

# MID-TERM REVIEW

*Report of the team of independent  
Consultants conducting the Review*

## STRENGTHENING OF LIVESTOCK SERVICES AND EXTENSION ACTIVITIES IN LAO PDR [ALA/96/19]

**Final draft report**

*From October 17 to December 4*

**Guy FREELAND (CIRAD-EMVT)  
Jean-François RENARD (CIRAD-EMVT)  
Patrick FUSILIER (NRI)**

Rapport N° 02-002



CIRAD-EMVT  
Département Elevage et Médecine Vétérinaire  
du CIRAD  
Campus International de Baillarguet  
TA 30/B  
34398 Montpellier Cedex 5  
FRANCE

**Novembre 2001**

**CIRAD-Dist**  
UNITÉ BIBLIOTHÈQUE  
Baillarguet



CIRAD-EMVT 2001

Tous droits de traduction, de reproduction par tous procédés,  
de diffusion et de cession réservés pour tous pays.

**AUTEURS :** Guy FREELAND  
Jean-François RENARD  
Patrick FUSILIER

**ACCES AU DOCUMENT :**  
Propriété du gouvernement laotien

**ACCES A LA REFERENCE  
DU DOCUMENT :** libre

**ORGANISME AUTEUR :** Consortium NRI (leader), KIT, CIRAD, IAO, IAC, IPP

**ETUDE FINANCEE PAR :** Union Européenne-EUROPAID, framework contract lot 1

**REFERENCE :** NRI n° 2198 et 2199 du 10/10/01  
(N° et date du contrat)

**AU PROFIT DE :** Consortium framework contract lot 1 sous traité NRI International  
(bénéficiaire du contrat)

**TITRE :** "Mid term review of the strengthening of livestock services and extension activities project in Lao-PDR"

**TYPE D'APPROCHE – DATE ET LIEU DE PUBLICATION :**  
(Séminaire, assistance technique à long terme...)  
Evaluation à mi-parcours d'un projet, Bruxelles, 16/12/01

**PAYS OU REGIONS CONCERNES :** Laos

**MOTS-CLES :** Productions animales, vulgarisation, services aux éleveurs, renforcement institutionnel.

**RESUME :**

Le projet a, à ce stade, produit les résultats attendus en adaptant judicieusement ses activités aux changements constatés du cadre institutionnel. Mais, davantage que la vulgarisation de méthodologie ou le renforcement des appuis institutionnels, il s'agit de changer la mentalité des producteurs : depuis un élevage de subsistance ou thésaurisation vers une activité spéculative orientée vers le marché. Cela nécessite un cadre institutionnel mieux adapté, une approche du projet plus proche du terrain, la prolongation et la continuité de l'effort.

# CONTENTS

*Page*

<b><u>CONTENTS</u></b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b><u>DISCLAIMER</u></b> .....	<b>II</b>
<b><u>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</u></b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b><u>INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</u></b> .....	<b>IV</b>
<b><u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u></b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b><u>MAIN REPORT</u></b> .....	<b>1</b>
1. PROJECT PREPARATION AND DESIGN .....	1
1.1. <i>Background of the project</i> .....	1
1.2. <i>Design and relevance of the project</i> .....	2
2. PROGRESS OF IMPLEMENTATION, EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS .....	4
2.1. <i>Overview of project achievements</i> .....	4
2.2. <i>Component 1 : Legislative programme</i> .....	5
2.3. <i>Component 2 : Information systems</i> .....	6
2.4. <i>Component 3 : Laboratories</i> .....	9
2.5. <i>Component 4 : Extension and Field Services</i> .....	12
2.6. <i>Component 5 : Regional and sub-regional co-operation and co-ordination</i> .....	17
2.7. <i>Component 6 : Information and communication</i> .....	17
2.8. <i>Component 7 : Core Programme Management</i> .....	17
3. IMPACT .....	19
4. SUSTAINABILITY .....	20
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	23
<b><u>ANNEXES</u></b> .....	<b>25</b>
1. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE MTRM.....	25
2. EVALUATORS .....	30
3. TIMING OF THE MTRM.....	33
4. PERSONS MET .....	37
5. LITERATURE AND DOCUMENTATION CONSULTED.....	39
6. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK .....	41
7. DAC SUMMARY .....	43
8. MONITORING AND EVALUATION .....	45
8.1. <i>Monitoring</i> .....	45
8.2. <i>Animal productivity baseline</i> .....	50
9. DLF AND CENTRES BUDGET .....	51
10. PROJECT FINANCIAL EVOLUTION .....	52
11. DLF STRUCTURE IN 2001 .....	53
12. DLF STRUCURE IN 1998.....	54



### **Disclaimer**

The views and opinions expressed in this report represent the collective view of the team of consultants that participated in the Mid-Term Review Mission; they **do not** necessarily represent the views of the European Union, the Government of LAO PDR or any other organisation.

The members of the Mission are independent consultants, and are not official representatives of the European Union. The opinions presented are their own; the European Union is not committed, either in whole or in part, by the Report's conclusions and recommendations.

## **ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

AFEA:	Agriculture and Forestry Extension Agency (also called NAFES)
AHPM:	Animal Health, Production and Extension Module
AVI:	Australian Volunteers International
AWP:	Annual Work Plan
CIMU:	Computerised Information and Mapping Unit
DAFO:	District Agriculture and Forestry Office
DLFO:	District Livestock and Fisheries Officer
DLF:	Department of Livestock and Fisheries
EC:	European Commission
FA:	Financing Agreement
FAO:	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FLSP:	Forage livestock System Project
GDP:	Gross Domestic Products
LAO PDR:	Lao People's Democratic Republic
LNP:	Luang Namtha Province
LPP:	Luang Prabang Province
MAF:	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
MTRM:	Mid Term Review Mission
NAFES: (see AFEA)	National Agriculture and Forestry Extension Services
NAFRI:	National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute
OWP:	Overall Work Plan
PAFO:	Provincial Agriculture and Forestry Office
PLFO:	Provincial Livestock and Fisheries Officer
PMU:	Project Management Unit
SLSEAP:	Strengthening of Livestock Services and Extension Activities Project (ALA/96/19)
SNV:	Netherlands Development Organisation
SUNV:	Joint Programme by SNV and UNV
TCO:	Technical Co-ordination Office
UNV:	United Nations Volunteers
VVW:	Village Veterinary Worker

## **Introduction and acknowledgements**

### ***Introduction***

The European Union's "Strengthening of Livestock Services and Extension Activities Project" is a programme of development assistance to the Department of Livestock and Fisheries in Laos. Begun in February 1998, it is now half way through its six-year schedule of activities so, in October /November 2001, the European Union fielded a Mission to conduct a Mid-Term Review (MTR). The MTR's objective was to provide an independent assessment for all the stakeholders (GoL, EU, project team) of the Project's achievements to date, together with both positive and negative aspects of its implementation, in order to confirm whether or not the programme should continue in its present form, or if there is a need for a reorientation.

The MTR team consisted of 3 European experts: G.G. Freeland (Senior Veterinary Specialist/ Team Leader), J-F. Renard (Livestock Specialist/Agricultural Economist), and P.L. Fusillier (Institution Development Specialist). The Terms of Reference of the Mission are in Annex 1. The Mission was briefed at the EU Head Quarters in Brussels and at the EU Delegation in Bangkok. The Mission visited Laos from 23<sup>rd</sup> October to 16th November 2001; during this period the team met relevant authorities in Vientiane; had discussions with Laotian and European staff of the SLSEAP, with the Director-General and staff of the Department of Livestock and Fisheries, and with representatives of other departments in the Ministry of Agriculture; and made field visits to the provinces of Luang Prabang, Luang Namtha, Oudomxay, and Sayaboury. In the provinces discussions were held with officials of the provincial and district administrations, naibans (village headmen) and with many farmers. The full itinerary of the mission and the persons met during it are detailed in Annexes 3 and 4.

The Mission presented the first draft of its report for discussion, and subsequent written comment, in a debriefing at the Department of Livestock and Fisheries, on 15<sup>th</sup> November. This meeting was attended by representatives of DLF, CPC, TCO, and the PMU and staff of the SLSEAP project.

The report details the findings and opinions of the Mission. Chapter 1 discusses the project preparation and project design, while chapter 2 focuses on its general progress, efficiency, and effectiveness. In chapters 3 and 4 the Mission comments on the project's impact and the sustainability of the results. In chapter 5 the Missions summarises its conclusions and principal recommendation.

### ***Acknowledgements***

Throughout the course of this Mission the MTRM team has been received in a friendly and courteous manner, and has received great co-operation in the provision of background information and data. We are grateful to all those, from PMU, DLF, MAF, Provincial and District Offices and other Ministries and organisations, who patiently gave of their time, knowledge and experience to assist our better understanding of the various factors and issues involved in the management of the livestock sector in Lao PDR, the changes that are taking place, and the requirements for their improvement.

We also offer a heartfelt thank you to Mrs Khaixham Phanvongsa and Mr Douangchanh Sirivongsa, and others, who have so uncomplainingly acted as interpreters for us.

Finally, we must record our appreciation of the warmth and hospitality with which we have been received by many people, especially the many farmers and local authorities in the Provinces, Districts and Villages, wherever we have met them, throughout our time in Lao PDR. All of them have been very co-operative in showing us around and answering our many questions.



## **Executive Summary**

The three main Agricultural Policy imperatives of Lao PDR are:

- food security - as a key contribution to the reduction of poverty
- reduction and eventual elimination of the 'Slash and Burn' cultivation, - as a key contribution to the sustainability of agriculture, and enhancement of the rural environment
- elimination of poppy plantation

**It is considered that these can only be achieved by lifting people out of subsistence agriculture into more diversified and commercial systems aimed at production for the market place rather than simply for home consumption.**

### **Project Design and Relevance:**

Livestock Production is seen as having a critical role in this process of bringing farmers into the cash economy. Through its discussions and observations, the Mid-Term Review Mission is able to fully concur with this view and to confirm the relevance of the Project's Wider Objective – *"Smallholders financial autonomy and capacity of initiative enhanced by improved income from livestock farming"* – to these policy imperatives. It also agrees the appropriateness of the Project's design - a two pronged approach: institutional strengthening at both central and decentralised levels, focussed mainly on animal health service delivery systems and disease control, coupled with animal production extension activities focussed at grassroots level.

Delivery of the animal health outputs will not only help to secure adequate returns to the investments that must be made into the somewhat more intensive market-oriented systems of animal husbandry that must be adopted but, in the medium term, should also help to secure access to the wider ASEAN market place, to which Lao PDR believes it could competitively and profitably export cattle as the demand for beef rises in these expanding economies.

It should be noted however that, concomitant upon the process of decentralisation of government, the Country has almost completed, a significant restructuring of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries is still on-going. These two processes have led to significant institutional changes and shifts of responsibility and authority; and uncertainties about the final sectorial plan still remain. Furthermore, since Lao PDR is critically short of well-educated and trained manpower, in these processes of restructuring and reorganisation the DLF has lost almost 60% of its manpower to facilitate the creation and strengthening of other Divisions.

### **Project Results**

Despite several months delay in securing the budget for its first year's plan, the Project has largely kept up to its overall plan of progress. This is especially true in respect of its



grassroots level activities but, largely for the reasons given immediately above, the progress in respect of institutional development has been rather patchy.

The Project's visiting Specialist Advisers seem generally to have taken very practical and pragmatic approaches to the tasks and, with one exception, have produced very sound reports with clear advice on the way forward for the units they are assisting, and the Project and DLF have responded accordingly.

## **Component 1: Legislation**

This comprises three sub-components:

- **Upgrading of the new Veterinary Legislation** – progress is being made, but slowly, and the first visit of the Legislation Consultant only began on 13 November 2001;
- **strengthening and equipping of 15 existing and 10 new Check Posts** – no progress at all as yet; the Mission was informed, at its final session, that 5 new livestock movement offices have been constructed, but as part of multi-functional check posts housing personnel from other departments too (e.g.: police, customs, immigration...). As yet, no details of their livestock functions, nor list of equipment required to fulfil them, has been provided to the Project
- **training of Meat Inspectors for urban markets** – no progress

the last sub-component seems to suffer from the complication that operationally it is the responsibility of Provincial Government.

**The MTRM advises urgent action is needed from the DLF to enable the Project to make its proper contribution to these last two sub-components, or else consider dropping them from the Project.**

## **Component 2 : Information Systems**

This component comprises two sub-components:

- (i) Animal Health Information System**
- (ii) Market Monitoring**

- (i) Reasonable progress has been made on the Animal Health Information System, but it is far from perfect. A computer database (LaoBase), adapted to Lao PDR requirements by the Australian ACIAR Epidemiology Project, forms the basis of the system: the SLSEAP has facilitated the training of personnel and computerisation of the Central Information and Mapping Unit (CIMU), and of the DLF laboratories so they can network with it. Standardised reporting formats have been developed, but they are not all yet universally used and reporting from the field is very variable in quality. The turn-around time for reports from the Districts and Provinces seems unduly long and with very little analysis, or even crosschecking of the data received.

Also, it is the intention under the AHPPEM system of participatory extension that the quarterly and half-yearly performance parameters collected from the villages should be

analysed at the time by the DLO with the representative farmers, so that they can immediately recognise trends occurring, identify the possible factors contributing to them and, where appropriate, consider remedial action. This simple on-the-spot participatory analysis does not always seem to occur, and this not only considerably weakens the impact of the AHPM system of participatory extension and development, but also allows some quite incongruous data to be recorded. Were the CIMU stronger, it would surely have picked up and fed back on this.

**The MTRM advises that there is an urgent need to strengthen the manpower resource in CIMU if the system is to realise its real potential as a fast and flexible aid to analysis and planning.**

(ii) The supporting consultancy on this topic did not yield practical recommendations, so the Project has turned to the Crop Division of MAF, which is also developing a marketing monitoring system and has agreed to include livestock and their products in the data collected. In respect of the markets, the controls on trading of livestock and on the retail price of meat are perceived to have two unfortunate side-effects: first they restrict competition and depress the farm-gate price; and secondly they appear contribute to the need to indulge in an unofficial export trade.

**The MTRM urges that, in the interests of the producer, and in the interests of the promotion of production for the market place, the markets in livestock and their products should be completely liberalised.**

### **Component 3 : Laboratories**

- **Vaccine Production Unit**
- **Diagnostic Laboratory**

With the benefit of good advice from their visiting Specialists, good progress has been made in the rehabilitation and strengthening of each of these laboratories, and under a recent rider to the TA contract, the Diagnostic Unit will be further supported in the development of its organisation and management, by the provision of 18 months of resident T.A. Both laboratories however present concerns for their longer-term sustainability – both in respect of financial and manpower resources.

**The MTRM advises that the DLF and Project should begin addressing these issues now and start soon to design an exit strategy that might help to secure their future.**

### **Component 4: Extension and Field Services**

This is perhaps the most impressive of all the components in that, not only has it kept up with or slightly ahead of its schedule to develop relevant, acceptable and effective VVWs, Extension and Credit programmes, but also it has been very sensitive to the institutional, farming, and market constraints surrounding it, and has progressively modified its activities and outputs to better attune to them. This does not mean that it is altogether without



problems; indeed a considerable list of issues to address is detailed in Section 2.5 of this Report.

In the course of its notable progress this component has highlighted the serious weakness of field services at farmer level. This shortage of human resources means that several of the farmers trained, and invested, through credit, with the animal resources to embark upon improved systems of market oriented production, are not getting the level or frequency of support and back-up they need to help them through this first experience of a quite new approach and purpose to animal production. This cannot be allowed to continue: not only is it unfair to the individual but, in a system depending upon the use of model farmers to demonstrate and disseminate its extension messages to a 'risk averse' community, the impact of every failure is several times greater than that of each success.

