the AID Indicator Tables, its policy is that *it will not claim impact in the AID Indicator Tables unless there is quantitative data in the HP to support it.*

IPDES is not only innovative as a structure for FTF program management; it also incorporates two innovative new analytical tools:

- sorting impacts by level; and
- the "Number of People Whose Lives Were Improved" chart.

Sorting Impacts By Level: As part of IPDES, CNFA has introduced an analytical tool that it has found to be extremely valuable in analyzing project impact. This is the concept of *levels of impact*. Impacts obviously vary in significance. The fact that a host farmer implements a new fertilization program recommended by a volunteer is certainly a positive impact that warrants recording, but the volunteers, CNFA, and USAID are also interested in whether the farmer's implementation of this fertilization program and other recommendations by volunteers result more broadly in an increase in his/her family's income or other improvements in their lives. Seeking an answer to this question requires some systematic analysis. To provide a structure for this analysis, CNFA's IPDES has adopted the practice of sorting impacts by level:

- Level I: Host performs specific acts using the information/ skills provided by the volunteer.
- Level II: Intermediate impacts (link Level I to Level III).
- Level III: Improvements in the lives of host people (usually an increase in income).

As stated above, the goal of CNFA's FTF Program is to increase people's incomes. In other words, CNFA is dedicated to achieving Level III impact. By listing and sorting the impacts that it is achieving in its various project documents, CNFA aims to help its staff, the hosts, and the volunteers stay focused on the overall goal of the project and see clearly how the specific training each volunteer provides ultimately contributes to it.

The "Number of People Whose Lives Improved" Chart: Very recently, at the end of FY01, CNFA added one additional element to the IPDES system, even though AID does not require it, aimed at strengthening documentation of impact. This is the "Number of People Whose Lives Were Improved" or LI chart. If the PIA reports that Level III impact (people's lives improved) has been achieved, then it is logical to go one step further and estimate – *also based on empirical data in the HP* -- the number of people who have achieved it. Developing such estimates will also enable CNFA to synthesize the overall impact of its program. The following table provides the first-ever empirically based estimate of the impact of CNFA's Agribusiness Volunteer Program in terms of number of people whose lives have been improved:

Number Of People Whose Lives Were Improved

FY01	Large Improvement	Small Improvement	Total
Directly Improved	407	1428	1835
Indirectly Improved	499	140	639
Total	906	1568	2474

It is important to note that the data in this chart are quite preliminary and partial. First, they are based entirely on data in Project Impact Assessments and Host Profile updates, and CNFA prepared PIAs and HP only on projects at least one year old, so all volunteer training projects begun during FY01 are excluded. Second, CNFA's field offices were only asked to develop this data at the end of the year and not all project HPs contained data to support estimating numbers of people very well. Such projects are also excluded from these data. Given these large exclusions, it is significant that the numbers of lives impacted are as large as they are. CNFA intends to concentrate on including indicators of lives impacted in all of its HPs for FY02 and will have more comprehensive and reliable data for the LI chart in next year's report.

How Reliable Are the Data?: Some people have questioned whether the impact data IPDES is producing are reliable. Particularly with the limited resources available under the FTF program for impact monitoring, it will generally be impossible to obtain fully comprehensive, objective data on impact. Moreover, even where comprehensive data collection is possible, the cause-effect relationship between volunteer training and observed improvement in hosts' lives will often be less from clear-cut. Just because perfection is impossible, however, does not mean that there can be no benefit from a limited, less-than-perfect effort. CNFA is testing the hypothesis that *an educated guess based on systematic sampling of results and comparison against baseline data* can produce valuable data on impact. CNFA is attaching to this report not only its completed AID Indicator Tables, but also all of the project HPs and PIAs that it has completed so far so that readers can evaluate IPDES for themselves. Readers are invited to glance especially at the discussion of the LI chart in a few of the PIAs to see how the numbers in the chart were estimated.

Can FTF support IPDES?: Some people have also questioned whether, even if IPDES is deemed to be effective and valuable, FTF programs have the resources to support so elaborate a system. CNFA has only 12 months' experience with IPDES so far, so its conclusion is preliminary, but that conclusion is affirmative. First, field staff report that, although it is demanding, the new IPDES' tabular format and emphasis on brevity are more manageable than the original one. Second, experience is revealing additional areas for streamlining that CNFA is pursuing. Particularly considering IPDES' benefits -- (a) a much stronger foundation for sorting out which prospective hosts will value the volunteer's time and seek to obtain as much information as possible from him/her and thus for CNFA to fulfill its *obligation to its volunteers to provide them fulfilling experiences*; and (b) (if confirmed by experience) a much more reliable foundation for measuring impact -- CNFA is increasingly optimistic that the costs of IPDES will prove reasonable and bearable.

3. Conclusion: In the area of FTF program development, FY01 was a very active year for CNFA. Introduction of the new Integrated Project Development and Evaluation System provided dramatic improvements in the management of the CNFA Agribusiness Volunteer Program. Although assessment of IPDES's value remains preliminary, most CNFA staff members, both headquarters and field, have expressed enthusiasm for it, and CNFA intends to concentrate over the coming year on using it to improve the quality of its FTF projects, raising the level of volunteer and host satisfaction with the program, and delivering more reliable data on program impact.

B. Program Implementation

CNFA conducted a total of 68 assignments into the West NIS countries in FY01. This was far below the work plan target of 121 assignments. CNFA was hit by the unanticipated departure, on short notice and in quick succession, of two headquarters-based recruiters that left CNFA severely short-handed in its volunteer recruiting effort for most of the year. This experience has convinced CNFA that it cannot operate the West NIS Agribusiness Volunteer Program successfully with only two full-time recruiters and it has juggled staffing responsibilities so as to open up the opportunity to add a third recruiter. CNFA is pleased to report that it hired Kristina Gribovskaja to fill this new position beginning October 29, 2001. CNFA is confident that this additional recruiting resource, together with rising efficiency in the field offices, will enable it to fulfill its work plan target of 135 volunteer assignments in FY02.

IV. COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY PROGRAM RESULTS

UKRAINE

1. Overview

CNFA-Ukraine created Project Strategies and Host Profiles for 15 new projects, developed volunteer Scopes Of Work for 58 volunteer assignments, conducted 34 volunteer assignments within 26 projects, and prepared Project Impact Assessments, update Host Profiles, and new Project Strategies for 12 projects¹ that have been in existence for over a year.