**The MTRM recommends that the Project should first consolidate its position in LPP and LPN before expanding further therein; then, focussing on a few clusters of villages, it should move slowly but steadily only into two or three more Provinces during the remainder of this phase of the Project.**

**Furthermore, to support these processes, it recommends that the TA presence in the North should be strengthened.**

**Finally, if they are approved by DLF, other projects, NGOs, Volunteers... could also adopt and develop SLSEAP packages and technologies, and facilitate their wider spread.**

Another factor in the field of resources at village level is the status and position of the VVW. There is little point in improving the quality and volume of their training if at the end of it all they are neither properly empowered, rewarded, respected, motivated, protected, or supported in their work.

**The MTRM recommends that the role and position of the VVW - as a local provider of simple therapeutic, prophylactic and disease control services, operating from the private sector - should be accorded proper status and recognition of his/her skills by appropriate examination and registration. Also that, until such time as alternative sources are developed, it should be an obligation of the District Livestock Office to support and, on a full cost-recovery basis, supply the VVWs in their work.**

### **Principal Recommendation:**

Although it is not without its institutional and operational problems and uncertainties, the MTRM is impressed with the progress, relevance, and potential impact of the Project. However, recognising that the processes the Project is assisting the DLF, PAFO and DAFO to establish will be neither completed nor sustainable from local resources by the year 2004, the MTRM recommends:

**Consideration should begin now to be given to the need for a second phase of this Project, extending to 2009/10; and to how best this may be achieved seamlessly, without any gap in time or resources occurring between the end of one Phase and the start of the next. The networking of extension activities, methodologies, and technologies should become a major thrust of the next Phase of the Project.**



# **MAIN REPORT**

## **1. Project preparation and design**

### **1.1. Background of the project**

Following a preliminary mission of the EC headquarters (December 95), a project preparation mission was fielded in Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR) in May 96. Its recommendations were translated into a Financing Agreement (FA) concluded between the European Commission (EC) and the Government of Lao PDR in October 97. The executing agency is the Department of Livestock and Fisheries (DLF) of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF). The Project, called "Strengthening of Livestock Services and Extension Activities Project" (SLSEAP), started 1 February 98 and the initial end-date was to be 31 January 04. The Overall Work Plan (OWP) and the Annual Work Plan (AWP) 1 were approved in July 98 but the AWP1 funding resources were delayed till February 99.

The SLSEAP overall objective is *'to enhance smallholders' financial autonomy and capacity of initiative by improving income from livestock rearing'*. The SLSEAP purpose is both to strengthen the DLF services at all levels nation-wide and to develop extension activities, through inputs and training, for a pre-existing network of around 6000 Village Veterinary Workers (VW) (see logical framework in appendix 6). These extension activities were supposed to be concentrated in the Luang Prabang Province (LPP) and Luang Namtha Province (LNP) during the first 3 years before being extended to the neighbouring provinces during the Years 4 to 6 (Y 4-6).

By the end of 1999, some aspects of the SLSEAP appeared inappropriate or too ambitious: due partly to a rather conservative approach of DLF, but also to the severe shortage of properly trained and professionally skilled manpower. Some re-orientations were then lengthily debated and finally approved at the end of 2000, principally:

- The concentration of the vaccine institute activities and the re-allocation of part of its equipment budget line into consumables and quality control;
- The reorientation of the revolving fund (initially oriented toward a supply unit for vaccine and drugs linked to the vaccine institute) towards producers and private operators;
- A higher emphasis on extension activities, including direct activities with farmers and village model farms, to compensate for the fact that many among the VWs were neither sufficiently skilled nor motivated to become effective extension agents themselves;
- The need to increase the strengthening of the diagnostic laboratory.

Simultaneously, the logical framework was consequently revisited in November 2000, but only in terms of indicators or hypothesis. These re-orientations were translated by an addendum to FA signed in August 01 but not yet applied in a rider to the Technical Assistance (TA) contract. Moreover, this addendum postpones the SLSEAP expiry date to the 30 October 2005 and the financing commitment validity until 30 April 2006; but no additional funding provision has been made and no change in the activities time schedule has been planned. There is some confusion now, in the minds of the project management, as to exactly when the Project does officially end, and whether or not it can apply to extend the life of its present phase to fill the extra few months apparently offered in the rider: **E.C. Brussels should clarify this situation to the Project as soon as possible.**



## 1.2. Design and relevance of the project

The improvement of income derived from livestock was, in 1996, perceived as a good means of enhancing the rural smallholders' overall income and security because livestock represented 39 % of the agricultural GDP. Recent data (agricultural census 98/99) confirm the relevance of this approach: 90 % of the population in the provinces are farmers, 48 % have buffaloes, 31 % cattle, 49 % pigs and 73 % poultry. Moreover, 35.5 % of the agricultural incomes result from livestock, making it the principal source of agricultural smallholders' incomes, a long way ahead of fruits and vegetables (13.8 %) and trice (12.8 %). In target areas for the extension activities, livestock still accounts for 31.1 % of the agricultural incomes in LPP and as much as 46.6% in LNP. In one village in Sayaboury Province, the average monthly revenue per family was only 100,000 kips (\$10.5). Several farmers went to the training organised by the project. Since their training these farmers training have 70% of their revenue generated by their crops and 30% generated by their animals; but the percentage of their revenue generated by the animals is still increasing. In terms of gender approach, livestock is also appropriate because pigs and poultry are often managed by women who benefit directly from their production and trade. Finally, livestock are of still greater importance to those who must farm in the hills rather than those who farm on the plains or in valley bottoms.

Annual meat consumption in Lao PDR was estimated by the preparation study to be 38.4 kg carcass and 7.2 kg fish per capita in 1996. In 2000, the DLF figures show a per capita annual meat consumption of around 20 kg carcass and 14.2 kg fish. These figures are considerably greater than the annual meat consumption (around 10 to 12 kg) in numerous developing countries, and well over the minimum dietary requirement for animal protein (7.3 kg of animal protein per capita per year). Despite important variations and perhaps some local problems in remote areas, the visited populations didn't appear to the MTRM under the pressure of any major animal protein deficit: the energetic supply (rice self-sufficiency) seems to be a more critical issue for the villagers. Nevertheless, meat consumption is undoubtedly skewed and demand still seems not to be saturated. It is therefore quite reasonable to suppose that any increase in livestock production could be translated into sales and thus into greater incomes. Also, although Lao PDR would already seem to export between 18 (preparation study) and 60 (SLSEAP market monitoring support mission) millions US\$ per year of meat and live animals, here too demand is probably still growing as the economies and populations of neighbouring countries continue to expand – unfortunately, the unofficial character of much of this trade makes it difficult to monitor.

Seeking to increase livestock productivity is also a relevant approach because the production parameters are confirmed as being very weak (see appendix 7). The reduction of losses through improvement of animal health is a first priority, but then still greater gains can be made through appropriate improvements and innovations in the systems of animal husbandry and feeding. The SLSEAP's two-pronged approach, through extension activities supported on a regional scale and the public services strengthening nation-wide, remains relevant for these purposes. The focus of extension activities in the Northern provinces also remains appropriate and desirable: particularly because of the specific requirements of this cattle and buffalo exporting area, but also because of the limitations of resources and logistic difficulties which require the Project to utilise support from other existing structures, such as the other EC projects.



However, three elements have changed since (or were not taken into account during) the SLSEAP preparation and justify an adaptation in the project design:

1. At the grassroots level, Laotian rural economy is based first on subsistence, home-consumption, and food security. This is the case for 94 % of farms (census 98/99). In this situation, the principal, almost exclusive, purpose of livestock still remains as a means of saving (and often the only means of saving) shielded from inflation, and sales are limited to the coverage of exceptional financial necessities (medical crises, schooling, taxes, weddings, buildings, seasonal shortages of food...). The producers' strategy is firstly driven by the need for self-sufficiency in rice, and this does not allow them to dedicate too many extra human, material, and financial resources to a more intensive system of livestock husbandry. As in all these agriculture systems, the smallholders operate mainly at the level of lowest risk rather than at the highest profit. In a case of rumours of a disease outbreak for example, Laotian livestock owners are still used to sell their pigs or poultry as quickly as possible to protect the saved wealth ... and to restart their livestock production when the disease risk is over. It is thus a complete change of mental attitudes and practices, from self-sufficiency agriculture towards a speculative commercial approach, which has to be stimulated and supported by the SLSEAP. These attitudinal changes require more time than initially planned; they also demand a political and institutional framework favourable to such a change, which did not exist at the time of project preparation. It means also that the SLSEAP should start its activities to reach the expected impact only with those smallholders ready for such a turn-about, and not through an indiscriminating global approach to the rural people as originally planned. These smallholders are still a small minority at the moment, which the SLSEAP will aim to enlarge progressively from their example.
2. National policies and institutional framework have been profoundly modified since the SLSEAP design. From a planned and controlled economic system, the Lao PDR is now moving gradually into a market-oriented economy: this change makes the context more favourable to the SLSEAP rationale. Important steps have already been taken and the DLF approach, initially rather conservative, has evolved significantly. Important steps still remain to be taken however, because the policy of supplying the urban consumers at favourably controlled prices still dominates over consideration of the production risks, costs, and income needs of the agricultural smallholders. Also, decentralisation has been implemented and the local PAFO and DAFO priorities are sometimes different (fight against slash and burn, eliminate poppy cultivation...) to those of the national livestock development policies, as defined for the SLSEAP at the DLF level. Last but not least, in the process of this restructuring of MAF, the DLF, the institution which the SLSEAP is supposed to strengthen, has lost a lot of its human resources and much of its direct authority and impact in the field: many of its best staff have been moved to new independent divisions, the NAFRI at first then the NAFES recently. Now, extension activities are theoretically under the responsibility of the NAFES instead of the DLF. The DLF staff decreased approximately from 143 persons in 1998 (at the beginning of SLSEAP) to 60 during the MTRM (see Annexes 11 and 12).
3. The VVWs network, which in the original project design was the only route envisaged for developing contact with the livestock owners, was found to be much weaker in quality, number and especially motivation than foreseen. It is clearly insufficient for the tasks



intended for the extension and animal health component. The situation is not dissimilar in respect of a number of the PAFO and DAFO staff, too.

As mentioned here above (§ 1.1.), the SLSEAP design has already been significantly adapted towards these different and changing circumstances'. However, **further changes of policies (progressive market liberalisation, improved recognition of the role of VVWs in the private sector...) and clarification at institutional level (linkages between DLF and NAFES, sustainability of vaccine institute...) still remain necessary, at least to merit and justify a second and indispensable phase of the project.**

## **2. Progress of implementation, efficiency and effectiveness**

### **2.1. Overview of project achievements**

Despite the need indicated above to re-orientate some of its activities, and in spite of several months of delay at the start of the Project in providing it with its funds for Year 1, the Project is up with or ahead of its schedule in most of its Components.

The major exception to this is Component 1, Legislation, in which there has been virtually no action on Meat Inspection training, nor on providing equipment for the Livestock Check Posts sited on the major trade routes within and at the borders of the Country. A major contributory factor to this delay is, in all probability, the on-going process of decentralisation of Government which is causing a considerable change and redefinition of responsibilities at Central, Provincial, and District levels, coupled with the transfer of nearly 60% of the DLF staff to other Divisions, Departments, and Administrations. Although the DLF retains a 'technical' responsibility for these two functions (Check Posts, and Meat Inspection), their operation is but one of many costs and responsibilities that must be borne by the Provinces: **the DLF must use such authority and influence as it has over the Provincial Governments to persuade them to place these activities higher in their list of priorities, or drop them altogether from the list of Project Activities and Outputs.**

These problems of redefined responsibilities and decentralisation of authority have repercussions in other components of the Project too - both in their development under the assistance of the Project, and for their longer-term operation and sustainability: the position of the programmes to improve Pig and Poultry Production which has to be moved to the NAFES is one possible example.

There is also some delay in the finalisation and passage of the Legislation itself.

There are a few, but relatively minor, delays in some of the other Components.

The visiting Consultants seem generally to have taken very practical approaches to their assignments and, with one exception, produced clear sets of appropriate recommendations for the units/sections they are assisting. In the main, these recommendations have been well accepted and acted upon by the Project and the Department. Also, the DLF, and the various sections involved in the project, do seem to be conscious of the need to keep to a minimum the burden of operational costs upon the Public purse. To this end, they are responding, albeit



cautiously, to advice about focussing only upon priorities; seeking means of recovering costs; and making distinction, or balanced judgements tempered by social and political concerns, on which (or what proportion of) costs and charges should rightly fall to the public or the private sector purse. There is still some way to go, however, for the Country as a whole, before the concepts and mechanisms of a liberalised economy with a completely open and competitive market place are fully achieved; and the hands-off role of Government, in monitoring and facilitating rather than controlling its operation, is fully accepted. The Project's approach and outputs must live with this reality but still seek to assist the transition.

These first three years of the Project have however been dominated by the necessary processes of familiarisation, studies, planning, programme development, training, rehabilitation, and provision of equipment. Moreover, the redefinition of the extension activities (§ 1.1. and 1.2.) has delayed the full emphasis of this component which has actually started only a couple of months ago within its new approach. It is too early to make any definitive judgement on the developmental effectiveness of the Project's activities and outputs, but they seem to be sound and appropriate to the needs of the stakeholders and, thus far, seem to have been accepted with enthusiasm by their targeted beneficiaries.

The Project should be able to complete all its prescribed activities so long as it continues to get appropriate support from DLF and the Provincial administrations. However, the on-going restructuring process is undoubtedly causing some uncertainties as to who quite is, or will be, responsible for what; and this uncertainty rubs off onto the Project, as it attempts to determine quite with whom it must align itself in the pursuit of the sustainable development and transfer of each of its outputs. It is hoped that the final organisational plan of the restructured DLF will very soon be decided, and that it and the Provinces can begin to refine their new responsibilities and relationships to their mutual advantage and to the greater benefit of the livestock sector and the Country.

## **2.2. Component 1 : Legislative programme**

In this component 1:

- The Project will assist the Government of Lao PDR in upgrading its new national veterinary legislation;
- It will strengthen existing checks post for the control of animals and animal products movements, and set up 10 new ones;
- It will upgrade skills for meat inspection.

### ***2.2.1. Legislative programme***

The Project organised two workshops, the first in January 2000, and the second in October 2001. The document on the Provisory Legislation and the technical document by the DLF on "Livestock Management Regulation" have been printed by the project and distributed nationwide in January 2001 to be tested in the provinces. Their translation was made.

Until 1995 each province had its own veterinary legislation. The expected output from this legislative programme will be that the existing ministerial decree will become a law to be implemented in all the provinces.



The Technical Division is getting the feedback from the provincial officers who were attending the last workshop. The deadline was 31 October but, one week before the deadline, they had received comments from only three out of the eighteen provinces in the country.

A veterinary legislation specialist will review the status and enactment of the Laotian veterinary legislation. This two-month assignment will commence in November 2001.

The training on legislation for veterinary officers has not started yet.

### ***2.2.2. Check posts***

In the Country they already have fifteen check posts. During the lifetime of the current EU Livestock Project the DLF will construct ten more check posts. In the framework of this project the financial contribution from the Government of 75,000 EURO will be used to build the new check posts.

The Government is planning to build new check posts of a style whereby all the relevant departments will share the same building (police, customs, agriculture, trade, etc.). Provincial Livestock and Fisheries Officers, who will be responsible for the control of import and export animals and animal products, will staff the Livestock offices of these check posts. It was mentioned, during the Review Mission's debriefing in Vientiane that the Government of Lao PDR had built five international border posts in 2001: Vientiane International Airport, Lao Thai Friendship Bridge (Vientiane municipality), Namphao (Khamkeut, Borikhamxay), Xepon (Savannakhet), Xongmek (Champassak). The Government of Lao PDR would start the construction in November 2001 of another check post in Nateui (Luang Namtha).

This component involves the financial contribution of the Government for the project budget and seems to have some difficulties to be fulfilled. In the National Animal Health Centre budget for 2001-2002, no budget is planned for the check posts. It was also mentioned during the debriefing that the Department of Livestock and Fisheries will provide, during the first quarter of 2002, financial statements for the construction of these new check posts, and make proposals to the Project for the list of equipment the check posts will need.

### ***2.2.3. Meat inspection***

Nothing has been achieved up to now. The DLF is requested to exert more pressure upon the provinces and municipalities to nominate suitable candidates for training. Alternatively, it might wish to suggest that this sub-component be dropped from the schedule.

## **2.3. Component 2 : Information systems**

### ***2.3.1. Animal Health Information System***

The project has assisted the DLF in computerising its laboratories and some of its offices and, to enhance disease reporting and the rapid analysis of developments and trends in both health and production parameters, has assisted in the establishment of a Central Information and Mapping Unit (CIMU) in DLF Headquarters. This unit has "Arcview" as its mapping software, and uses a modification of 'Epi info', which they have named LaoBase, (which was



designed specially for them by the Australian Epidemiology project that was monitoring FMD and CSF occurrence in Laos) for their data storage and analysis.

The main databases held on their network cover:

- AHPM;
- Disease Outbreaks;
- Monitoring of Pig and Poultry schemes.

For use with these they have designed standard reporting forms, and having taken training sessions to all Provinces on how to complete these forms, they are now generally accepted and used (though not necessarily used well), for monitoring and reporting on these items. Unfortunately, it would appear that routine reporting of non-epidemic diseases still does not occur in all Districts, so it is only a very patchy picture that is being built up on this basis.

On the other hand the use of the new forms for reporting outbreaks of potentially epidemic disease does seem to be going ahead properly, as does the reporting of the active and passive surveillance sampling being conducted around the Country.

These computerised database systems are very powerful tools with potential to provide rapid and accurate information, analysis, trends and comparisons of any data sets properly collected and stored; and then to place them on maps too. They are however, only as good as the data that are put in and the operators who process, extract, and interpret them. Successful management of such databases is a skilled job and it is apparent that neither staff collecting data in the field, nor those managing it in CIMU, have yet fully acquired the skills and knowledge required to make it an effective and useful tool for informing planners and decision makers at all levels - from Villages to the Ministry. **The DLF must ensure that the CIMU office is given an adequate complement of properly trained staff.** Without staff fully conversant with the systems involved, computerised analyses and databases can be virtually worthless and sometimes very misleading.

### ***2.3.2. Market monitoring***

The project had to carry out a basic study on livestock products marketing and to set up a market monitoring system in order to strengthen the DLF Planning tools. The study, made through some supporting consultancy missions, allowed the marketing channel description, even if some practical information, notably the fluxes, don't appear so documented as desirable. It insisted on opportunities for a more productive sectorial approach.

The supporting consultancy missions seem to have been rather weak and missing the point and, as a result, did not make suitable recommendations on how to set up an appropriate market monitoring system for the DLF as expected. The SLSEAP therefore sensibly turned to the crop division of the MAF which is also establishing a market monitoring system in 10 provinces, relied upon by provincial and district home trade services. The crop division benefits from the support of the FAO and both agreed 23 February 2001 to include live animals also. The crop division should however to benefit from the support of a DLF staff, who has not yet been appointed, and from a local consultancy funded by the SLSEAP which has not been fully achieved yet. The work began thus in February 01 and should end in July

02 by supplying weekly key market statements with prices and quantities. For the live animals, forms have already been prepared by the crop division and are under testing.

However, meat prices are fixed at retail level, regulated by Provinces - at different rates from one to another - through the traders and/or butchers. The objective of this regulation seems intended to ensure meat supply in quantities and at prices compatible with the weak salary level of the urban people within the Provincial towns and cities. The MTRM, however, has seen also (see § 2.5.) the non-stimulating effect for the productive sector of such a trade-frame, and emphasises the importance of trade freedom for livestock-owners if they are to be stimulated to risk and invest more in production for the market-place. Actually, in spite of the transport costs, inter-province controlled-price differentials are such as to justify the traders buying in one Province and selling in another, or even to a neighbouring Country. The SLSEAP study underlined the importance of trade not being restrained by price controls. On the contrary, for the local markets, the traders buy at a farm-gate price roughly equivalent to the fixed retail price at which they must sell. The MTRM was told on several occasions that, despite a significant drop in official exports of live animals, there is still a large volume of unofficial movement of animals across national and provincial borders. It was also intimated that it was the same set of 'official' traders that were involved. All this leads the MTRM to suspect that in numerous cases the traders, by honouring their obligation to supply meat within their Province at the fixed price, "buy" the right to sell live animals outside without restriction. Consequently, the decentralised services are going to be in the paradoxical situation to provide both fixed retail price control and, at the same time, report on farm-gate prices variations, which are variable mainly because of their connection to the unrecorded trade.

However, even if farm-gate prices can be monitored the quantities traded will remain, in this context, always very difficult to estimate. In this respect therefore, in terms of effectiveness, the market monitoring will never be able to fully perform for the DLF its role as an economic planning tool.

**Thus, the MTRM recommends to the SLSEAP and to the DLF to make effective use of the crop division initiative** but this activity will have full effectiveness and impact only once the meat market is totally liberalised and transparent.

### ***2.3.3. Documentation centre***

The Documentation Centre has been set up as planned and is correctly provided on a regular basis in data and documentation. The weakness in qualified human resources within DLF still jeopardises the effectiveness of the Centre through a low level of use and consultation. However, the DLF strengthening should progressively improve the use of the Centre and the MTRM strongly advice SLSEAP and DLF to pursue this activity.



## 2.4. Component 3 : Laboratories

### 2.4.1. Vaccine Unit

Founded in 1979, and supported with FAO/UNDP assistance until 1995, there must have been some considerable debate of the 'pro's and 'con's of including rehabilitation of the Vaccine Production Laboratory in the Project. It is only a small unit, catering for an even smaller market, and as such cannot even fully utilise its present capacity – still less enjoy any economies of scale. **Such a unit can never be fully cost efficient nor economically competitive with importable products.** As such, it can only be justified on the grounds that, in the interests of disease control and security, the Country must have guaranteed and timely access to its critical needs for vaccines of certain type, quality, and efficacy.

The essence of this facility therefore must be a robust dependability, achieved using the simplest of suitable techniques and equipment so that staff training, servicing, and maintenance of equipment, and trouble-shooting can, as far as possible, all be catered for in-house. At the same time it must be very cost conscious, cutting out production of high cost/low-volume vaccines, carefully calculating its **full** annual costs of production and accurately apportioning them to the respective vaccines produced, so that each can be accurately priced. It must then seek to optimise its production schedules to as few runs as can be safely and economically stored without risk to efficacy, as this at least can reduce some of the production, quality control, and administration costs incurred in the process. It must also institute, and vigorously implement, systems of cost recovery. All this will help to reduce the size of its burden upon the public, and make it easier therefore for the Government to budget year after year for its operational support. In the National Animal Health Centre budget for 2001-2002, no budget is planned for the Vaccine Institute. The Vaccine Institute will have a hard time to generate enough revenues to cover its operating cost and pay half of its staff. The other half are civil servants.

The importance of this is borne witness by the catastrophic number of small Vaccine Units around the world which, because of chronic under-funding, lie idle or, worse still, continue to struggle against unfair odds and produce batches of sub-standard – sometimes positively dangerous – vaccines, which are of advantage to no-one.

In all these respects the Laboratory seems to have been very well advised by the Project's visiting short-term specialist. The equipment recommended has, with two exceptions, all been purchased, installed and commissioned – the exceptions being a freeze-dryer, which has finally been delivered but still awaits commissioning, and a 30-litre fermenter that has yet to reach Laos. The buildings have been rehabilitated and, where appropriate, refitted with benching, sinks and cupboards, and the electrical wiring completely replaced. The various activities involved in Quality Control have all been brought together into one section of the building, which is physically separated from the production units. Staff numbers have been lowered to 24, whereas previously they exceeded 50, and the various members have been sent to appropriate short-course training arranged in neighbouring countries.

It is intended that the Specialist will give on-the-job training during the course of his second visit which, unfortunately, has had to be delayed pending the arrival and commissioning of the last pieces of equipment. Dr Sithong has identified a few extra pieces of equipment (such as a water purifier, air-compressor, capping machine, plastic bottle maker...) which, if made available, could significantly improve the smooth-running and self-sufficiency of this unit.



**The Specialist, when next he visits, should be asked if he recommends their purchase to the Project. He should also be asked whether anything needs to be done to improve the animal houses, or whether the lab can function without them.**

Currently, the Unit is producing only about 5.5 million doses of vaccine (mostly for poultry) per year, but even this regularly exceeds annual demand by 20-25%. Production runs seem to be made on a continual, small batch basis throughout the year: even now the Director, Dr Sithong, estimates a production capacity of 15 million doses per year (4 times present demand), and with the new equipment this could increase still further.

Since it is probable that the production could be economically reduced to 1, 2 or 3 runs per vaccine per year, there could be a lot of idle time for the staff and the equipment: the Director and the project might like to consider if there are any ways in which this spare capacity could be put to good use - might some have skills which could periodically utilised by the Diagnostic Laboratory, for example? Perhaps the Specialist should be asked to give an opinion on this during his next visit, for it is a sure fact that staff who are both bored and poorly rewarded, either leave and get a better job, or stay and do a poor job. Reward and motivation are critical factors in retaining good staff, and staff continuity is a critical factor in maintaining quality in a small operation such as this.

Of course, producing sufficient quantities of appropriately priced, good quality vaccine in the laboratory is only the start of the story, not the end of it. The vaccine must remain in good condition right up to the point of its administration to the animal, and it must be administered properly. The MTRM was told several times, stories of animals that died despite having been vaccinated. Of course, there are several reasons why this might have been the case, quite possibly they died of a different disease but, whatever the cause, if it leaves any room for doubt about the quality of vaccines, it discredits the whole process and lowers still further the perceived value of vaccination. It should also be remembered that, however good its condition at the time of administration, no vaccine is perfect in the protection it offers: and that for most vaccines, the risk of break-through is markedly reduced if the majority of the herd is immunised, not just a select few as seems currently to be the case in most villages.

The DLF has rightly identified that, given the systems and purposes of animal husbandry at village level, and given the distances and time involved in reaching most of them, the only cost-effective, affordable and accessible mode of animal health service delivery is via a cadre of local farmers trained as Village Veterinary Workers (VVs) to give simple prophylactic and therapeutic services, and advice, within their village/locality. These VVs are not employed by any public service (although they could be commissioned) but are expected operate in the private sector. However, if, in the interests of disease control and the overall health status of the Country, (a public good), they are to promote the benefits of vaccination and to encourage its use at levels sufficient to both control disease and protect against it, then the VVs must be properly supported, supplied and rewarded for their efforts if they are to retain both their motivation and their credibility.

**For the foreseeable future, provision of such support and back-up must be a duty and obligation of the District Livestock Officers, but the VVs' rewards should come largely from the farmers; but not exclusively if a public good is involved. Also, the roles and status of the VVs should be recognised, protected, facilitated, and regulated under the law, in ways that stimulate rather than stifle them. The Project and DLF must ensure that these issues, and others related to them (such as examination and**



registration), are at least given full and proper debate even if it may not yet be appropriate to act on all of them.

#### **2.4.2. Diagnostic Unit**

This again is a small unit justified by the performance of a few critical functions: so most of the remarks made above for the Vaccine Unit, in respect of prioritisation, cost reduction, cost recovery (a few opportunities may arise), idle time, staff continuity, and alternative use/pooling of resources may similarly apply. The key functions of this unit are confirmatory diagnosis of outbreaks of disease, and participation in their subsequent investigation and monitoring; research into the distribution, prevalence and seasonal incidence of diseases suspected of being of important constraints to animal production; and active and passive systems of surveillance of key diseases important not just to Laos but to the ASEAN region and the freedom of trade within it as a whole. It also has a responsibility for the diagnosis of certain zoonoses, such as rabies.

The old laboratory for the unit in Vientiane was closed and pulled down in 1998, its replacement is in the early stages of construction and may be completed in 2002. In the meantime the Project has rehabilitated and equipped some temporary accommodation in the same compound. The unit has two small out-stationed Laboratories, in Luang Prabang and Champassak, but these are currently used primarily as centres at which samples collected in the field can appropriately be prepared and packaged for dispatch to the main Unit: later, when additional trained manpower is available, they may also carry out some of the simpler, and safer, diagnostic procedures.

Also, because most of its samples must be taken from the field, it has four 4x4 mobile laboratory units.

As with the Vaccine Unit, this Diagnostic Unit seems to have been well advised and supported by the visiting Specialist, the equipment identified as essential has been kept relatively simple and has all been supplied, training needs have been identified and appropriate courses within the region attended. Additionally, the laboratory is able to make many of its own reagents. Unfortunately, as is the case with so many technical units, there is a critical shortage of suitably trained staff, and a lack of experience in the organisation and management of such a laboratory. To compensate for these deficiencies, under a rider to the Project document, the Project will now recruit for 18 months TA, a Veterinarian experienced in Veterinary diagnostics, Laboratory management, and issues of Health and Safety.

Currently the laboratory seems to be functioning quite well, although sample throughput remains quite low (about 500 in 2001). It is engaged in four studies on disease prevalence around the Country, covering poultry diseases (5), gastro-intestinal parasitism, haemoparasitism, and fowl typhoid.

**Sustainability will be a key issue with this laboratory and in addressing this issue the Project might already start considering an exit strategy that might enhance the prospects of post-Project sustainability.** Since the 1997-1998 budget, no budget was planned for the Diagnostic Laboratory Unit. During this period the only support and equipment it has received has come from the SLSEAP.



## **2.5. Component 4 : Extension and Field Services**

### **2.5.1. Overview**

The SLSEAP extension activities, achievements and outputs are quite impressive with development schedules conforming to, or rather in advance of those initially planned (see Annex 8). The baseline survey was set up (see § 2.8), manuals and training courses were provided. The Project's commendable practice of continuous test and evaluation of technical packages and methodologies should also be underlined. This phase of preparation of extension tools and supports can be now considered as almost ended. In the field, extensive contacts have been made with DAFO staff, VVWs, farmers, and other projects, in anticipation of delivering these finalised extension packages. A strong and efficient collaboration has been established with SUNV and AVI that enables, through the provision of volunteers, a wider and faster spread of the SLSEAP packages and methodologies.

But the most important in terms of sustained efficiency of the extension activities are their progressive adaptation by the SLSEAP, in response both to field observations and to institutional constraints:

- The original intention that village level extension should be delivered only through all VVWs, had to be changed because there are just not enough VVWs with sufficient training or motivation. The focus now is on the careful and participatory selection, and improved training, of a smaller number of motivated VVWs.
- The SLSEAP also turned to working directly with the most dynamic farmers (rather than only through the VVWs as initially foreseen), through direct training and/or through adapted credit schemes and model farms.
- The introduction of the AHPM system should allow a fully participative approach and monitoring directly at the grassroots level.
- The implementation of model farms and of individual or village credits in kind (animals).
- Around 50 % of the trainees are women and this represents and enables a balanced approach to issues of gender and socio-economics in livestock production and management.

Globally speaking, the MTRM considers these activities as efficient and relevant, and the adaptations and methodologies used by the Project as appropriate to the circumstances.

However, in terms of effectiveness, several threats could limit the outputs of the project:

- The absence of recognition and especially of incentives (e.g.: out of vaccination fees) for the VVWs, as well as a sense of direct competition instead of complementary activity that they sometimes experience with district staff, do not always allow or encourage them to use their abilities as much as desirable.
- The model farmers or the credits beneficiaries, at present seem mainly to be in a phase of testing and observing the technical packages and inputs promoted by the project; their



adoption is often still far from being full or definitive. But the MTRM notices that, thanks to the project design, the activities remain essentially directed on the extension of the technical packages. The quality and availability of continuous support and advice for these farmers by decentralised services however is still too weak; and the feed-back from these farmers to the Project is still insufficient to allow optimal adaptation of the packages.