2. Development Projects

Current Projects	Number of Volunteers		
	Previous Years	Current Year	Total
AGRO Dairy	5	2	7
Agrodivir Dairy	0	2	2
Crimea Private Farmers Association (CPFA)	5	3	8
Donetsk Beekeepers	1	1	2
ELITON Agribusiness	0	1	1
Holma Cooperative (Balta Dairy Coops)	3	1	4
Ivano-Frankivsk Farm Women's Council	0	2	2

¹ One of CNFA's longer-term projects, a project with the Lviv Private Mushroom Growers Association, did not host any AVP volunteers during FY2001, but CNFA still conducted a project impact assessment.

Kharkiv Dairy	0	1	1
Kherson Private Farmers Association (KPFA)	1	1	2
Khmelnysky Cooperatives (Teofipol, Burtyn)	1	1	2
Krutoyarovka Farm Women's Association (KFWA)	0	1	1
Lviv Dairy Coops	0	1	1
Lviv Private Farmers (LAES)	0	1	1
Makariv Agricultural Service Center	0	2	2
National Agricultural Cooperatives Union (NACU)	4	1	5
Novgorodka Private Farmers Association	0	1	1
Odesa Beekeepers	0	1	1
Odesa Grape Growers' Association (OGGA)	0	1	1
Pavlograd Dairy	0	1	1
PROTOS Agribusiness	0	1	1
Sambir Informal Beekeepers Association (SIBA)	1	2	3
Tavriyski Lany Farm Store	0	1	1
Ukrainian Dairy Union (UDU)	0	1	1
Vynnytsa Apple Growers Association (VAGA)	0	1	1
Zakarpattia-National Council of Farm Women (NCFW)	5	1	6
Zaporizhia Private Farmers Association (ZPFA)	1	2	3
Total	40	34	74

3. Impact

(Note: The impact of volunteer training occurs over time. CNFA therefore waits 12 months following its first volunteer assignment to a project to conduct a Project Impact Assessment. The impact data reported in this section are drawn exclusively from the PIAs (and Host Profile updates upon which the PIAs are based) completed during FY01 (all attached for reference as appendices to this report). This means that there are no impact data for projects for which no PIA has been completed and the lists of projects in these charts differ from that in the table above. For projects that were initiated in FY01, CNFA will prepare a PIA and report impacts beginning in FY02.)

A. Number of People Whose Lives Were Improved

Projects	Large Improvement		Small Improvement		Total
	Directly Improved	Indirectly Improved	Directly Improved	Indirectly Improved	
Program Objective 1: Strengthen the ability of formal and informal private farmer associations to improve the incomes and businesses of their members.					
1. Crimea Private Farmers Association (CPFA)	0	61	289	0	350
2. Zakarpattia-National Council of Farm Women (NCFW)	10	13	0	0	23
3. Lviv Private Mushroom Growers Association (LPMGA)	26	21	81	0	128
Program Objective 2: Increase the incomes of private farmers by helping them create viable cooperative businesses based on the Western cooperative model.					
1. Holma Cooperative (Balta Dairy Coops)	20	100	111	10	241
2. Khmelnysky Cooperatives (Teofipol, Burtyn)	0	0	22	0	22
3. National Agricultural Cooperative Union (NACU)	0	400	0	0	400
Program Objective 3: Strengthen small- and medium-scale private agribusinesses.					

1. Ukrainian Dairy Union (UDU)	8	0	12	0	20
2. AGRO Dairy	3	0	0	0	3
Program Objective 4: Increase the access of private farmers and private agribusiness entrepreneurs to credit by deepening their understanding of financial planning and management.					
1. Zaporizhia Private Farmers Association (ZPFA)	58	0	37	0	95
Program Objective 5: Stimulate the development of entrepreneurial initiative within collective agricultural enterprises (former collective farms).					
1. Donetsk Beekeepers	0	0	40	0	40
2. Odesa Beekeepers	No data				
3. Sambir Informal Beekeepers Association (SIBA)	10	0	110	0	120
TOTAL	135	595	702	10	1,442

B. USAID Indicator Tables V – IX: Country Detail

Table V: Hosts with Improved Business Operations as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table VI: Hosts with Improved Organizational Capacity as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table VII: Hosts with Improved Services to Membership/ Employees as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table VIII: Host with Improved Financial Services to the Agricultural Sector as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table IX: Hosts with Improved Use and/ or Protection of the Environment as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance
A. Number of Hosts providing new or improved products and/ or services. 1. AGRO Dairy 2. Crimea PFA 3. Holma Cooperative 4. Zaporizhia PFA	A. Number of organizations formed as a result of grantee/volunteer intervention. 1. Crimea PFA 2. Khmelnytsky Cooperatives 3. Ukrainian Dairy Union 4. Zaporizhia PFA	A. Number of hosts that have successfully intervened on behalf of members with government or business. 1. Crimea PFA 2. NACU 3. Sambir Beekeepers	A. Number of hosts with an increased number of agricultural related loans. 1. Zaporizhia PFA	A. Number of hosts adopting one or more practices to improve waste or pollution management. 1. AGRO Dairy
B. Number of hosts with production increases over pre-assignment levels. 1. AGRO Dairy 2. Crimea PFA 3. Holma Cooperative 4. LPMGA 5. Sambir Beekeepers 6. Zakarpattia NCFW 7. Zaporizhia PFA	B. Number of hosts using new or improved planning techniques, program methodologies, and/or management practices, including the use of a business plan or a strategic plan. 1. AGRO Dairy 2. Crimea PFA 3. Donetsk Beekeepers 4. Holma Cooperative 5. Khmelnytsky Cooperatives 6. LPMGA 7. NACU 8. Sambir Beekeepers	B. Number of hosts with new training courses or new subject matter for courses to use with membership or associates.	B. Number of hosts with loan delinquency rate < 10%. 1. Zaporizhia PFA	B. Number of hosts adopting one or more practices to improve natural resources management (soil, water, forest, grazing lands, national parkland, etc.) 1. Holma Cooperative

	9. Ukrainian Dairy Union 10. Zakarpattia NCFW 11. Zaporizhia PFA			
C. Number of hosts with increased business efficiency or resource conservation. 1. AGRO Dairy 2. Crimea PFA 3. Holma Cooperative 4. Khmelnytsky Cooperatives 5. LPMGA 6. NACU 7. Zaporizhia PFA	C. Number of hosts with increased revenue/resources through new grants and/or increased fees. 1. Crimea PFA	C. Number of hosts with improved training materials and skills. 1. AGRO Dairy 2. LPMGA 3. Zakarpattia NCFW	C. Number of hosts that provide improved banking services to the agricultural sector.	
D. Number of hosts receiving increased revenue/resources through increased sales receipts as a result of grantee/volunteer intervention. 1. AGRO Dairy 2. Crimea PFA 3. Donetsk Beekeepers 4. Holma Cooperative 5. Sambir Beekeepers 6. Ukrainian Dairy Union	D. Number of hosts that have increased their membership as a result of grantee/volunteer interventions. 1. Crimea PFA 2. Holma Cooperative 3. LPMGA 4. Sambir Beekeepers 5. Ukrainian Dairy Union 6. Zaporizhia PFA		D. Number of hosts with an increase in Enterprise Portfolio Value (micro-finance loans)	
E. Number of hosts with increased profits. 1. AGRO Dairy 2. Crimea PFA 3. Sambir Beekeepers				

C. Discussion

Political and economic reform in Ukraine has proceeded at an inconsistent pace, with some sectoral reforms long ago implemented and others still being debated and far from reality. Reform in the agricultural sector has progressed slowly, with land reform finally taking place in December 1999 and land titling still in the process.