- The setting up of model farms does not always seem to take enough consideration the market opportunities nor the demand (for example the potential production of only 24 model pig farmers could fill 50 % the present Luang Namtha city demand). Moreover farmers' choices (of breeds for example) seem sometimes more influenced by the training received, or the animal availability (white pigs), or by opportunities to receive subsidised inputs, than by a sustainable approach to production in the circumstances prevailing in the particular farm and village.
- The rapid pace of geographic spread of Project activities, whilst impressive and desirable if targets are to be reached and significant developmental impact achieved, has complicated the logistic problems of support and these will increase with the scheduled developments. This pressure on means and human resources broadly explains the weakness of the direct support given to the farmers once they were trained and their first inputs administered.
- If the revolving "in-kind credits", implying a control by social pressure, seem appropriate, they also imply a relatively slow spread of these project inputs within a targeted village, and leads to the multiplication of villages involved on a very small scale. The scheme leads thus to a wider dispersal of activity which stresses logistical problems still further: a day journey to visit a single farmer possessing only 2 pigs or 25 chickens is not within the current means of the Project or the DAFOs.
- The Project has adopted and adapted an AHPEM approach. This appears an adequate tool for a participative approach at the grassroots level, but the MTRM notices that the analysis of AHPEM data is not yet realised and discussed by the district staff within the involved villages; this is due mostly to the lack of sufficient capacity and support to these district staff. Therefore the AHPEM tends only to be used for monitoring and evaluation (see § 2.8.) and not as an extension tool for the participative definition and adaptation of the technical messages. The SLSEAP thus risks disappointing some of its targeted farmers or villages due to the lack of ability to react.
- In this phase of testing by the farmers, the proposed technical packages are often still only partially adopted by the smallholders. Adoption often concerns only the genetic and/or the starting capital and/or some animal health aspects, whilst other factors, such as adequately balanced diets, remain neglected. Therefore, these other constraints could quickly thwart the first farmer's efforts and lead later to a global rejection of the Project contributions.
- Last but not least, to turn the minds of the targeted farmers from surviving in a subsistence economy to investing in a market-oriented economy supposes a framework that allows them to really benefit from the market economy's advantages. The current marketing system for animals, headed by a limited number of traders and fixed retail prices, does not assure them as much as access as desirable to the market, and notably not to any competition between traders for the farm-gate prices. Broadly speaking, all the systems of taxes and control, by favouring frauds, damage the market transparency and flow which



would allow the targeted farmers to benefit completely from the market economy's financial incentives.

As a consequence and to improve the efficiency of its numerous outputs, the MTRM recommends to the SLSEAP and DLF:

- **The organisation at institutional level of a coherent status for the VVWs, a recognition of this status connected to the testing (and perhaps periodic re-testing) of their skills, and clear incentives spreading between them and PAFO/DAFO staff.**
- **The complete and rapid liberalisation of the meat and livestock markets.**
- **A better concentration of the Project resources in the field at the grassroots level (e.g. with the Senior Extension TA based in the field at least six months a year). At this stage of testing by the smallholders, the SLSEAP should concentrate its extension efforts on the success and the complete adoption of well-adapted packages in a limited number of locations, rather than looking for an unrealistically wide spread of its outputs. This larger spread would be more relevant in a following project phase.**
- **If DLF and EC fully support the SLSEAP approach, they could induce a stronger co-operation between the SLSEAP (providing packages, methodologies and advice) and the different stakeholders in the rural development concerned with livestock (NGOs, Volunteers, other projects under their responsibility...) that could provide the extra means, funding, and human resources which are lacking to the SLSEAP. Such a networking approach would be less risky than an unrealistic growth and spread simply of SLSEAP itself.**
- **A particular effort for the organisation of a direct reporting feedback from the end-users and for the adaptation, according to these demands, of the technical packages. This supposes a more complete use of the AHPM, a direct support network at the grassroots level, and the more rigorous testing of the proposed packages.**

### **2.5.2. VVWs**

The DLF had accepted the concept of using Village Veterinary Workers (VVWs) long before this project started and thousands of VVWs had already been selected and trained to work in their villages. Indeed, in its proposal, the Project intended to make use of them directly for extension work and concentrate simply on strengthening their position and linkages in the field of animal health service delivery, and update their training.

Unfortunately, when actually embarking upon the extension programme, the Project soon found that the previous training had been very meagre, and prepared them to be little more than simple vaccinators. These VVWs, lacking sufficient extra skill, could not gain enough respect for farmers to trust or make much use of their services. They also lacked motivation and incentives. So they could not be immediately involved in the extension and animal health service delivery programmes of the Project.



As a result, a full training programme had to be adopted, and this has been modified and strengthened with experience. The Project trains Trainers selected from Provincial and District Livestock Section staff; they in turn train villagers/farmers selected to become VVWs. Selection is made by the Naiban (Headman) in consultation with his villagers, and in liaison with the District Livestock Officer.

The training of trainers is an intensive two-week course, and the University of Nabong has been contracted to deliver the technical components of this course. The training of VVWs is split into three modules, each of 3-5 days and 12 – 16 trainees, covering Animal Husbandry, Disease prevention, and Treatment. The curriculum is supported by a manual covering the three main topics which, being largely pictorial, can serve as simple *aide-memoire* for any trainee once the course is completed.

Candidates have been selected from various villages in different Districts of 5 Provinces in the North of the Country. So far 294 have completed at least one module, and 204 have completed all three. At the end of the course, the VVWs are given a case of simple veterinary equipment and a small stock of drugs to get them started in their role as private sector operators providing a basic Animal Health Service at village level.

As yet there has been no testing/examination of the trainees at the end of the course to verify that they have in fact gained in knowledge, skills and competence, and merit the right to offer such private services to other farmers; nor as yet is there any certification, registration, or official recognition of this category of animal health worker. However, a recent VVW workshop, held in Luang Prabang, involving groups of Farmers, VVWs, Naibans and District staff, concluded that these were issues that needed to be addressed if this cadre was to become an effective asset to the livestock sector. Unfortunately, the conclusions of this workshop suggest there is still considerable confusion as to the position of the VVW (i.e. are they private sector entrepreneurs who can be called upon by farmers to deliver a paid service, or are they “voluntary” public servants who supplement the District staff in the delivery of disease control?). The present intention would seem to be that they are private sector operators who must earn sufficient money from the service they deliver to cover the cost of the time and resources they expend in delivering it: this concept however seems still to be resisted by some villagers, Naiban, and District staff, who feel they have a degree of ownership of, without necessarily any responsibility for, the VVWs.

Whatever their position, it is clear that for the foreseeable future the VVWs will be the only source of animal health assistance regularly accessible to the majority of villages in the Country. Since the Provincial and District authorities implement no regular compulsory programmes of vaccination for disease control, but periodically encourage farmers to purchase vaccination against certain diseases, such protection and control of disease as there is, is at the choice of the farmer. It would be judicious therefore, for the DLF, and Provincial and District Authorities to make delivery of routine vaccination an attractive proposition for VVWs, so that they might actively seek to promote its benefits among their farming clientele. Also, if in the interests of disease control and the overall health status of the Country (a public good), they are to promote the benefits of vaccination and to encourage its use at levels sufficient to both control disease and protect against it, then the VVWs must be properly supported, supplied and rewarded for their efforts, by the commissioning authority, if they are to retain both their motivation and their credibility.



For the foreseeable future (at least until private sector is ready to take over), provision of such support and back-up must be a duty and obligation of the District Livestock Officers. The VVWs' rewards should come largely from the farmers; however exceptions to this may occur when disease control in the public-good, rather than just to the benefit of the individual farmer, is the driving force behind the activity. Also, the roles and status of the VVWs should be recognised, protected, facilitated, and regulated under the law, in ways that stimulate rather than stifle them.

These legal and institutional issues of standards/examination, certification, registration, ownership, reward, and motivation, *et al*, will have to be given serious thought and resolved in ways that give status and impetus to the VVW cadre, else, in a few years, it again wither and die. The Project and DLF must ensure that these issues, and others related to them, are at least given full and proper debate even if it may not yet be appropriate to act on all of them.

### 2.5.3. Credit

The SLSEAP has 4 different credit schemes (see Annex 8). Besides drugs and equipment to VVWs and a credit line for revolved micro-finance questions through APB, the SLSEAP is providing animals to farmers as a revolving fund in two ways:

- Parent stock keeping for multiplication purposes: the purpose is to multiply an improved breed. Under the supervision of DAFO, the village chief, and the VVW, a farmer receives parent stock and some commercial feed in the starting phase. He has to reimburse the loan in weaners, which can then enter into the "model" farms set up by the SLSEAP.
- "Model" farmers in pig and poultry raising: the objective is to implement and demonstrate the extension messages and create opportunities for farmers to exchange and learn from each other. Villagers should form a Village Credit Committee. Loans are taken individually via a group of 3 or 5 farmers selected in the village and who will have successive access to the animals after repayment in kind by the previous borrower. The loan duration is a year for poultry and 18 months for pig and the loan amount is from 50 to 100 Euro for poultry and from 100 to 200 Euro for pigs.

The MTRM considers the second option as the only one potentially sustainable because the Village Credit Committee can control more efficiently the management of the credit. They have a better knowledge of the farmers, the problems they can face, and the solution to solve them. The first option should thus only to be considered as an investment for genetic improvement at national or regional level.

The success of these revolving funds depends mainly on the capacity of VVWs and District Officers to monitor the farmers and provide technical advice and on the patience of the farmers who have to wait a long time before getting the animals. Due to the lack of means of transport for the District Officers, the selection of the villagers must take into account the distance to the villages; it will be too difficult for the District Officers to go to many remoter



areas. Also, remoteness provides added problems and smaller rewards for the marketing of the extra production.

## **2.6. Component 5 : Regional and sub-regional co-operation and co-ordination**

Regionally Lao PDR is a member of the ASEAN group of Countries, and sub-regionally of the Mekong Basin group. The driving interest in the Livestock sector is the fear of spread of disease, particularly Foot-and-Mouth disease, and how a Country's Animal Health status affects its right to trade in Livestock and Livestock Products. Conversely, ASEAN seeks to establish free-trade between its member Countries, so, in the Livestock sector this will require that Countries achieve some parity of status in disease control, harmonisation of goals and targets, disease surveillance, standardisation of reporting and certification, etc... and are all issues to be resolved between them if non-tariff barriers to trade are to be lifted. This requires regular consultation between them, as well as representation at meetings of the Global organisations – FAO and OIE. The regional bodies also organise training programmes, workshops and seminars to up-grade and up-date knowledge in various aspects of disease diagnosis, monitoring and surveillance, epidemiology, information technology, movement control, and facilitate collaborative research. The Project has assisted attendance and participation in several of these events and sponsored one held in June in Vientiane.

## **2.7. Component 6 : Information and communication**

A lot of materials have been produced. The institutional and development agencies personnel are fully aware of the project; but this is not always the case with the targeted smallholders who sometimes confuse with the SLSEAP and the other EU projects.

Even if these activities do allow a better introduction for the SLSEAP within Lao PDR, and also promote recognition of E.C. activities in the Country, the MTRM does not consider them of any particular benefit to the Project itself.

## **2.8. Component 7 : Core Programme Management**

The PMU has been set up as initially planned: staff, accommodation, and facilities were allocated as recommended, and the equipment and consumables acquired. The TA was recruited at the beginning of the SLSEAP, in expertise and numbers as stipulated in the FA. The short-term consultancies have been implemented as planned.

Since 1999, the DLF can organise during three days a general workshop for annual planning supported financially by the EU Livestock Project. Before 1999, the DLF could only organise this workshop every three years period. The participants are staff from the Planning Division, the chiefs of the Livestock and Fisheries sections, the chiefs of international border Check Posts (12 with DLF staff), the chief of National Health Centre, staff from the Technical Division, staff from Customs Office, staff from Trade Office, staff from the Co-operation Division from the Cabinet, staff from the National Planning Committee and staff from the EU Livestock Project.



Nevertheless, due to the conceptual tasks (manual drafting, extension system set up...), to the strengthening of DLF (vaccine institute, diagnosis lab...), and to the project design (extension through PAFO, DAFO and VVWs), the long term Technical Assistants have had to spend the main part of their time in Vientiane and are only travelling to the fields mainly for special events (workshops, etc...). In Sayaboury Province, the Project started one year ago and the Technical Assistants have not returned there since. If we want to improve the motivation of DLF staff in the provinces, it is necessary to co-operate much more closely with them, and to demonstrate that the Project cares about their work.

In light of the re-orientation of the extension activities, the MTRM recommends that the long term Technical Assistants need to be more involved in the farmers' supervision and monitoring to facilitate appropriate feed back and subsequent adaptation of their technologies and support services (see § 2.5.1.).

### **Project monitoring and evaluation**

The SLSEAP has adapted its indicators of activities and outputs to its new approaches in extension activities, and set up a monitoring system which can be considered as efficient with a delay of response from 1 to 3 months only (see annex 8.1.). The half yearly progress reports summarise these monitoring products and allow a good project follow up, even though explanations are sometimes too scanty and financial comparisons are made only with regard to the ongoing AWP rather than to the OWP or to the FA.

The SLSEAP had to set up an evaluation system to assess its effectiveness and its impact at the targeted farmer's level. A baseline survey followed-up by year-line surveys was initially foreseen in the LPP and LNP. The baseline survey was produced in 2000 and can be also considered as efficient and valuable, despite a relatively limited number of villages (see annex 8.2.). Combined with the work carried out by the project on the general census, it presented the first relevant set of data on livestock owners in the Northern Lao PDR. Nevertheless, the first year-line survey (2001) showed the limitations of this approach: too laborious and inefficient to allow follow-up on a continuous basis. So the SLSEAP then turned to the AHPM system, introduced in Laos by the FAO. The MTRM considers this change to have been sensible, and the subsequent adaptations made as relevant and pertinent to the means and purpose of conducting this activity: it ought to allow more sensitive analysis, comparisons between provinces/projects and facilitate a progressive improvement of the extension work through better adapted packages. Moreover, relevant data on the smallholders socio-economic status and their trends are still lacking and in this way the SLSEAP could assist institutional strengthening on planning matters: DLF, EC and all the development agencies would thus be fully interested.

From an efficiency point of view, the AHPM data checking, processing, and overall analysis at the CIMU level, due to a lack of sufficient suitably trained personnel, is still too weak and must be improved. Moreover, it is also clear that data measures in the field need to be still improved (see § 2.3.1.).

Due to the long-term nature of the benefit flows from this Project, assessment of its effectiveness and impact (as expected from its evaluation systems) will only be really possible some considerable time after its completion: the project preparation study foresaw an increase of 18 % in the participating farmers incomes (6 % of the targeted population incomes) at the end of the project (Y 6), which will probably not be measurable at that time. The real impact



of the project will be discernible and measurable only as from the year 10 in terms of rural incomes. Therefore, the impact evaluation has little immediate interest for the SLSEAP in itself, and such an evaluation tool could be considered as effective only if the DLF wants to include it in its methods of economic planning or if the EC takes it into consideration for driving forward its longer term co-operation policies in Lao PDR, and not just for a single project.

In the first case, **the MTRM recommends that the DLF endows the CIMU, on a durable basis, with adequate human resources. Moreover, the support of the SLSEAP short-term consultant on monitoring and evaluation has to be planned for at least once a year:** not only to strengthen CIMU, but also to check the progress in data collection processes in the field. In the second case, the EC could consider creating a common unit for evaluation of all its projects in the Northern areas, as recommended by the SLSEAP monitoring and evaluation expert, but it seems that EC has no resources available to set up such a transversal planning and evaluation tool. DLF and EC have thus to decide how and why such a long-term evaluation system might be effective for them and then invest the necessary complementary resources for its implementation, or drop the concept from their agenda.

As another consequence of the long-term nature of the impacts, the MTRM has been able to base its observations only on qualitative indicators and on its experience from other contexts and former projects.