As a result of this delayed and inconsistent reform process, Ukraine's agricultural sector has been stuck in transition. Although Ukrainian farmers are no longer confined by the state-run, collective agricultural system, many have not yet learned or experienced the benefits of a farming system that relies on private initiative and free markets. This is partly due to continuing bureaucratic regulations that hinder private entrepreneurship, but also due to mentality that was ingrained in many farmers over the course of 70 years of Soviet collectivization.

Nevertheless, a number of **private farmer associations** have been established in the past decade. These associations bring together a diverse collection of private farmers, with differing farm sizes, modes of operation, education, and production levels. CNFA is working with several of these oblast-level farmer associations, providing technical assistance to help develop these budding organizations into democratic, sustainable, member-driven associations. In addition to working with association leadership to develop the association structure and establish membership services (as stated in USAID indicator table V: A; hosts with new or improved services), CNFA has gone within these associations to work directly with their private farmer members, helping them to improve their crop yields (USAID indicator table V: B; number of hosts with production increases) and to manage their farms better (USAID indicator table V: C; number of hosts with increased business efficiency).

The result of this training has been impressive. By helping the **Crimea Private Farmers Association (CPFA)** create a sound association structure and provide beneficial membership services, CNFA has helped the PFA boost its membership by 700%, supporting USAID indicator table VI: D (number of hosts that have increased membership). Also, with help from AVP volunteers, the Zaporizhia Private Farmers Association has created a credit union as a member service, allowing Zaporizhia private farmers to access credit when previously they had none, demonstrating a clear impact under USAID indicator table VIII: A (hosts with an increased number of agricultural-related loans). Of the three private farmer associations for which CNFA has conducted project impact assessments for, one group has increased its profits (USAID indicator table V: E; hosts with increased profits), each has increased their production levels and business efficiency (indicator tables V: B and V: C), and all three associations have increased their membership (indicator table V: D). In these three private farmer association projects, CNFA has measured an improvement in the lives of 501 people from AVP technical assistance.

While private farmer associations are attracting members and gaining strength on the oblast level, CNFA is also working to organize farmers on the rayon and village level. **Cooperatives** in the U.S. have proven to be a successful vehicle for farmers to share costs and maximize revenues, both by allowing them to buy inputs at discount rates and by allowing them to sell their produce directly. However, formation of cooperatives in Ukraine has been slowed due to the misunderstood concept of cooperatives. Many private farmers have memories of forced collectivization, and many automatically correlate “cooperatives” with “collectives.”

In order to overcome this pre-conceived notion, CNFA, along with the **National Agricultural Cooperatives Union (NACU)**, has begun to help farmers establish “Western-style cooperatives,” teaching farmers and household plot owners about the benefits of cooperation in selling member production such as milk and vegetables. After CNFA previously established a number of milk collection stations in villages across Ukraine, CNFA has helped milk producers in those villages to create cooperatives, supporting USAID indicator table VI: A (number of organizations formed as a result of volunteer intervention). In Balta, members of the Holma Cooperative have banded together to sell their milk, increasing their average monthly income by nearly 50%, demonstrating a clear impact under USAID indicator table V: D (number of hosts with increased revenue through increased sales receipts). Of the three cooperative projects that CNFA has conducted project impact assessments for, one cooperative (Holma Cooperative) has increased its revenue from sales, improved its natural resources management (USAID indicator

table IX: B; number of hosts with improved natural resources management), and increased its services to members (indicator table V: A). Among these cooperative development projects, CNFA has measured an improvement in the lives of 630 people from AVP technical assistance.

CNFA has also worked on the national level to assist Ukraine's agricultural sector. In working with the NACU, AVP volunteer James Baarda helped to write a **new cooperative law** for Ukraine, helping to achieve USAID indicator table VII: A (number of hosts that have intervened on behalf of members with government or business). As a result, in December 2000, the Verkhovna Rada (Ukrainian Parliament) passed an amendment to the country's cooperative law, making it easier for farmers to create cooperatives and providing economic incentives for them to join cooperatives. Separately, CNFA helped bring together eight major Ukrainian dairies to establish a **nationwide Ukrainian dairy association** to represent the interests of dairies in governmental affairs, achieving USAID indicator table VI: A (number of new organizations formed). The recently created **Ukrainian Dairy Union** will serve to lobby the Ukrainian executive and legislative branches to promote the dairy industry on a national level. Already, the membership in this very important organization has grown from the founding group of eight dairies to 20 members.

Recognizing that progress and sustainable development has to come from the bottom up, CNFA is also working with **individual farmers and agribusinesses** by teaching them new ways of conducting their business (as stated in USAID indicator table VI: B; number of hosts using new or improved planning techniques, program methodologies, and/or management practices). In addition to working on the oblast and village level, CNFA has several projects working with individual beekeepers. These projects, which seek to stimulate the development of entrepreneurial initiative within former collective farms, bring together farmers who keep bees as a private hobby. CNFA is training these informal groups of beekeepers how to increase their honey production, market their honey, and subsequently boost their incomes, demonstrating impact under several USAID indicator tables.

Members of the Sambir Informal Beekeepers Association (SIBA) have shown strong interest in receiving and implementing technical assistance. CNFA has measured an improvement in the lives of 120 people who received training under this project. Through working with AVP volunteers, SIBA members have increased their honey production, sales, and total profits, demonstrating that long-term sustainable development comes from farmers having a personal interest in the project and a motivation to improve their lives.

4. Sub-Contractor Activities

In Year Two, VITA continued working with CNFA Ukraine in the West NIS initiative to facilitate access to credit by farmers and farm enterprises. The methodology was to follow up on Year One assessments of training utility potential among farmers, and the identification of any credit mechanisms available in a difficult and complex post-Soviet Union environment (i.e. banks, credit unions, supply credits, etc.) as well as contacts with small farmers and agricultural entrepreneurs.

5. Collaboration and Partnerships

CNFA-Ukraine, is cooperating with Louisiana State University (LSU) in the Vinnytsa Region, where LSU is implementing an extension service program. The cooperation consists of coordinating CNFA volunteer assignments with LSU so that the volunteer can reach a broader private farmer audience.

CNFA-Ukraine also has cooperated in similar efforts with International Finance Corporation (IFC) in the Kakhovka District. Several CNFA volunteers have conducted seminars at IFC field days and participated in IFC presentations to farmers and agribusinesses in the Kakhovka District.

One possible partnership for FY2002 is cooperating with Iowa Sister States (ISS). ISS has a relationship in the Cherkasi Region in Ukraine and CNFA is exploring possible agricultural projects that can be coordinated with ISS.

MOLDOVA

1. Overview

CNFA Moldova conducted 20 volunteer assignments within 7 long-term projects during the second half of FY2001. This brought total assignments for FY2001 to 26 (against the target of 42). CNFA Moldova plans to conduct 47 assignments during FY2002.

Completing a full cycle of CNFA's new Host Profile impact monitoring and evaluation system, CNFA Moldova completed Host Profile updates on 17 hosts. Spreadsheets of updated HPs that show significant improvement are attached. CNFA Moldova also completed 4 Project Impact Assessments for projects during this period.

2. Development Projects

Current Projects	Number of Volunteers		
	Previous Years	Current Year	Total
Mindria Albinii Co-op	3	4	7
Tiglau Co-op	2	3	5
National Federation of SCACs SCAC Mereseni SCAC Tatarasti SCAC Hirtopul Mic SCAC Cotiujenii Mari SCAC Recesti SCAC Cuizauca	10	9	19
Dairy Co-ops Gura Cainarului	3	6	9

Stefanesti Cotiujenii Mari Cosernita Putinesti Recesti Raspopeni Ignatei			
Alfa-Nistru Cannery	1	1	2
Orhei-Vit Cannery	0	1	1
Farm Store Development Tutoveni-Agro Farm Store ProFermier Farm Store Vins Agro Farm Store Hajiu Farm Store La Vila Farm Store	0	2	2
Total	19	26	45

3. Impact

(Note: The impact of volunteer training occurs over time. CNFA therefore waits 12 months following its first volunteer assignment to a project to conduct a Project Impact Assessment. The impact data reported in this section are drawn exclusively from the PIAs (and Host Profile updates upon which the PIAs are based) completed during FY01 (all attached for reference as appendices to this report). This means that there are no impact data for projects for which no PIA has been completed and the lists of projects in these charts differ from that in the table above. For projects that were initiated in FY01, CNFA will prepare a PIA and report impacts beginning in FY02.)

A. Number of People Whose Lives Were Improved

Projects	Large Improvement		Small Improvement		Total
	Directly Improved	Indirectly Improved	Directly Improved	Indirectly Improved	
Projects Under Objective A					
1. Mindria Albinii Co-op	17	3	7	11	38
2. Dairy Co-ops Gura Cainarului Stefanesti Cotiujenii Mari Cosernita Putinesti Recesti Raspopeni Ignatei	175	0	638	2	815
3. Tiglau Co-op	29	0	0	0	29
Projects Under Objective C					
1. National Federation of SCACs SCAC Mereseni SCAC Tatarasti SCAC Hirtopul Mic	14	0	29	127	170

SCAC Cotuijenii Mari SCAC Recesti SCAC Cuizauca					
Total	235	3	674	140	1052

B. USAID Indicator Tables V – IX: Country Detail

Table V: Hosts with Improved Business Operations as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table VI: Hosts with Improved Organizational Capacity as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table VII: Hosts with Improved Services to Membership/Employees as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table VIII: Host with Improved Financial Services to the Agricultural Sector as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table IX: Hosts with Improved Use and/ or Protection of the Environment as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance
<p>A. Number of Hosts providing new or improved products and/ or services.</p> <p>1. MCC Gura Cainarului 2. MCC Stefanesti 3. MCC Cotujeni Mari 4. MCC Cosemita 5. MCC Putenesti 6. MCC Racesti 7. MCC Raspopoeni 8. MCC Igantei 9. MABC</p>	<p>A. Number of organizations formed as a result of grantee/volunteer intervention.</p> <p>1. MCC Gura Cainarului 2. MCC Stefanesti 3. MCC Cotujeni Mari 4. MCC Cosemita 5. MCC Putenesti 6. MCC Racesti 7. MCC Raspopoeni 8. MCC Igantei</p>	<p>A. Number of hosts that have successfully intervened on behalf of members with government or business.</p>	<p>A. Number of hosts with an increased number of agricultural related loans.</p> <p>1. SCAC Cotujeni Mari 2. SCAC Mereseni 3. SCAC Tatarasti 4. SCAC Cuizauca 5. SCAC Hirtopul Mic 6. SCAC Racesti</p>	<p>A. Number of hosts adopting one or more practices to improve waste or pollution management.</p>
<p>B. Number of hosts with production increases over pre-assignment levels.</p> <p>1. Tiglau 2. MCC Gura Cainarului 3. MCC Stefanesti 4. MCC Cotujeni Mari 5. MCC Cosemita 6. MCC Putenesti 7. MCC Racesti 8. MCC Raspopoeni 9. MCC Igantei 10. NFS 11. SCAC Cotujeni Mari 12. SCAC Mereseni 13. SCAC Tataresti 14. SCAC Cuizauca 15. SCAC Hirtopul Mic 16. SCAC Racesti</p>	<p>B. Number of hosts using new or improved planning techniques, program methodologies, and/or management practices, including the use of a business plan or a strategic plan.</p> <p>1. NFS 2. SCAC Cotujeni Mari 3. SCAC Mereseni 4. SCAC Tataresti 5. SCAC Cuizauca 6. SCAC Hirtopul Mic 7. SCAC Racesti 8. MABC</p>	<p>B. Number of hosts with new training courses or new subject matter for courses to use with membership or associates.</p> <p>1. NFS 2. SCAC Cotujeni Mari 3. SCAC Mereseni 4. SCAC Tataresti 5. SCAC Cuizauca 6. SCAC Hirtopul Mic 7. SCAC Racesti</p>	<p>B. Number of hosts with loan delinquency rate < 10%.</p> <p>1. SCAC Cotujeni Mari 2. SCAC Mereseni 3. SCAC Tatarasti 4. SCAC Cuizauca 5. SCAC Hirtopul Mic 6. SCAC Racesti</p>	<p>B. Number of hosts adopting one or more practices to improve natural resources management (soil, water, forest, grazing lands, national parkland, etc.)</p>
<p>C. Number of hosts with increased business efficiency or resource conservation.</p> <p>1. MABC 2. NFS 3. SCAC Cotujeni Mari 4. SCAC Mereseni</p>	<p>C. Number of hosts with increased revenue/resources through new grants and/or increased fees.</p> <p>1. NFS 2. MCC Gura Cainarului 3. MCC Stefanesti</p>	<p>C. Number of hosts with improved training materials and skills.</p> <p>1. NFS 2. SCAC Cotujeni Mari 3. SCAC Mereseni 4. SCAC Tataresti 5. SCAC Cuizauca</p>	<p>C. Number of hosts that provide improved banking services to the agricultural sector.</p> <p>1. Number of hosts with an increase in average loan size. 1. SCAC Cotujeni Mari</p>	