The use of this tool only for evaluation, as it is still the case (see § 2.5.1.), does not fulfil its intended roles within the Project framework.

### **3. Impact**

The extension activities of SLSEAP should enable farmers who adopt the principles and practices demonstrated to improve their financial autonomy. The MTRM observed that one year after their training and their first investments, most of the farmers are still continuing to test some of the SLSEAP recommendations. Animal performances can be significantly improved indeed and, if these productions are effectively commercialised, they could bring substantial additional incomes.

Impacts, however, will only appear slowly due to the length of the production cycles (6 - 8 years for buffaloes and cattle) to which the time for livestock owners training, testing of the proposed methodologies and investing in their practise, have to be added.

But the necessary change of mentality and operating systems within the rural population imposes two limitations:

- It will be possible only as far as it benefits from an adequate commercial and institutional frame. So, a global approach of the initially targeted population would be inefficient. Indeed, at first, only those livestock owners having access to the market (to an external demand) will be able to integrate with this market-oriented economy, by adopting a more speculative way of farming. The focus of these extension efforts should therefore be on the most convenient areas (along the roads/rivers, surrounding cities/markets), on the short generation-cycle species, and on those technical packages best adapted to the local



markets (Chinese pigs), would seem to be a sensible target to aim for this first stage. On the other hand, structural reforms, such as the liberalisation of meat markets for example, would bring benefit directly to the whole rural population, including the bovine breeders within the remote areas.

- Only some of the smallholders are in a position to immediately change their mentality and livestock production objectives. Their choice as “model farmers” and their example should gradually but effectively influence the rest of the rural population: the policy of “model farms” seems therefore particularly adequate in terms of impact. But to ensure the success of these examples, it requires a more complete follow-up and support service than seems currently to be given: each and every failure will stir doubts in the minds of the neighbours who observe them and, at best, cause lengthy delay in obtaining an impact, at worst a definitive rejection of the SLSEAP proposals. So, after the development of the technical packages, the **continuous support and advice to these pilot farmers becomes a higher priority in terms of impact than their progressively wider dissemination: the project needs thus a period of consolidation before further expansion.**

The improvement of planning capacities at central level (market monitoring, evaluation...) will have significant impact on the final beneficiaries only once the changes in mentality resulting from the extension component begin to be realised. The MTRM therefore considers them less urgent than the field activities, even though they remain indispensable in the medium term.

On the other hand, activities connected with animal disease control are indispensable to the durable change of livestock production methods in so far as they offer protection to the investment and, in the longer term, are the condition for opening up the markets. So, they remain a priority: effective in terms of fast impact on the targeted beneficiaries, both within and beyond the peri-urban production areas; essential to the support of the extension packages; and critical in the perspective of the ASEAN market.

#### **4. Sustainability**

The sustainability of the SLSEAP extension activities is based above all on the smallholders' conviction of the interest benefits for themselves in producing livestock for specifically marketing, and not only for security or saving. The economic policy framework that is developing in Lao PDR should favour this market-oriented economy. Demand seems to be sustainable in the country or abroad and so should not be a brake either on prices or on the quantities potentially produced. Primary resources availability is not a limiting factor; the workforce availability could be one, but this constraint should decrease as the livestock owners gain confidence in the new systems of production. Access to capital could be another limiting factor but the amounts individually required are small and actually not inaccessible for a lot of farmers; moreover the SLSEAP has constituted credit lines adapted to their needs. The main limiting factor could simply be the degree of trust and confidence with which the livestock owners feel they can invest in the proposed techniques. Therefore, the success of the pilot farms and villages, as well as the implementation of the input-supply and services network, constitutes the critical element in securing the initial success of this enterprise: in that case and with an adequate institutional environment, thereafter the SLSEAP proposals should be taken up and developed among the other smallholders. But this approach and thus the project's sustainability need probably more time than the two next years. If the SLSEAP



fulfils its outputs, as they are now designed, and if the extension activities can be pursued with enough time, the project sustainability very likely will be achieved at the field level.

But several constraints could jeopardise the SLSEAP sustainability:

### **Lack of human resources and budget**

The MTRM travelled to four provinces where the EU Livestock Project is involved: Luang Prabang Province, Sayaboury Province, Oudomxay Province, and Luang Namtha Province. Several districts and villages were visited. The MTRM met the Livestock and Fisheries Sections staff at the provincial level and the Livestock and Fisheries Units staff at the district level.

On the one hand, each PAFO is getting instructions from the Governor to work on specific tasks like, for example, food security, poverty alleviation or reduce slash and burn. PAFO requires from the sections to collect these data. The sections analyse the data and propose to PAFO a certain number of projects like, for example, fish production, promotion of large and small animals, animal mix feed plant, etc. PAFO makes the proposal to the Governor to finance them. During an average period of four months the sections and the districts are collecting the data, about one month is necessary to analyse the data and two weeks to make the selection.

On the other hand, the Livestock and Fisheries sections are also collecting data for the DFL through the questionnaire sent out by the DFL each year to prepare the annual report, distributed after the annual workshop to provide the instructions and guidelines to improve the work of the PLFO and the DLFO in the provinces and the districts. The sections are supposed to send their reports every three months to the DLF, but in fact the report is sent every six months. The sections are complaining they do not get any feedback from the DLF.

In the case of animal diseases, the Chief of the Livestock and Fisheries Section informs the DLF. If the section can control the situation, they will intervene themselves; if the section cannot control the animal diseases, the DLF will provide assistance from the National Animal Health Centre Epidemiology Unit. Sometimes the Province accepts to pay for it, if not the EU Livestock Project will pay for it. If a section has sufficient budget, the section can send a letter to DLF to train the DLFO; from October 2000 to September 2001, the DLF provided training five times.

All the Livestock and Fisheries Sections and Units were facing the same two major constraints:

- Lack of human resources, particularly qualified human resources.
- Lack of budget.

The sections in the provinces cannot properly supervise the units in the districts because of their limited budget, and for the same reason the units cannot properly supervise and monitor the farmers in the villages.

Due to this lack of human resources, of qualified officers, and of budget, it would seem very difficult for the Livestock and Fisheries Sections and the Livestock and Fisheries Units to provide fully reliable data for the Provinces and for the DLF. These data (reliable or not) play an important role because they contribute to the definition of the measures the Provinces will



implement, and they contribute to the definition of the annual National Livestock Strategy and the estimate of the DLF budget for the year.

The EU Livestock Project has to pay more attention to the type and quality of data collected by the Livestock and Fisheries Sections and the Livestock and Fisheries Units.

### **Extension services**

In the next three or four months, NAFES may take over all the Extension Units in the Provincial Sections and all the DAFOs will be part of NAFES staff.

There is considerable confusion in the provinces and the districts because the chiefs of the sections do not understand clearly “who is doing what?” In some sections the extension unit is still an integral part of the section but in others the extension unit is not included anymore. **All** the extension units in the sections will become an Extension Activities Section, which will become part of PAFO like the other sections. In the near future, the Livestock and Fisheries sections will only provide technical advice to the DLFOs but will not supervise them directly, they will operate under the supervision of the Extension Services Section.

According to this new structure, the way the project intervenes, and with whom it collaborates, in extension activities must be redefined. We have to keep in mind the main objective of the EU Livestock Project which is “Strengthening of Livestock Services and Extension Activities”.

### **DLF**

At the beginning of the project the total number of the DLF staff at the central level was 143; by November 2001, the total number of the DLF staff had been reduced to 60 plus 5 studying abroad: i.e. 65.

Once again, the title of the EU Livestock Project, “Strengthening of Livestock Services and Extension Activities”, is quite important. In a period of three years, more than 55% of staff left the DLF, 55 civil servants went to NAFRI and 38 civil servants went to NAFES. The main activity remaining to the DLF today is the National Animal Health Centre. In the Provinces the situation is even worse, because a large number of staff working in the Extension Units in the Livestock and Fisheries sections will go to the Extension Activities Section (NAFES) and 563 DLFOs will not be part of DLF anymore and will work for the Extension Activities Section.

**The question is “What are the activities left at DLF to be strengthened”?**

### **Laboratory Vaccine Institute and Laboratory Diagnostic Unit**

If there is no more budget for the Vaccine Institute from the Central Government, the MTRM thinks the Vaccine Institute will face serious financial problems in the near future. In case of emergency it is difficult for the Vaccine Institute to refuse to deliver vaccines to a Province, even knowing the Province will not pay for them.

The Laboratory Diagnostic Unit is still operating only because of the financial support it gets from the EU Livestock Project, the Laboratory Diagnostic Unit has not had any operating budget from the Central Government since 1997-1998. **The main issue is how the Unit will operate at the end of the Project without any further financial support. The sustainability level is quite low.**

## **5. Conclusions and recommendations**

The Review Team's visits to the field in Luang Prabang, Luang Namtha, Sayaboury, and Oudomxay bore testimony to the significant importance of livestock to the subsistence and small-scale, semi-commercial, mixed farming systems of Lao PDR. Although, of course, the Team only saw small parts of four Provinces, it is understood that the roles and importance of livestock are similar in most other parts of the Country, too. 76 % of households own livestock, the relative importance of the different species varying with location, circumstances, needs, and opportunities. Livestock contribute almost 40 % of the Gross Agricultural Product, and reportedly account for about half the total cash income of rural households; they also serve as the bank of capital assets to be drawn upon in times of serious or urgent need for cash - e.g. seasonal shortages of food; medical emergencies; house building; weddings; festivals; school fees and clothing; and occasional luxuries such as a radio, motor cycle, or car. Additionally, they recycle nutrients to fertilise the fields, and provide draught power. Moreover livestock is the main item farmers are accustomed to trade for cash, and women are also strongly involved in livestock production and trade.

In these respects the Livestock sub-sector is well chosen as a focus of attention to draw farmers out of subsistence economy towards market-oriented systems of production. This is the essence of the project. However, for this to be successful, the market has to be attractive and accessible to the producers, and some policies have still to be improved to support such a change of attitude: e.g. the role and status of VVWs; progressive withdrawal of the Government from the market place; liberalisation of the market in animal products; acceptance of private sector as a partner in the provision of animal health and extension services.

The Project has two major facets: one is institutional development, both at central and decentralised levels; the other focuses more directly upon extension activities at the grassroots level.

The extension activities have taken a participatory and process approach and have been progressively adapted over the three years to improve their acceptability and performance. Progress is essentially up to schedule, but scarce resources (human, financial, and technical) are being stretched by the continued expansion.

The overall decentralisation process and restructuring of MAF have led to an institutional environment that has changed significantly since the beginning of the project and the MTRM was advised that the sectoral restructuring and planning is not yet completed. At central level, the DLF's staff has been reduced by more than 55 %, and its responsibilities are still being redefined. These changes have contributed to rather more patchy progress and uncertainty on the institutional side.



The Project is in tune with the development strategy of the Country, but the processes it is assisting to create will not be completed, nor immediately sustainable from the Lao PDR economy, by the year 2004. Moreover, an interruption of the external support would probably jeopardise the investments already made. **At this stage the MTRM recommends that consideration should be given to the need for a second phase of at least five years.** According to the preparation time schedule, the MTRM recommends also a potential extension of the present phase to avoid any gap of funding and activities.

The Project approach is to set up, demonstrate, and validate appropriate methodologies rather than to implement them itself on a large scale. The Project has thus first to consolidate its activities in Luang Prabang and Luang Namtha Provinces and expand progressively to two or three other Provinces during the remainder of the present phase, using a cluster approach to optimise the demonstration effects and facilitate indispensable follow up and support to the model farmers without unduly stretching the scarce resources. Strengthening of TA presence in the North would greatly assist the extension effort of the Project. Due to the lack of means and the lengthy nature of the extension processes, the SLSEAP should avail itself of opportunities to collaborate with and enlist the support and human resources of other projects, NGOs, volunteers, etc...

In terms of sustainability, Lao PDR Government and EC have to take into consideration not only the operational costs but also the scarcity of skilled human resources (notably graduates), the length of their training, the key role played by staff and the critical importance of continuity. **Undergraduate training is vital to create a sufficient intellectual resource to sustain the development processes that are being put in place.**

## **ANNEXES**

### **1. Terms of reference of the MTRM**

#### **1. BACKGROUND**

The project “Strengthening of Livestock Services and Extension Activities ALA/96/19” is based on the Financing Agreement between the European Communities and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic (LAO PDR), signed in Brussels on 19 September 1997 and Vientiane on 13 October 1997.

The project commenced in February 1998 and is due to end in January 2004. The Department of Livestock and Fisheries (DLF) of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF) is the Executing Agency for the project.

Following Annex 2 (Technical and Administrative Provisions) of the Financing Agreement, Article 9, External Evaluation would be carried out by an independent team recruited by the Commission when deemed necessary.

A Mid-Term Review has been foreseen in the Fourth Annual Work Plan of the project, and it is expected that the recommendations of the evaluation mission could be used for further planning and be included in the Fifth Annual Work Plan (Feb 2002 – Jan 2003). It is therefore proposed to hold this review in October 2001

The project is being implemented through seven project components, with the following expected outputs:

#### **a) Legislative Programme :**

- Veterinary legislation adapted
- Operational check posts for control of animal movements and diseases
- Skills in meat inspection upgraded.

#### **b) Information systems :**

- Efficient nation-wide Animal Health System;
- Improved capacity in planning livestock development and animal disease control
- Accurate market monitoring system established
- Operational documentation centre on AHP and extension.

#### **c) Laboratory :**

- Capacity for national vaccine production adapted to needs;
- Improved capacity for disease diagnosis.



d) Extension :

- Extension packages for AHP developed;
- Delivery of veterinary and animal production services in N Laos strengthened.

e) Regional Co-ordination :

- Regional and sub-regional co-ordination for animal disease eradication enhanced.

f) Information/Communication:

- Public awareness on EC-supported action in the field of AHP

g) Management and Monitoring and Evaluation:

- Operational PMU office established
- Monitoring and Evaluation system established.

Whereas the first three components address issues of Institutional Strengthening, the Extension component delivers direct benefit to animal keepers at village level. This component also requires functioning institutions at different levels. The last three components provide overall support to the project.

The current state of implementation is described in the half-yearly project reports.

## **2. DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT**

### **Beneficiary(ies)**

The immediate beneficiaries are the livestock and extension services; the ultimate beneficiaries are the farmers, particularly smallholders, whose income and assets will be secured.

### **Global and specific objectives**

The general objective of the project is to enhance small-holders' financial autonomy and capacity of initiative by improving their income from livestock rearing.

The specific objectives are:

- (i) to strengthen veterinary services and the extension network at all levels for an efficient and sustainable delivery of animal health and production services, and thereby,
- (ii) reduce disease incidence, improve management practice and increase livestock productivity.

### **➤ Requested services**

The main objective of the review mission is to provide an independent assessment for all the stakeholders (GoL, EC, project team) of the achievements to date, together with both positive and negative aspects of the implementation in order to confirm or no whether the programme should continue in its present form or whether there is a need for a reorientation.

Taking into account that the responsibility for implementation rests with the executing agency, the purpose of the mission is to review:

- The extent to which the Department of Livestock and Fisheries is assuming ownership of the project in relationship to its operational capacity to sustain project activities and investments;
- The extent to which long-term sustainability for the provision of veterinary services in certain areas can be achieved during the project life-span;
- The achievements of the project in implementing the planned activities and in attaining planned project outputs;
- The extent to which achievement of project outputs to date has contributed to the project purpose and overall objective;
- The validity of assumptions and relevance of verifiable indicators;

➤ Expected results

The main objective of the review mission is to provide an independent assessment for all the stakeholders (GoL, EC, project team) of the achievements to date, together with both positive and negative aspects of the implementation in order to confirm or no whether the programme should continue in its present form or whether there is a need for a reorientation.

And to recommend:

- Any possible need for changes to current project operations (which can be incorporated into the forthcoming annual work plan starting January 2002) to ensure the successful completion of the project;
- Any possible need for an extension of the project as a whole or in part;
- The possible need for a second phase of the project;
- Any possible need for re-orientation of DLF or EC approach, in view of a subsequent project phase.