5. SCAC Tataresti 6. SCAC Cuizauca 7. SCAC Hirtopul Mic 8. SCAC Racesti	4.MCC Cotiujenii Mari 5.MCC Cosernita 6.MCC Putinesti 7.MCC Racesti 8.MCC Raspopeni 9.MCC Ignatei	6. SCAC Hirtopul Mic 7. SCAC Racesti	2.SCAC Mereseni 3.SCAC Tatarasti 4.SCAC Cuizauca 5.SCAC Hirtopul Mic 6.SCAC Racesti	
D. Number of hosts receiving increased revenue/resources through increased sales receipts as a result of grantee/volunteer intervention. 1. Tiglau 2. MABC 3. MCC Gura Cainarului 4. MCC Stefanesti 5. MCC Cotujeni Mari 6. MCC Cosernita 7. MCC Putenesti 8. MCC Racesti 9. MCC Raspopeni 10. MCC Igantei	D.Number of hosts that have increased their membership as a result of grantee/volunteer interventions. 1.NFS 2.MCC Gura Cainarului 3.MCC Stefanesti 4.MCC Cotiujenii Mari 5.MCC Cosernita 6.MCC Putinesti 7.MCC Racesti 8.MCC Raspopeni 9.MCC Ignatei 10.Tiglau 11.MABC		D. Number of hosts with an increase in Enterprise Portfolio Value (micro-finance loans)	
E. Number of hosts with increased profits.				

C. Discussion

Capital formation is a traditional problem in agrarian areas, whether for agricultural or other rural economic development. This need also offers one of the strongest arguments for creating producer-owned and consumer-owned cooperatives. But there is more to developing a cooperative than capital formation. One way CNFA is **supporting the integration of rural populations into market economies** in Moldova is by improving our clients' organizational capacity to *manage* capital, which in a cooperative is as important as securing legal registration or fund raising. Even though Mindria Albinii co-op and the dairy co-ops successfully overcame capital formation issues by raising funds internally, increased sales receipts are presenting new challenges such as forecasting incomes, managing expenses, producing realistic monthly budgets, objectively examining sales trends and expanding into new markets. Both Mindria Albinii co-op and our dairy co-op clients are using new business planning techniques and capital management practices introduced by CNFA volunteers, implemented by the hosts and nurtured along by local CNFA staff. These impacts are reflected in USAID indicator VI B (hosts using new/improved planning techniques and management practices).

The impacts resulting from CNFA volunteer assistance are impressive and are proving **cooperatives** can be an effective development tool. Memberships are increasing, proving more people believe in and trust the management capabilities of their cooperatives. Increased membership results in higher revenue for cooperatives, supporting USAID indicator VI C (hosts with increased revenue through increased fees). Also, members are using the services of their cooperatives more. Both Mindria Albinii co-op and the dairy co-ops have increased sales by over 100%, successfully achieving USAID indicator V D (hosts receiving increased sales receipts as result of volunteer intervention). Lastly, greater numbers of **household incomes are**

increasing at a faster pace due to increased sales receipts and timely cash payments. Thus, through well-designed volunteer projects, over 200 individual cooperative members improved their lives directly as shown in Section 3, Table A of this report. CNFA's Host Profile impact monitoring and evaluation system confirms these trends.

Moldova has been the beneficiary of extensive assistance in the area of **microfinance development** from various donors over the past 5 years. Thanks to this assistance, Moldova today boasts over 370 rural Savings and Credit Associations (SCACs) with over 30,000 members, \$6.5 million in outstanding loans, and an average repayment rate of 98 percent. The system is still far from perfect, however. SCAC members are expressing strong demand for training in small business financial management and marketing that will enable them to manage their enterprises and loans successfully. Responding to these needs, 48 of the SCACs banded together in 1999 to form a National Federation of SCACs (NFS) to organize needed training programs and serve SCACs' other needs. The NFS has strong leadership dedicated to empowering and increasing the incomes of the impoverished through their **Small Enterprise Management Training program** developed with assistance from CNFA volunteers. When developing the volunteer strategy, CNFA, with the additional assistance of sub-contractor VITA, focused on increasing SCACs' efficiency level (as expressed by USAID indicator V B), diversifying their services and developing their loan portfolio ((USAID indicator V A).

In line with USAID indicator VII B (hosts with new training courses/new subject matter), CNFA volunteers, helped successfully develop **new training courses** and delivered them, on a test basis, through 6 SCACs to nearly 540 private farmers/active account borrowers. CNFA concluded, as **confirmed by our Host Profile** impact monitoring and evaluation system, that as a result of intensive training in farm financial management, record-keeping and agricultural marketing, a total of 156 private farmers made better use of operational credit available through their local SCACs, and 29 of them expanded their farming operations and increased overall efficiency. These 29 farmers restructured their farming activities by including new profitable enterprises, based on thorough planning and market research, demonstrating the impact tracked by USAID indicator V C (hosts with increased business efficiency).

4. Sub-Contractor Activities

In Year Two, VITA continued working with CNFA/Moldova in the West NIS initiative to facilitate access to credit by farmers and farm enterprises. The methodology was to follow up on Year One assessments of training demand/needs among SCAC farmers, and to support the National Federation of SCAC's. VITA did not have the opportunity due to various constraints to continue with the identification of additional (non-SCAC) credit mechanisms available in a difficult and complex post-Soviet Union environment (i.e. banks, credit unions, supply credits, etc.).

VITA also assisted in the recruitment of volunteers, particularly credit and financial management specialists needed by the Moldova program. VITA listed volunteer openings on its website, posted positions on its volunteer listserv, and networked with other volunteer organizations to make them aware of the available opportunities. One volunteer, Paula Higgins, recruited through this process, successfully completed an assignment with SCAC Tataresti.

CNFA Moldova also subcontracted with the Causeni (Moldova) Business Center for Information and Marketing (CBCIM) for volunteer assignment support services during FY01. CBCIM has supported agricultural development in Moldova since 1997 by selling a wide range of consulting and informational services in the areas of marketing and management, strategic planning and finances, agricultural machinery, pest management, veterinary medicine and animal sciences. In addition, CBCIM regularly organizes (for a fee) training events for farmers and entrepreneurs on a variety of topics ranging from farm production to small business management.

CBCIM has proven a valuable resource not only in assisting volunteers to create standardized training materials but also in interacting with local hosts and monitoring implementation of volunteer recommendations. During the second half of FY2001, CBCIM staff contributed to volunteer programming activities in a variety of ways:

- Supported 2 CNFA volunteer assignments with Mindria Albinii Cooperative by facilitating training events, organizing roundtables, local business excursions, collecting market information and disseminating volunteer recommendations.
- Followed up on CNFA assignments with Mindria Albinii Cooperative by assisting the beekeepers in locating viable markets for their honey and identify locally available wax processing facilities and wick suppliers.
- CBCIM veterinarian, marketing and management specialist and agronomist accompanied 2 volunteer assignments to 8 Milk Cooperatives in northeastern Moldova. CBCIM staff assisted CNFA volunteers in training dairymen belonging to the cooperatives in cooperative governance and financial management.

Project hosts have consistently remarked positively on the usefulness of having CBCIM locally available to answer questions concerning volunteer recommendations and/or business strategies.

CNFA continues to be pleased with the support it receives from CBCIM and intends to extend the contract, both to enhance its own performance and to build local Moldovan capacity for farmer development.

5. Collaboration and Partnerships

As in-country resources, Peace Corps Volunteers (PCVs) are a valuable asset to CNFA volunteers. From helping hosts inform their memberships of FTF volunteer training sessions, through participating in the sessions themselves, to providing follow-up reinforcement, PCVs contribute to the positive effect of FTF impact. CNFA has therefore actively sought collaboration with Peace Corps in the one West NIS country in which Peace Corps has volunteers working in rural areas – Moldova. In FY 2001, CNFA responded to three PCV requests:

- PCV Frank Gore, assigned to a Savings and Credit Association in Cotujenii Mari, worked with CNFA volunteer Phillip Hufferd to reach former collective farmers in his village and stimulate their interest in joining the Association.

- PCV Don Phillips arranged for CNFA volunteers Merle Anderson, Richard Lettner, Tom Kriegl, and Loren Wallace to train smallholder dairy farmers to increase lactation in his village. Each CNFA volunteer spent one training day in PCV Phillips' village.
- PCV Douglas Bowman, a U.S. veterinarian with a Masters of Business Administration degree who has taken great interest in milk production training, collaborated with AVP volunteers Richard Lettner, Tom Kriegl, and Loren Wallace. Following up on their training, Bowman, using his business center as a hub, visited the host milk marketing cooperatives and helped them troubleshoot inefficiencies and generate creative solutions.

CNFA Moldova anticipates further collaboration with these and other PCVs during FY02.

BELARUS

1. Overview

CNFA-Belarus conducted eight volunteer assignments during FY2001 within five projects. CNFA-Belarus developed volunteer scopes of work for 17 different assignments, created project strategies and host profiles for seven new projects², and conducted project impact assessments for two projects that have been in existence for over a year. CNFA-Belarus also updated existing host profiles and project strategies for these two longer-term projects.

CNFA-Belarus is hoping to make up the FY2001 shortfall with plans to host 15 volunteers in FY2002. In addition, CNFA-Belarus will conduct project impact assessments on all of its projects, as well as update all host profiles and project strategies.

2. Development Projects

Projects	Number of Volunteers		
	Previous Years	Current Year	Total
Avtuki Farm	0	2	2
Belarusian Farmers Union (BFU)	1	1	2
Dubravy Farm	0	2	2
Lesnoy Tsar Agribusiness	0	1	1
ORACUL Agribusiness	1	0	1
Zazhevichi Agribusiness	0	2	2
Total	2	8	10

3. Impact

(Note: The impact of volunteer training occurs over time. CNFA therefore waits 12 months following its first volunteer assignment to a project to conduct a Project Impact Assessment. The impact data reported in this section are drawn exclusively from the PIAs (and Host Profile updates upon which the PIAs are based) completed during FY01 (all attached for reference as appendices to this report). This means that there are no impact data for projects for which no PIA has been completed and the lists of projects in these charts differ from that in the table above. For projects that were initiated in FY01, CNFA will prepare a PIA and report impacts beginning in FY02.)

² Four out of these seven projects have not yet hosted an AVP volunteer.

A. Number of People Whose Lives Were Improved

Projects	Large Improvement		Small Improvement		Total
	Directly Improved	Indirectly Improved	Directly Improved	Indirectly Improved	
Program Objective 1: Support the development of democratic farmer associations and strengthen their ability to improve the incomes and businesses of their members.					
1. Belarusian Farmers Union	0	1	50	0	51
Program Objective 2: Increase the incomes of private farmers by helping them create viable cooperative businesses based on the Western cooperative model.					
None	--	--	--	--	0
Program Objective 3: Strengthen small- and medium-scale private agribusinesses.					
1. Lesnoy Tsar	2	0	0	0	2
Program Objective 4: Stimulate the development of entrepreneurial initiative among members of former collective farms.					
None	--	--	--	--	0
TOTAL	2	1	50	0	53

B. USAID Indicator Tables V – IX: Country Detail

Table V: Hosts with Improved Business Operations as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table VI: Hosts with Improved Organizational Capacity as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table VII: Hosts with Improved Services to Membership/ Employees as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table VIII: Host with Improved Financial Services to the Agricultural Sector as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance	Table IX: Hosts with Improved Use and/ or Protection of the Environment as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance
A. Number of Hosts providing new or improved products and/ or services. 1. Lesnoy Tsar	A. Number of organizations formed as a result of grantee/volunteer intervention.	A. Number of hosts that have successfully intervened on behalf of members with government or business. 1. Belarusian Farmers Union	A. Number of hosts with an increased number of agricultural related loans.	A. Number of hosts adopting one or more practices to improve waste or pollution management.
B. Number of hosts with production increases over pre-assignment levels.	B. Number of hosts using new or improved planning techniques, program methodologies, and/or management practices, including the use of a business plan or a strategic plan. 1. Belarusian Farmers Union 2. Lesnoy Tsar	B. Number of hosts with new training courses or new subject matter for courses to use with membership or associates.	B. Number of hosts with loan delinquency rate < 10%.	B. Number of hosts adopting one or more practices to improve natural resources management (soil, water, forest, grazing lands, national parkland, etc.)
C. Number of hosts with increased business	C. Number of hosts with increased	C. Number of hosts with improved	C. Number of hosts that provide	