### **3. EXPERTS PROFILE**

In order to fulfil this assignment, the mission will be comprised of three expatriate experts as follows :

1. Senior veterinary Specialist, Team Leader
2. Livestock Specialist/Agricultural Economist
3. Institution Development Specialist

Each of these experts should have a graduate degree and field experience relevant to the TOR. All experts must have sound communications skills in dealing with local agencies and rural communities, and be capable of working as a team. Each must be fluent in English and be able to produce high quality reports rapidly. The team will be able to work independently in terms of computer and office facilities. All the experts should have relevant field experience in institutional/rural development projects in Asia. Within this overall framework, the specific tasks of each expert and their individual profiles are as indicated below.



### 1. Team Leader – Senior Veterinary Specialist

At least 20 years overall experience and 15 years specific experience in the main fields of public veterinary services (policy and planning, legislation, disease control, veterinary public health). Familiar with veterinary laboratory operations. Familiar with issues related to the transition from state controlled to private sector delivery of animal health and production services. Sufficiently related experience in developing countries, preferably in South-East Asia. Familiar with EC procedures. Experienced in evaluating/assessing large-scale livestock/veterinary projects and to lead a team of experts. Very good English proficiency and report writing skills are required. A high degree of flexibility and a proven record of cultural sensitivity is required.

The other members of the team will operate under the direct supervision of the team leader, who will be directly responsible to the EC for the overall quality and consistency of all reports and documents produced by the mission.

### 2. Livestock Specialist/Agricultural Economist

At least 20 years of overall experience and 15 years in livestock development and extension in developing countries, preferably in South-East Asia. Particular working experience is required in the field of smallholder oriented livestock health and production delivery services, in particular the training of basic veterinary health workers, and the organisation of veterinary health delivery systems at village level. Familiar with revolving fund and credit scheme operations related to livestock. Familiar with EC procedures. Experienced in review missions. Very good English proficiency and report writing skills required.

### 3. Institution Development Specialist

At least 15 years experience in the development of institutions in developing countries, designing and implementing institutional development programmes. In addition, some experience in the creation of private sector supply networks that cover the whole spectrum from importation to the supply of services at village level. Proven capacity in assessment of human resource capacity and needs related to the changing role of the public sector and the emerging private sector. The specialist should have a minimum of 10 years experience in South-East Asian countries and preferably work experience in Lao PDR because the institutional and privatisation mechanisms there are quite different to those in the region.

#### LOCATION AND DURATION :

Starting date : Mid October 2001

Finishing date of the assignment : Mid November 2001

The following time schedule is proposed for October to allow the results of the MTR mission to be included in the next AWP:

<b>TASK</b>	<b>No of days per expert</b>
Briefing in EC Brussels, review files/reports	1
Travel to Thailand	1
Briefing at EC Delegation in BKK/ travel to VTE	1
Briefing at PMU/DFL and with other key parties	3
Field mission in Lao PDR	10
Draft final report, debriefing EU MS embassies in VTE	7
Travel to BKK, debriefing EC Delegation	1
Travel to Europe	1
Debriefing Brussels	1
Writing of final report in Europe	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29</b>

Location of assignment: LAOS

#### 4. REPORTING

The team leader is responsible to ensure that the draft of the Final Report of the MTR mission will be submitted at least three working days before the debriefing meeting in Vientiane, by fax or e-mail to the PMU. The PMU will be responsible for transmitting it as soon as possible to the DLF, CIC, EC Delegation in Bangkok, and to the TCO/L.

The full draft MTR mission report will be submitted in 13 copies within 20 days after the end of the mission by the MTR team as follows: 3 (three) copies to EC headquarters and 10 (ten) copies being simultaneously and directly sent by express courier to the EC Delegation in Bangkok.

The final MTR mission report shall not exceed 25 pages without annexes. It should be submitted in 13 (thirteen) copies within 10 working days after receiving comments on the draft report, the copies will be as follows: 3 (three) to EC headquarters and 10 (ten) copies being sent simultaneously and directly sent by express courier to the EC Delegation in Bangkok.

The outline of the report should follow EC guidelines for evaluation reports as outlined on web page : [http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/evaluation/methods/guidelines\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/evaluation/methods/guidelines_en.pdf)

All reports are to be written in English. In addition to the number of hard copies specified above, all reports are to be made available in electronic form (diskette or CD) using processing and calculation software compatible with but preferably in MS WORD and, if applicable, MS EXCEL.

The Commission will issue its definite approval on the basis of the Final Report, but it reserves the right to have the report redrafted, by the Review Mission Team, as many times as may be necessary.



## **2. Evaluators**

**Name :**       **FREELAND Guy**, BVMS; MSc; MRCVS.

### **Qualifications:**

- 1965: Graduated as Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine and Surgery from Glasgow University in 1965.
- 1978: Graduated as Master of Science (Tropical Animal Production and Health), from Edinburgh University, Centre for Tropical Veterinary Medicine, in 1978.

### **Career:**

- 1965 – 1970: Assistant Veterinary Surgeon in three different farm-animal veterinary practices in England.
- 1970 – 1973: District Veterinary Officer in Swaziland
- 1974 – 1977: Divisional Veterinary Officer in Sarawak
- 1978 – 1981: Animal Health Services Project Team Leader, and Adviser to the Director of Livestock Services, Bangladesh.
- 1981 – 1982: Principal Veterinary Officer and Livestock Development Adviser, Lafia Agricultural Development Project, Nigeria;
- 1983 – 1999: Senior Animal Health and Production Adviser to the British Government's Overseas Development Administration (O.D.A.), (now known as the Department for International Development, D.F.I.D.). Livestock project appraisal, monitoring and supervision in some 45 countries, in: Africa; West, South, and South-east Asia; and Pacific regions.
- July 1999: Civil Service Retirement.
- August 1999 – to date : Freelance Consultant.
- March 2000 – CTVM, Edinburgh; Rinderpest Research Review
- Nov.1999 and July 2000 – Output to Purpose Reviews of the Veterinary Epidemiology and Economics Section V.E.E.S.) Project and the Tsetse Control Division Projects in Botswana, and subsequently Final Reviews of the same;
- February/March 2001- MTR, Vietnam: Strengthening of Veterinary Services Project
- April - October 2001 – FMD Control, Newcastle, U.K.

Various short commissions for IFAD, FAO, IAEA

### **Extra-mural Positions:**

- 1987 – 1991: External examiner [MSc. level] to the Centre for Tropical Medicine, Edinburgh University;
- 1991 – 1994: External examiner [MSc. level] to the Veterinary Epidemiology and Economics Dept, Reading University;
- 1986 – 1995: Member of Council of the Royal Veterinary College, London.
- 1994 – 2001: Member of the PAAT [Programme Against African Trypanosomosis] Programme Committee.
- 1999 – to date: Member of the Board of Directors of VETAID.

**Name:** FUSILIER Patrick L.

**Nationality:** French

**Education:** Vanderbilt University U. S.A.  
Ph.D. in Political Science  
Specialisation: Economic Development

<b>Language skills:</b>	French	Reading 5	Speaking 5	Writing 5
	English	Reading 5	Speaking 5	Writing 5
	Spanish	Reading 5	Speaking 4	Writing 4
	Russian	Reading 3	Speaking 4	Writing 3

**Present position:** Management Consultant - Economist

**Key qualifications:**

Regional economic development.

Feasibility studies.

Business planning and small/medium business development.

Analysis of the government-industry interface to select the appropriate policy instruments, for example taxation, subsidies or regulations of some kind.

Identify investment opportunities for foreign investors to bring in needed financial, managerial and technical resources.

Carry out a search for foreign investors, analyse the responses and recommend a way forward.

Development of programmes to identify growth/investment possibilities.

Quantitative analysis in international trade:

- Carry out assessment of product areas showing rapid growth.
- Assess product areas with significant under-supply.
- Review major product imports.
- Review major product exports.
- Identify product areas of strategic importance.
- Evaluate areas identified as priorities by National Government Plans.
- Assess availability of natural resource materials providing competitive advantage.
- Identify and assess availability of production assets providing competitive advantage.
- Comprehensive review of growth possibilities within the country economy.
- Development of proposals for an economic policy reform.

Institutional strengthening, including management and organisational development.

Design and execution of appropriate management training programmes.

Improving corporate and organisational performance, through the introduction of effective management structures, marketing strategies and promotional activities.

**Countries:** Burundi, Madagascar, Nigeria, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Botswana, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Uganda, Rwanda, Egypt, Tunisia, Russia, Bangladesh, Azerbaijan, Gabon, Central African Republic, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Guinea (Conakry), Zaïre, Congo (Brazzaville), Mali, Niger, Chad, Malawi, Turkey, Cameroon, Switzerland, France, U.S.A., Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, French Polynesia.



**Name :**        **RENARD Jean-François**

**ADDRESS:** CIRAD – EMVT, Campus international de Baillarguet, TA30B,F-34398 Montpellier Cedex5, France (Tel: + 33 (0)4 67 593808, Fax: + 33 (0)4 67 593795, E-mail: [jean-francois.renard@cirad.fr](mailto:jean-francois.renard@cirad.fr))

**DATE OF BIRTH:** July 13th 1955

**NATIONALITY:** Belgian

**FAMILIAL STATUS:** Married, two children (16 & 14)

**LANGUAGES:** French (mother tongue), English

**PRESENT POSITION:** CIRAD – EMVT: Business development manager

### **EDUCATION**

**1978: Agricultural Engineer** - specialised in livestock from the State Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, Gembloux, Belgium.

**2000: Post graduate diploma in Management** from the Catholic University of Leuven (UCL), Belgium.

**Others:** Financial Analysis course from the Catholic Faculty of Mons University, Belgium, (FUCAM, 1992); Seminar on "Project Cycle Management" (logical framework methodology) from the Commission of the European Union, 1994; Courses on « Negotiating, drafting and understanding international research & development agreements », Hawksmere, London, 2001; Various CIRAD internal courses on research management (intellectual property rights, planning,...) 1999 to 2001

### **KEY QUALIFICATIONS**

- ☞ Identification, study, supervision, organisation and management of livestock projects, rangeland management projects, farms and rural development projects;
- ☞ Agrostology and tropical livestock husbandry;
- ☞ Economy of livestock productions in the tropics;
- ☞ Agro-industrial plants management;
- ☞ Analysis of surrounding factors, both technical and socio-economical, relevant to development programmes or investments in livestock sector.
- ☞ Research management

### **PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

- Agrostological and zootechnical studies.
- Set up and supervision of practical schemes for the management of tropical rangeland
- Supervision of rural development projects and agro-industrial farm specialised in livestock (field missions, technical assistance management and backstopping, headquarter follow up and monitoring, technical and economical forecasts).
- Agricultural projects studies (identification, feasibility, evaluation); tropical livestock rearing projects and policies appraisals .
- Analysis of livestock, meat and milk sectors (all species) in Africa and Asia.
- Teaching and research in agrostology and zootechny.
- Management of livestock farms, management of agro-industrial farms, management of a consulting firm specialised in tropical livestock.
- Management of research development in livestock sector for tropical areas

### **COUNTRIES of ASSIGNMENTS**

Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central Africa, Chad, China, D.R Congo, Congo (Brazzaville), Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Guinea (Conakry), Ivory Coast, Kenya, Laos, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritius, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan, Togo, Turkey, Vietnam.

### **3. Timing of the MTRM**

#### **October 17:**

- Brussels briefing with Mr. DALE

#### **October 21:**

- Travel Europe – Bangkok

#### **October 22:**

- Bangkok briefing with Ms Nopmanee SOMBOONSUB

#### **October 23:**

- Travel Bangkok – Vientiane
- Introduction meeting with Mr Patrick VAN DE VELDE, Bob BALDWIN, Geoff GRIFFITH, Dirk VAN AKEN, Sounthone VONGTHILATH.
- PMU meeting, programming

#### **October 24:**

- Meeting with Ms Khempeng Pholsena, Mr Bob BALDWIN, Patrick VAN DE VELDE.
- Meeting with Mr PHONSIVAY
- Meeting with Mr Gerard OOSTERWIJK
- Meeting with Mr Phouang Parisak Pravongviengkham

#### **October 25:**

- Meeting with Mr THADAVONG, JANSONIUS
- Visit of the Diagnosis Laboratory and meeting with Mr Syseng KHOUNSY
- Documentation and discussion at PMU

#### **October 26:**

- Visit of the Vaccine Production Institute and meeting with Mr Sithong PHIPHAKHAVONG
- Visit of the Nongteng poultry, fish and pig Breeding Station and Training Centre and discussion with Mr BOUALY and KHIMPHONG
- Meeting with Mr SYSANETH and PHONEKHAMPHENG
- Discussion with Mr Chris BENTLEY
- Meeting with Mr Tienne VANNASOUK

#### **October 27:**

- Documentation

#### **October 28:**

- Travel Vientiane – Luang Prabang

#### **October 29:**

- Meeting with Ms DE KONING and Mr KHANSOUVONG
- Visit of the Provincial Livestock Office



- Visits of four farmers at Hadjan (Pok On district) and Donmo ( Xiang Nguen district)
- Meeting with Provincial Livestock Office Staff in Sayabouri Province:  
Mr Sommay THORATHY, Head of the Section  
Mr Somneuk SAYNATHY, Deputy Head of the Section  
Mr Vivaphong PHONVICHITH, Fisheries Unit  
Mr Souphak LAKSIVY, Veterinary Extension and EU Livestock Project Co-ordinator  
Mrs Viravanh SITHIXAY, Veterinary Drugs
- Meeting with Mr Plane CHANTHIP, PAFO Deputy Head in Sayaboury Province
- Meeting in a village in Sayaboury Province with:  
Mrs Bounseng SOUKSENGPHET, Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Unit, District of Sayaboury  
Mr BOUNMY, Chief of Village  
Mr Somchith MEKTAKOUN, VVW and farmer  
Five farmers
- Meeting with Mr KOENIG

#### **October 30:**

- Visit of the Luang Prabang market, discussion with retailers
- Visit of Had Hmoi Village; discussion with the head of village, visits and discussion with farmers
- Discussion with Pak Xiang District Livestock Officer
- Visit of the chicken parents stock centre
- Visit and discussion at the Luang Prabang hatchery
- Meeting with Provincial Livestock Office Staff in Luang Prabang Province  
Mr Pheng KHAMMAVONG, Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Section  
Mr SENGPASITH, Deputy Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Section  
Mrs CHANESAMON, Trainer  
Mrs KOKDAVONH, VVW training  
Mr KHAMPHAY, responsible for the incubators  
Mr HUOMPHEANG, EU Livestock Project Coordinator  
Mrs KESONE, VVW training  
Mr KHAMPHOUY, Meat Inspector
- Meeting with District Livestock Office Staff in Chomphet District:  
Mr Houmphaeng PHONSAYA, Deputy Chief  
Mr KHAMSING, Chief of the Livestock and Fisheries Unit  
Mrs Somsagnouan KHAMSOUKSAVATH, AHPM  
Mr Toui BOUALAPHANH, responsible for FLSP  
Mr VIENGSAI, Veterinary Services

#### **October 31:**

- Visit of the Luang Prabang slaughterhouse, discussion with livestock trader and meat inspector
- Visit of the diagnosis lab; meeting with Mr SYSENG
- Meeting with Mr PRADICHIT
- Meeting with Mr PHENG
- Meeting with Ms DIDERON

- Attendance to the closing session of the workshop on the evaluation of VVW training
- Meeting with Mr Thy SONG, Director of Agricultural Promotion Bank, Luang Prabang Branch
- Meeting with Khamtan SOMPHANVILAY, Deputy Chief of External Relations Bureau in Luang Prabang Province

#### **November 1:**

- Travel from Luang Prabang to Luang Namtha
- Visit of the Oudom Xay chicken parent stocks farm with Mr DONANGPHASIT B., CHOMMIYA, Ms SENGDALATH A. and Mr BENTLEY C.
- Discussion in a Hmong village and in a pig raising village