<p>efficiency or resource conservation.</p> <p>1. Lesnoy Tsar</p>	<p>revenue/resources through new grants and/or increased fees.</p> <p>1. Belarusian Farmers' Union</p>	<p>training materials and skills.</p>	<p>improved banking services to the agricultural sector.</p>	
<p>D. Number of hosts receiving increased revenue/resources through increased sales receipts as a result of grantee/volunteer intervention.</p> <p>1. Lesnoy Tsar</p>	<p>D. Number of hosts that have increased their membership as a result of grantee/volunteer interventions.</p> <p>1. Belarusian Farmers Union</p>		<p>D. Number of hosts with an increase in Enterprise Portfolio Value (micro-finance loans)</p>	
<p>E. Number of hosts with increased profits.</p>				

C. Discussion

The Belarusian agricultural sector is still largely controlled by the state. Few state or collective farms have been privatized, and the **state continues to control** these farms by providing all inputs, credit at low interest rates, and marketing outlets. However, the government's own price controls on all staple foods undermine these farms, ensuring that they remain unprofitable, and, thus, unable to repay their credits.

In addition, the Belarusian business climate is dismal. Business regulations change often, and, are frequently retroactive in effect. Private entrepreneurship is discouraged by a ceiling on profits for the provision of goods and services. Land ownership and taxation policies are extremely bureaucratic, and **ownership of agricultural land is illegal**.

Against these obstacles, CNFA has begun to make inroads in training Belarusian farmers how to orient their activities to increase their incomes. In recent years, a number of **private farms have been established** by people with some background in agriculture who have leased land from collective farms. Since this land is usually under-utilized, poor quality, distantly located, fragmented, and without access roads, employees of *kolkhozes* and *sovkhozes* are reluctant to start this form of farming. CNFA has identified those farmers who are taking the initiative to begin private farming and has begun to work with them. By **teaching Western farming techniques** (supporting USAID indicator table VI: A; number of hosts with new or improved planning techniques, program methodologies, and/or management practices), CNFA AVP volunteers are helping these farms boost the quantity and quality of their production (USAID indicator table V: B), while training in financial management and strategic planning allows these farms to work more efficiently (USAID indicator table V: C) and intelligently to maximize their profit potential.

The lack of political reform in Belarus also has slowed the establishment of a democratic foundation for Belarusian society. CNFA is working to teach Belarusian farmers and agribusinesses about the benefits of democratic associations. With the **Belarusian Farmers**

Union (BFU), CNFA has begun to teach Belarusian farmers how to run a non-governmental, member-driven organization, supporting USAID indicator table VI: A). Progress has been slow, with farmers not yet fully grasping the **rights and responsibilities of being a member** of the association, and the association leadership still allowing farmers to remain a member without paying their dues. Development of association services, which will show farmers the benefits of association membership, is a pressing need, as is dues collection. The creation of a sustainable association that provides beneficial services to its members is the goal of this training. Already, the BFU has increased its membership (USAID indicator table V: D) and its revenue from dues collection (USAID indicator table V: C; number of hosts with increases revenue through fees). Thus far, CNFA has measured an improvement in the lives of 51 people via training received by this project.

CNFA is also supporting **Belarusian agribusinesses** that are profit-motivated. CNFA is working with several agribusinesses that have demonstrated their willingness to learn and ability to implement market economic principles. With Lesnoy Tsar, CNFA is helping the agribusiness improve its ability to **generate profits by training management** in financial management and marketing. As a result of the first assignment with this project, CNFA already has measured a large, direct improvement in the lives of the two owners of the agribusiness. The development and implementation of marketing and business plans (indicator table VI: A), combined with sound financial record keeping and accounting, will allow Belarusian agribusinesses to increase sales, reduce operating costs, and maximize their profits, helping CNFA to demonstrate impact under a number of USAID indicator tables.

4. Sub-Contractor Activities

There are no sub-contractor activities in Belarus.

V. ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

Ukraine: Agriculture reform in Ukraine has been marked by poor performance, but progress is occurring and the outlook for this year is a marked increase over the previous year for agricultural output. Private farmers still struggle with adequate access to credit, input supplies and cash markets. Land reform is central to this problem. Without a clear land code and the rights that go with it, farmers will be reluctant, and at times not able, to react to true market conditions. Only when private individuals have true ownership of land will reform develop quickly.

Along with this will be the increased importance of education and training. Once private farmers have a vested ownership in land, they will also have increased their risk of financial failure if they are not capable of making sound business decisions. The issue is how the government proceeds on land reform, and specifically the issuing of land titles, to the millions of private farmers and household plot owners in Ukraine.

The macro-economic situation in Ukraine did not, and does not, facilitate the progress of the program. Land privatization has often been more a matter of form than substance. The GOU's

frequent lack of compliance with multilateral and bilateral agency agreements challenges the possibility of rapid steps towards the improvement of small private farms and farm enterprises.

Because of a fragile economy, local currency has often lost value in terms of Western 'hard currencies'. Devaluation & inflation contribute to very high interest rates, very high collateral requirements, and an aversion to agricultural loans in favor of high turnover, high volume lending to traders and merchants.

The historic lack of access to credit by ordinary business people has led to a mutual distrust between potential borrowers and potential lenders. Borrowers assume that the system is designed to exclude them, and the loan officers in banks assume that borrowers want nothing more than to default on a loan.

Another issue concerns the role of credit unions in the financing of agricultural producers and entrepreneurs. While the program cannot unilaterally veto host organization strategies, we must develop a clear means of reporting basic international (and Ukrainian) guidelines for viable credit unions.

Moldova: Despite some major situational advantages, it is not reasonable to depict the Moldovan context as easy. Fundamentally, Moldova faces many of the same problems as Ukraine concerning the inability of the so-called free market to operate as macroeconomists might wish. While the economic environment is encouraging, it is worth noting some of the issues that still present a challenge to our program.

The mass of farmers still face an environment where barter is more common than cash transactions, thus limiting access to inputs, equipment/tools, and markets very far beyond the farm gate. Banks are still leery of lending to farmers and rural entrepreneurs without what can only kindly be called excessive collateral requirements.

Belarus: When comparing agriculture reform in Belarus to Ukraine and Moldova, Belarus lags behind both countries. Private farmers have not emerged as predominately as private farmers have in Ukraine. The government still subsidizes and controls agriculture and the reform of old collective enterprises is slow to develop.

VI. ADMINISTRATION, PERSONNEL, AND FINANCIAL

CNFA recently hired a third - Washington, DC-based, - volunteer recruiter position for the West NIS AVP Program. CNFA-Belarus is planning to hire a part-time local staff person to assist in office administrative duties.

VII. LESSONS LEARNED

It is important to maintain robust capacity for recruiting volunteers. CNFA's effort to operate this program with a minimum of recruiters in Washington, DC resulted in failure to meet program objectives when recruiting was disrupted by unanticipated staff turnover.

It may not be possible to recruit volunteers with qualifications to fill all assignments conceived by hosts and field offices. CNFA has experienced two related problems over the past two years:

- Hosts seek training on quite specialized topics on which the pool of experts, and hence prospects for recruiting volunteers, is quite small.
- CNFA undertakes projects (focusing, for example, on farm credit) that require a large number of volunteers in fields for which the pool of experts, while significant, is limited enough that generating the numbers of volunteers required is quite difficult.

CNFA will in future maintain close consultation between its recruiters and field staff about recruiting difficulties and perhaps on occasion forego certain assignments that are too difficult to fill.

Greater involvement of local CNFA staff in volunteer assignments results in greater impact. Taking advantage of Moldova's small size, CNFA Moldova staff in FY01 expanded their efforts to maintain close ongoing contact with project host organizations. Such contact was enormously helpful in improving host preparation for and hosting of volunteers, and promoting host implementation of host recommendations. CNFA Moldova will expand this effort further in FY02. CNFA Moldova staff will spend even more time on site both during and after volunteer assignments, emphasizing understanding and implementation of volunteer recommendations. New projects will require hosts to be more proactive in their own development and CNFA will select hosts who demonstrate commitment to investing time and capital in themselves.

Providing informational resources and local language training materials for volunteer use improves volunteer impact. CNFA volunteers in Moldova are expressing appreciation frequently for CNFA's steadily expanding reference and training materials and crediting them with contributing significantly to the success of their assignments.

VIII. VOLUNTEER STATISTICS

Volunteer	Home State	Number of Previous Assignments on Project	Volunteer's Valuation of Time Donated
Ukraine			
Leslie Price	MS	0	1923.43
James Baarda	DC	0	3000.00
Jack Kennedy	IA	1	3928.57
Everil Quist	WI	1	3075.00
Joe Gergela	NY	0	7000.00
Philip Colgan	WA	0	6600.00
Robert Beard	FL	0	11,035.71
Boyd Wolff	PA	2	6782.14
Sean Shinnors	NY	0	1317.86
Edwin Holcombe	TN	0	2003.57
Eleanor Verwers	IA	0	4221.43
Sheryl Seib	IN	0	1100.00
Ann Harman	VA	1	9803.57

Bob Cole	NC	1	11928.57
John Scott	PA	1	3144.64
Ray Ropp	IL	0	2683.93
Charles McCay	ND	0	6010.71
Philip Colgan	WA	1	6600.00
Philip Colgan	WA	2	6600.00
Andrew Martin	PA	0	3080.00
Clair Hicks	KY	0	4000.00
Rich Eshleman	OH	0	4800.00
Curtis Swift	CO	0	4714.29
Stan McKee	PA	1	4885.71
Tony Kutter	NY	0	5100.00
Todd Mason	VA	0	18241.29
Robert Hiatt	AL	0	3114.29
Hugh Moore	IN	0	8514.29
Dale Morse	NY	1	4419.64
Don Hand	IL	0	1759.82
Larry Stratton	PA	0	4370.00
Frank Townsend	SC	0	8700.00
Thomas Molnar	NY	0	12357.14
Jerry Warren	MO	0	1925.00
TOTAL: 34			188,713.61
Moldova			
Pat McAllister	OR	0	6010.72
Phil Hufferd	IA	0	5800.00
Jerry Warren	IL	1	2630.36
Loren Wallace	UT	0	2971.43
Cesar Flores	CO	1	2100.00
Peter McNeill	KY	1	5250.00
Bob Wells	NC	1	3307.14
Jim Nelson	IA	1	8085.00
Phil Hufferd	IA	1	9196.43
James Caudill	NC	0	3133.93
John Caldeira	TX	0	10200.00
Merle Anderson	IA	0	9571.43
Jack Kennedy	IA	1	3600.00
John Richardson	NC	0	5400.00
George Young	AL	0	7228.57
Boyd Wolff	PA	1	7044.64
Brent Van Dyke	NM	0	6003.00
Dee Shore	NC	0	6525.00
Richard Lettner	WI	0	5710.71
Roger Schmeising	MN	1	8200.00
Clyde Evans	AL	0	8050.00
Paula Higgins	KY	0	6150.00
Susan Schoenian	MD	0	2018.75
Thomas Kriegl	WI	0	5121.43
Cesar Flores	CO	2	2100.00
Jeff Patton	PA	0	4015.00
TOTAL: 26			145,423.54
Belarus			

Stanley Freedman	MD	0	13098.21
Jean New	AR	0	2260.71
William Grolli	NY	0	5500.00
Douglas Gilbert	PA	0	1864.29
Joel Anderson	MD	0	8303.57
Joel Anderson	MD	1	8303.57
Loren Nelson	WY	0	6000.00
Ray Jilek	ND	0	9042.86
TOTAL: 8			54,373.21
TOTAL: 66			388,510.35

	Total Volunteers	Repeat Volunteers	First Time Volunteers	Women
Moldova	26	10	16	3
Ukraine	34	13	21	3
Belarus	8	1	7	1
Total	68	24	44	7

IX. PUBLIC OUTREACH

CNFA volunteers are active in a wide array of public outreach activities that not only promote the AVP program, but also USAID's funding of such programs. CNFA has confirmed that, during FY01, NIS volunteers spoke at 79 club/association meetings, wrote and/or were the subjects of 22 news articles (**samples in appendix**), and were featured in 2 radio shows. The predominance of meetings as an outreach activity is due largely to both the volunteers pre-existing memberships in community groups, and an awareness in local communities that one of their fellow citizens is participating in an international volunteer program. Meetings also are best suited for face-to-face interaction with the audience, providing the audience with personal exposure to a participant in a U.S. foreign aid program. Overall, NIS volunteers reached an audience of 1129 in these meetings.

Some particularly interesting outreach activities that CNFA volunteers have been involved with:

- At the 2001 Annual Eastern Apiculture Society of North America meeting this past August, Ukraine volunteer Bob Cole made a speech entitled "Honey Bees in Developing Nations" to an audience of about 600, in which he spoke in depth about his experience as a CNFA volunteer. Coincidentally, a fellow Ukraine volunteer Ann Harman, who also drew on her experience with CNFA and USAID for her commentary, chaired the panel on which Mr. Cole spoke.
- Moldova program volunteer Orville Goodenough had his article, entitled "Dairy farming in Moldova", published this September in the *Illinois Holstein Herald*. In it he wrote about his experience with CNFA, USAID's role in this foreign assistance program, and the need for experienced American farmers to participate as volunteers.