#### **November 2:**

- Meeting with Mr KEOVILAY S. and KHAMPHAENG
- Visit and discussion at Chaleansouk village
- Meeting with Mr CHENAYVONG O.
- Visit of the Luang Namtha pig breeding and training centre
- Meeting with Muang Sing District Livestock and Fisheries Unit Staff:  
Mr Chanhsouk CHANTHAXAY, Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Unit  
Mr Khamphaeng PHANAVANT, Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Section  
Mr KHAMPHAY, Deputy Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Unit
- Visit to the check post in Pak Khong, Laos-China border

#### **November 3:**

- Meeting with Mr KEOVILAY
- Visit of the Luang Namtha chicken breeding and training centre
- Visit of farmers in Thongdi village; discussion with VVW
- Visit of farmers in Donesamphanh village
- Visit of farmers in Phonxaysavang village
- Meeting with Mr Khamphaeng PHANAVANT, Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Section
- Meeting with Mr SOUPHAVANH, EU Livestock Project Co-ordinator in Luang Namtha Province

#### **November 4:**

- Visit of Luang Namtha meat market
- Travel Luang Namtha – Vientiane

#### **November 5:**

- Meeting at PMU
- Meeting at TCO with Mr GRIFFITH
- Meeting with Mr BARD
- Visit at the CIMU
- Meeting with Mr Roger KHAMPHET, Chief of DLF Technical Division



**November 6:**

- Meeting with Mr Somphanh CHANPHENGSAI, Chief of DLF Planning Division
- Meeting with Mr Khamphone HAO ONECHANH, Director of National Animal Health Centre
- Meeting with Mrs Maythong SONIVATH, Chief of Animal Feed Laboratory

**November 7 – 11:**

- report drafting

**November 12:**

- meeting with Mr NORACHACK
- meeting at the PMU
- report drafting

**November 13:**

- meeting with Mr PHONSIVAY
- report drafting

**November 14:**

- report drafting

**November 15:**

- Debriefing meeting in Vientiane

**November 16:**

- Travel Vientiane-Bangkok
- Debriefing at EC delegation in Bangkok

**November 17:**

- Travel Bangkok-Europe

**December 4:**

- Debriefing at Brussels EC Headquarters

#### 4. Persons met

BALDWIN B.:	First Secretary, EC Delegation, Bangkok
BARD, D.:	Consultant on credit management for TCO in Vientiane
BENTLEY C.:	Project consultant for extension in new provinces
BOUALY M.:	Director, DLF Poultry Breeding Station and Training Centre, Nongteng
BOUATHONG:	Responsible for Luang Namtha Yellow Chicken scheme, SLSEAP
BOUALAPHANH T.:	Responsible for FLSP, District Livestock Office, Chomphet District
BOUNMA P.:	Legislation Unit, Technical division, DLF
CHANESAMON :	Trainer, Luang Prabang Province
CHANPHENGSAI S.:	Chief of DLF Planning Division
CHANTHAXAY:	Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Unit, Muang Sing District
CHANTHIP P.:	PAFO Deputy Head, Sayaboury Province
CHAYYNAVONG O.:	Deputy Director, Provincial Agriculture & Forestry Department, Luang Namtha Province
CHOMMIYA:	Oudom Xay Livestock District Officer
DALE M.:	Livestock Officer, EC Brussels Headquarters
DE KONING M.:	Luang Prabang Livestock Advisor, SLSEAP
DIDERON S.:	Former Junior Extensionist TA, SLESEAP
DONANGPHASIT B. :	Oudom Xay Chief of Livestock Section
DOUANG NDEUNG B.:	Director, DLF – Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory
GRIFFITH G.:	Rural Development Programme Officer, Technical Co-ordination Office for the EC Co-operation Programmes in Lao PDR
HAO ONECHANH K.:	Director of National Animal Health Centre, DLF
INTHAVONG P.:	Legislation Unit, Technical division, DLF
JANSONIUS J.:	FAO Consultant for the Market Information and Extension Project
KEOVILAY S.:	Luang Namtha Project Co-ordinator, SLSEAP
KESONE:	VWW training, Luang Prabang Province
KHAMMAVONG P.:	Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Section, Luang Prabang Province
KHAMPHAY:	Responsible for the incubators, Luang Prabang Province
KHAMPHAY:	Deputy Chief, Livestock and Fisheries Unit, Muang Sing District
KHAMPHAENG:	Director, Luang Namtha Livestock Section
KHAMPHET R.:	Chief of DLF Technical Division
KHAMPHOUY:	Meat Inspector, Luang Prabang Province
KHAMSING:	Chief of the Livestock and Fisheries Unit, District Livestock Office, Chomphet District
KHANSOUVONG H. P:	Luang Prabang Provincial Project Director, SLSEAP
KHAMSOUKSAVATH S.:	AHPM, District Livestock Office, Chomphet District
KHIMPHONG:	Director, DLF, Nongteng Pig Breeding Station and Training Centre
KHOUNSY S.:	Chief of Epidemiology Section / Project Mobile Unit Co-ordinator, DLF
KOENIG:	Luang Prabang EU Micro-projects TA
KOKDAVONH:	VWW training, Luang Prabang Province
LAKSIVY S.:	Veterinary Extension and EU Livestock Project Co-ordinator, Sayaboury Province
NORACHACK B.:	Head of CIMU, DLF
OOSTERWIJK G.:	TA, Project Livestock and Extension Specialist, SLSEAP



PARISAK PRAVONGVIENGKHAM P.: Permanent Secretary Office, MAF

PHANAVANT K.: Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Section, Muang Sing District

PHANVONGSA K.: Project Management Assistant, SLSEAP

PHENG: Director, Luang Prabang Livestock Section

PHIPHAKHAVONG S.: Director, DLF – Animal Vaccine Production Institute

PHOLSENA K.: Vice-President, MAF – Committee for Planning and Co-operation

PHONEKHAMPHENG O.: Head of Department of Livestock and Fisheries, National University of Lao PDR, Faculty of Agriculture

PHONSAYA H.: Deputy Chief, District Livestock Office, Chomphet District

PHONSIVAY S.: Director, DLF

PHONVICHITH V.: Fisheries Unit, Provincial Livestock Office, Sayabouri Province

PRADICHIT S.: Deputy Director, Provincial Agriculture & Forestry Department, Luang Prabang province

SAYASONE C.: Apprentice at CIMU

SAYNATHI S.: Deputy Head of the Provincial Livestock Office, Sayabouri Province

SENGDALATH A.: Oudom Xay Project Co-ordinator, SLSEAP

SENGPASITH : Deputy Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Section, Luang Prabang Province

SIRIVONGSA D.: Assistant to the National Co-ordinator, SLSEAP

SITHIXAY V.: Veterinary Drugs, Sayabouri Province

SOMBOONSUB N.: Projects economist, Bangkok EC Delegation

SOMPHANVILAY K.: Deputy Chief, External Relations Bureau in Luang Prabang Province

SONG T.: Director, Agricultural Promotion Bank, Luang Prabang Branch

SONIVATH M.: Chief of Animal Feed Laboratory, DLF

SOUBANG: Lao PDR manager, Gold Coin

SOUKSENGPHET B.: Chief of Livestock and Fisheries Unit, Luang Prabang Province

SYSANETH S.: Academic Officer and teaching staff, National University of Lao PDR, Faculty of Agriculture

THADAVONG K.: Director of Planning Division, MAF – Department of Agriculture

THORATHY S.: Head of the Provincial Livestock Office, Sayabouri Province

VAN AKEN D.: TA, Co-Director, SLSEAP

VAN DE VELDE P.: Co-ordinator, Technical Co-ordination Office for the EC Co-operation Programmes in Lao PDR

VANASOUK T.: Deputy Director General, MAF - AFEA/NAFES

VIENGSAI: Veterinary Services, District Livestock Office, Chomphet District

VONGTHILATH S.: Project National Co-Director, SLSEAP

YEO N.: Headquarter manager, Gold Coin Singapore

WISSOCQ Y.: Board member, J. Van Lancker

## **5. Literature and documentation consulted**

- Agristudio – J. Van Lancker Association, “Report of the Livestock Marketing Specialist: January-March 1999”, March 1999
- Agristudio – J. Van Lancker Association, “Report of the Livestock Marketing Specialist: March-April 2000”, April 2000
- Agristudio – J. Van Lancker Association, “Report of the Diagnostic Laboratory Specialist: February-March 2000”, March 2000
- Agristudio – J. Van Lancker Association, “Report of the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist: May-June 1999”, June 1999
- Agristudio – J. Van Lancker Association, “Report of the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist: May-June 2000”, June 2000
- Agristudio – J. Van Lancker Association, “Report of the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist: July-August 2001”, August 2001
- Agristudio – J. Van Lancker Association, “Report of the Second Mission of the Diagnostic Laboratory Specialist: May-June 2001”, June 2001
- Agristudio – J. Van Lancker Association, “Report of the Vaccine Laboratory Specialist: November-December 1998”, December 1998
- Agristudio – J. Van Lancker Association, “Report of the Vaccine Laboratory Specialist: November-December 1998”, December 1998
- Agristudio – J. Van Lancker Association, “Report of the Veterinary Parasitology Specialist: November 1999”, November 1999
- CIMU, “Animal Health, production and extension Module (AHPM) in Luangnamtha, Luangprabang, Champask, Bolikhamxay Provinces, 8/2000 – 31/1/2001”
- DANAGRO Adviser a/s, “The impact of 10 years of involvement of Micro-Projects I and II in Luang Prabang province, in Ban Kok Van ( Luang Prabang District) and Ban Nam Bo (Phonxay district), September 2001
- DLF, “Brief report on Vaccine Production Laboratory Improvement (During Implementation of AWP4 of the PMU)”, August 2001
- DLF, “Regional workshop on animal movement management and FMD control in the lower Mekong basin”, June 2001
- DLF, “Sixth Meeting of the OIE Sub-Commission for FMD in South-East Asia: Country Report of Lao PDR”, April 2000
- EC, “Addendum N°1 to financing agreement N° LAO/B7-3000/IB/ALA/96/19”, August 2001
- EC, “Evaluation in the European Commission – A guide to the Evaluation Procedures and Structures currently operational in the Commission’s external Co-operation Programmes”, March 2001-09-02
- EC, “Financing agreement between the European Commission and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic – “Strengthening of Livestock Services and Extension Activities”, October 1997
- EC – TCO – Lao PDR, “Credit Mission in Lao PDR, 1 may – 30 June 2001”, June 2001
- PMU, “Fourth Annual Work Plan”, November 2000
- PMU, “Improved rural pig production”, draft
- PMU, “Improved rural poultry production”, December 2000
- PMU, “Livestock sector profile of Luangnamtha province”, June 2000
- PMU, “Livestock sector profile of Luangprabang province”, June 2000
- PMU, “Minutes of the PMU-Planning Meeting, 5<sup>th</sup> October 2001
- PMU, “Monitoring and evaluation – Output Monitoring report – (1 November 2000 – 30 April 2001)”, May 2001



- PMU, “Monitoring and evaluation – Output Monitoring report – (intermediate tables: 1 May 2001 – 30 September 2001)”, November 2001
- PMU, “Overall Work Plan”, July 1998
- PMU, “Progress reports N° 1 to 9”, May 1998 to August 2001
- PMU, “Project presentation”, October 2001
- PMU, “ Report of the baseline survey”, June 2001
- PMU, “Report of year-line survey 2000”, October 2000
- PMU, “VWV manual”, under press
- SETA, “Strengthening of Livestock Services and Extension Activities – Preparation mission – Final report”, September 1996
- Steering Committee for the Agricultural Census – Agricultural Census Office, “ Lao Agricultural Census, 1998/99 – Highlights”, February 2000
- TCP/LAO/0065 (DOA/FAO), “Questionnaire abattoir” and “Questionnaire Livestock Trader”, July 2001

## 6. Logical framework

	INTERVENTION LOGIC	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS
OVERALL OBJECTIVE	Smallholders' financial autonomy and capacity of initiative enhanced by improved income from livestock rearing Beneficiaries: 100,000 households in Northern Lao PDR			
PURPOSE	Disease incidence reduced, management practice improved and livestock productivity increased. Veterinary services and extension network strengthened at all levels for an efficient and sustainable delivery of animal health and production services <u>Target group:</u> Small holder farmers in villages in up to 30 districts in Northern Lao PDR, belonging to 3 ethnic groups: Lao Loum, Lao Theung, Lao Soung.	Decrease in mortality and morbidity rates Decrease in Nr of disease outbreaks Increase in animal productivity Increase in off take rates Increase in reporting from AHP providers Overall increase in farmers' herds & flocks productivity	Bench mark survey M&E reports Field reports (VFW, district, province, central DLF) PMU reports	Farmers adhere to farming lifestyle
OUTPUTS	<b>1. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMME</b> 1.1. Veterinary legislation adapted 1.2. Operational check posts for control of animal movements and diseases 1.3. Skills in meat inspection upgraded	Translated legal documents; reviewed legislation Increased operational capacity of check posts; increased number of check posts Number of meat inspectors trained Legislation passed and enforced relating to check posts and meat inspection	PMU and DLF reports	Law presented to National Assembly by 2000. Check post location reflects accurately major stock routes. GOL Willing to pass and act on legislation
	<b>2. INFORMATION SYSTEMS</b> 2.1. Efficient nation-wide Animal Health Information System 2.2. Improved capacity in planning livestock development and animal disease control 2.2.1. Accurate market monitoring system established 2.2.2. Operational documentation centre on AHP and extension	Market study available; Nr of DLF staff trained Provinces equipped for AHIS; documented information collection strategy Operational documentation centre Provincial and District reports. Harmonised AHIS developed. Nr of villages following harmonised AHIS. Nr of villages following Market Reporting systems.	PMU reports Documentation centre DLF reports	Proposed AHIS is fully developed and ready for use. Cooperation between Provinces and Centre. Satisfactory [uniform] reporting system used.
	<b>3. LABORATORY</b> 3.1. Capacity for national vaccine production adapted to needs 3.2. Improved capacity for disease diagnosis	List of equipment repaired; list of new equipment; number of vaccine doses produced List of equipment; list of available tests; number of tests made available and carried out at each lab.	DLF, ADDL, PMU reports	Sufficiently high educational level of technical staff can be obtained by refresher courses, to follow specialized training courses. Diagnostic laboratory building constructed
	<b>4. EXTENSION</b> 4.1. Extension packages for AHP developed 4.2. Delivery of veterinary and animal production services in Northern Lao PDR strengthened	List of personnel trained; training manuals Nr of VFW active M&E reports Nr of animals vaccinated and/or treated Nr of farmers that adopt recommended AHP techniques Nr of farmers trained Demonstration units established Revolving funds established Cooperative ventures with sister projects	DLF, PMU reports Documentation Centre M&E reports, provincial and district reports.	Partner programmes are operational in the districts. Partner programmes can serve as a conduit for livestock activities. Adequate logistics (air and land transportation). Participatory involvement of livestock owners in animal health and production services delivery. Cost recovery system accepted by livestock owners. An officially accepted strategy is found to level vaccine and medicine price across areas.
	<b>5. REGIONAL COORDINATION</b> Regional and sub-regional coordination for animal disease eradication enhanced	Nr of regional meetings, workshops, conferences, study tours attended and/or organised Radio / Television Broadcasts	PMU reports Papers presented at meetings, conferences	Commitment of Lao PDR and neighbouring countries for regional coordination
	<b>6. INFORMATION/COMMUNICATION</b> Public awareness on EC-supported action in the field of AHP	Brochures, pamphlets, publications produced	PMU reports Documentation Centre	
	<b>7. MANAGEMENT AND M&amp;E</b> Operational PMU office established Monitoring and Evaluation system established	PMU office at DLF M&E unit created, M&E forms, reporting system Project approach and methodology adopted and continued by DLF	DLF, PMU reports M&E reports	



ACTIVITIES	1. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMME 1.1. Translation of legal documents; strengthen enforcement of legislation; training of 1 officer; review legislation 1.2. Equip check posts; train staff; construction of new check posts 1.3. Training on meat inspection; regional training	RESOURCES (following FA)	COST (X 1000 Euro)		
			EC	GoL	Total
2. INFORMATION SYSTEMS 2.1. Market study; establish monitoring system; training of district officers; continuous market monitoring 2.2. Training provincial staff; equip provinces; test information collection strategy; regional training; continuous AH monitoring 2.3. Establish documentation centre; continuous updating on information; operate documentation centre	3. LABORATORY 3.1. Vaccine laboratory; rehabilitation + new equipment; staff training; consultancy 3.2. Diagnostic laboratories; rehabilitation; provide equipment and consumables; organize mobile units; train staff; carry out surveys on animal diseases; consultancy	1. SERVICES			
		1.1. European T.A.	1,690	-	1,690
4. EXTENSION Bench mark survey; establish M&E systems Multidisciplinary training of extension officers Prepare AHP extension packages Design extension methodology Strengthen provincial and district staff with equipment Training of provincial and district staff on AHP Train VVW; provide equipment; evaluate VVW Establish revolving fund for purchase of drugs to supply VVW AHP: pilot scheme; extend coverage in LP, LN, other provinces	5. REGIONAL COORDINATION Participate in/ organize regional meetings-activities; integrate in regional veterinary associations; representation	1.2. Local T.A.	40	-	40
		1.3. Audit and Evaluation	100	-	100
6. INFORMATION/COMMUNICATION Assure visibility of project activities; produce information materials	7. MANAGEMENT AND M&E Rehabilitate + equip PMU office; procure vehicles Employ support staff; train DLF staff; annual project workshop Preparation WP/B; reporting; audit; PSC meetings Continuous internal M&E; representation	1.4. Training	503	-	503
		2. SUPPLIES			
7. OTHERS: REGIONAL COORDINATION	8. CONTINGENCIES	2.1. Equipment	1,720	-	1,720
		2.2. Consumables	30	-	30
TOTAL		3. BUILDING WORKS	60	75	135
		4. INFORMATION-COMMUNICATION	50	-	50
		5. OPERATION			
		5.1. Local staff	496	280	776
		5.2. Others	210	45	255
		6. CREDIT (REVOLVING FUND)	200	-	200
		7. OTHERS: REGIONAL COORDINATION	100	-	100
		8. CONTINGENCIES	501	-	501
		TOTAL	5,700	400	6,100

## **7. DAC summary**

### **Evaluation Title (+ Evaluation Reference)**

“Strengthening of Livestock Services and Extension Activities Project” (SLSEAP), Laos:

ALA/96/19 - Mid-Term Review

### **Abstract**

*The project has two distinct facets: the first is a programme of institutional strengthening for the DLF itself – concentrating almost exclusively upon its Disease Control and Disease Surveillance capacities; the second concentrates upon identifying appropriate packages of technology to improve the productivity of livestock husbandry systems, and piloting models for their effective extension and sustainable adoption at village level.*

### **Subject of the evaluation**

SLSEAP represents six years of EC development assistance to the Department of Livestock and Fisheries, in Laos. The project began on 01/02/98 and is due to end on 31/01/04: although, by a rider signed in August '01, its life may be extended to October 2001. The Project's purpose is to assist the DLF, in collaboration with Provincial and District Administrations, to reduce the incidence of disease and to improve livestock management and marketing practices: thereby facilitating an increase in the productivity of livestock husbandry systems in the Country.

### **Evaluation description**

Purpose: to provide an independent assessment for all the stakeholders (GoL, EC, project team) of the achievements to date, together with both positive and negative aspects of the implementation in order to confirm or no whether the programme should continue in its present form or whether there is a need for a reorientation.

Methodology: the review was conducted by a team of three independent consultants, expert in their own right in the key fields of project activity, who, after briefings in Brussels and Bangkok, spent 4 weeks visiting the project and DLF in Vientiane, and provincial and district officials and farmers at its field sites in the provinces.

### **Main findings**

Various factors have changed since its preparation in 1996 and the project adapted to changing situations as it goes along. One key area of change is the current programme of restructuring of MAF, subsequent to the general process of decentralization of government that has recently been completed. These continuing changes have created delays, obstacles, and uncertainties in the progress of some of the institutional aspects of the project; and, until it has been conclusively decided for just which areas of livestock development activity the DLF and its counterpart sections in the provinces and districts will remain responsible, these uncertainties will remain.

On the other hand, change is also slowly but steadily evolving in the market place, with liberalization of trade and encouragement of the private sector. This can only benefit the agricultural and rural economic strategies of the Country in its aims to create opportunities for diversification and to lift people out of subsistence agriculture into market-oriented systems of production. This complements the aims and outputs of the extension side of the Project, which is operating more at grassroots level, and where better progress has been made. Farmers are beginning to show a concrete interest in the more commercial, market-oriented systems of livestock production that the project is promoting. However, because the extension services are so very weak, the project has to do more itself. It has adopted a participatory approach to the development and extension of these new technologies, and is largely reliant upon 'key farmers' to adopt and demonstrate the new methods to their neighbours in the village. Also, the project is piloting several small-scale credit schemes to enable more farmers to buy into these technologies. Additionally, it is training and strengthening the cadre of VVWs so that it might be better able to provide support to these (and other) farmers and help protect them from unnecessary losses from disease.

The Project is very much in line with the Country's development policy; it has generally received good, practical and pragmatic advice from its visiting experts; and, within the limits of its resources, has been well supported by the DLF. However, despite the quite good progress made to date, it will neither be completed nor sustainable from local resources (neither financial nor human) by 2004. Key areas of doubt lie with the operational funding of the



Vaccine Unit and Diagnostic Laboratory: neither can ever expect to be self-supporting yet, during the Project's lifetime, they have been receiving progressively smaller budgets from the Government to sustain their activities.

## **Recommendations**

The principal recommendation of the MTRM is:

- **Consideration should now be given to the need for a second phase of this Project, extending to 2009/10; and to how best this may be achieved seamlessly, without any gap in time or resources occurring between the end of one Phase and the start of the next.**

Other key recommendations include:

in respect of the Check-Posts and Meat Inspection sub-components:

- **urgent action is needed from the DLF to enable the Project to make its proper contribution to these two sub-components, or else consider dropping them from the Project.**

in respect of the Information Systems component:

- **there is an urgent need to strengthen the manpower resources in CIMU.**

in respect of the Vaccine and Diagnostic laboratories:

- **DLF and the Project should begin now to address issues of their cost and sustainability, and start soon to design an exit strategy which might help to secure their future.**

in respect of Extension and Field Services:

- **in the interests of the producers, and in the interests of the promotion of production for the market place, the markets in livestock and their products should be completely liberalised.**
- **the Project should first consolidate its present extension and demonstration activities in LPP and LPN before expanding further therein; then, focusing on a few clusters of villages, it should move slowly but steadily into only two or three more Provinces during the remainder of this Phase.**
- **to support the Project's extension activities, its TA presence in the North should be strengthened.**
- **DLF is urged to give official approval to the methodologies and technologies which the Project is promoting: so that other projects, organizations, NGOs, Volunteers... may also be encouraged to adopt and develop the SLSEAP systems and thereby facilitate their wider spread – this networking of extension activities should become a significant component of the next phase of the Project.**
- **the roles and status of the VVWs need to be rationalized, clearly defined, and regularized within the law. Support for their operation should be an obligation of the District Livestock Office.**

## **Feedback**

To be completed by Europe Aid/H/6 (5 lines max)

Donor : <b>Commission Européenne</b>	Region <sup>7</sup> : <b>LAO PDR</b>	DAC sector <sup>8</sup>
Evaluation type <sup>9</sup> : <b>effectiveness</b>	Date of report <sup>10</sup> : <b>05/12/2001</b>	Subject of evaluation <sup>11</sup>
Language : <b>English</b>	N° vol./pages <sup>12</sup> : <b>52</b>	Authors : <b>Freeland G. Renard J.F. – Fusilier P.</b>

Programme and budget line concerned <sup>13</sup> : <b>ALA</b>			
Type of evaluation :	( ) ex-ante	( <b>X</b> ) immediate	( ) ex-post
Timing :	Start : <b>17/10/2001</b>	Completion : <b>5/12/2001</b>	

<sup>7</sup> If more than 3 countries but not continent-wide, choose a geographical region

<sup>8</sup> Choose from standard list

<sup>9</sup> Choose between : relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact

<sup>10</sup> Date as on cover page of report

<sup>11</sup> Choose one of : programme/project/sector/country or region/synthesis/thematic/NGO

<sup>12</sup> Indicate number of pages per volume (e.g. 72 pp ; 80 pp ; 102 pp in case of 3 volumes)

<sup>13</sup> Budget line (EDF, Tacis, Phare, etc...)

Contact person <sup>14</sup> : <b>M. DALE</b>	Authors : <b>Freeland G. - Renard J.F. – Fusilier P.</b>
Cost <sup>15</sup> :	Steering group :

## 8. Monitoring and Evaluation

### 8.1. Monitoring

	INTERVENTION LOGIC	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	PLANNED in project preparation	EFFECTIVE
OVERALL OBJECTIVE	Smallholders' financial autonomy and capacity of initiative enhanced by improved income from livestock rearing Beneficiaries: 100,000 households in Northern Lao PDR			
PURPOSE	Disease incidence reduced, management practice improved and livestock productivity increased. Veterinary services and extension network strengthened at all levels for an efficient and sustainable delivery of animal health and production services <u>Target group:</u> Small holder farmers in villages in up to 30 districts in Northern Lao PDR, belonging to 3 ethnic groups: Lao Loum, Lao Theung, Lao Soung.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decrease in mortality and morbidity rates</li> <li>- Decrease in Nr of disease outbreaks</li> <li>- Increase in animal productivity</li> <li>- Increase in off take rates</li> <li>- Increase in reporting from AHP providers</li> <li>- Overall increase in farmers' herds &amp; flocks productivity</li> </ul>	<p>25% after 4 years</p> <p>11% in Y 6</p>	<p>Checking still impossible</p> <p>Id.</p> <p>Id.</p> <p>Id.</p> <p>See § 2.3.1.</p> <p>Checking still impossible</p>

<sup>14</sup> Name of the responsible person in Europe Aid/H/6

<sup>15</sup> Cost of the evaluation



<b>OUTPUTS</b>	<b>1. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMME</b>			
	1.1. Veterinary legislation adapted	- Translated legal documents		Yes and spread; 2 workshop held.
		- Reviewed legislation	Y 4	Planned for November 2001
	1.2. Operational check posts for control of animal movements and diseases	- Increased operational capacity of check posts;	15 in Y 2	None
		- Increased number of check posts	10 in Y 4	None
	1.3. Skills in meat inspection upgraded	- Number of meat inspectors trained	2 in Y2 30 in Y6	None
		- Legislation passed and enforced relating to check posts and meat inspection	Y 2	No
	<b>2. INFORMATION SYSTEMS</b>			
	2.1. Efficient nation-wide Animal Health Information System	- Provincial and District reports.	25 Staff trained in Y 2	163 staff trained
		- Harmonised AHIS developed.	Y 3	yes
		- Nr of villages following harmonised AHIS.	Y 4 – 6	18 provinces
		- Provinces equipped for AHIS;	Y 2	Yes
		- Documented information collection strategy	Y 3	Yes
	2.2. Improved capacity in planning livestock development and animal disease control			
	2.2.1. Accurate market monitoring system established	- Market study available;	Y 2	Yes
		- Nr of DLF staff trained	135 in Y 3	44 staff trained; ongoing through TCP
		- Nr of villages following Market Reporting systems.	from Y 3	None
	2.2.2. Operational documentation centre on AHP and extension	- Operational documentation centre	Y 1- 2	Yes

	<b>3. LABORATORY</b>			
	3.1. Capacity for national vaccine production adapted to needs	- List of equipment repaired;	Y 1 – 2	Available
		- list of new equipment;	Y 2 – 3	Available, provision still ongoing
		- Number of vaccine doses produced		3,5 million distributed in 1998 and 4,4 million in 2000
	3.2. Improved capacity for disease diagnosis	- List of equipment;	Y 1 – 3	Available
		- List of available tests;	Y 2 – 3	Available
		- Number of tests made available and carried out at each lab.	Y 2 – 6	On average per month: 125 from 2/98 to 4/01 and 560 from 5/01 to 7/01; feed back reports: 880 from 2/98 to 4/01 and 181 from 5/01 to 7/01





	<b>6. INFORMATION and COMMUNICATION</b> Public awareness on EC-supported action in the field of AHP	- Brochures, pamphlets, publications produced		Cap, calendar, leaflets, sticker, maps,...
	<b>7. MANAGEMENT AND M&amp;E</b> Operational PMU office established  Monitoring and Evaluation system established	- PMU office at DLF  - M&E unit created,  - M&E forms, reporting system Project approach and methodology adopted and continued by DLF		Yes  Eval. Process ongoing at CIMU; Monitoring effective in project  Effective; data management has to be strengthened at DLF level (CIMU)



## 8.2. Animal productivity baseline

Livestock productivity was estimated by using similar simplified mathematical models of herd development, fed by the technical parameters assessed during the various approaches. Where the parameters were not completely assessed, those of the project preparation were remained.

Data “observed” during the project preparation were compiled from the Luang Prabang micro – project, in 1991-1993. AHPem parameters were taken out from average data by district in the Luang Prabang and Luang Namtha Provinces.

### *Estimated livestock annual off-take*

	PROJECT PREPARATION	BASELINE SURVEY	AHPem
<b>BUFFALOES</b>			
- Calculated	12,3%	12,6%	14,5%
- Observed	17,9%	16,0%	-
<b>CATTLE :</b>			
- Calculated	14,5%	15,1%	14,7%
- Observed	21,4%	7,0%	-
<b>PIG :</b>			
- Calculated	32,8%	40,1%	32,5%
- Observed	29,9%	38,0%	-
<b>POULTRY :</b>			
- Calculated	221%	151%	190%

The various assessments look coherent among themselves, even if the MTRM confidence in some data and analysis is not complete.

The AHPem process should enable the differences in farmers’ productivity to be highlighted, from 42 to 99 %, expected further from the project (Y 10). However, the management of APHEM data must still be broadly improved at the CIMU level. Finally, strong variation following villages and farms implies consequent samples; only AHPem system, foreseen on 100 villages, could insure it in the future, but the accuracy of the indicators should be improved and estimated every time.

It has to be noticed, on the one hand, that the poultry productivity may be even lower than initially assessed. On the other hand, the buffalo herd may either be overexploited, or reproduce at levels different from those indicated.

## 9. DLF and Centres budget

### DLF BUDGET : SALARIES AND OPERATING COSTS

	1995-1996	1996-1997	1997-1998	1998-1999	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002 (Estimate)
<b>SALARIES</b>	53.780.546	56.938.992	56.076.870	132.573.108	118.512.914	118.420.003	149.746.776
<b>OPERATING BUDGET</b>	216.519.478	364.718.103	346.722.476	472.854.764	359.891.382	149.998.000	360.000.000
<b>TOTAL</b>	270.300.024	421.657.095	402.799.346	605.427.872	478.404.296	268.418.003	509.746.776

### NATIONAL ANIMAL HEALTH CENTRE BUDGET

#### Central Government Budget

	1996-1997	1997-1998	1998-1999	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002 (Estimate)
<b>Veterinary Extension</b>	32.999.185	29.988.000	30.998.700	44.987.620	29.994.650	100.000.000
<b>Vaccine Institute</b>	14.971.773	44.952.700	29.996.900	44.995.550	49.998.800	
<b>Diagnostic Laboratory</b>	9.999.700					
<b>ACIAR</b>			4.987.900			
<b>FMD</b>				19.992.770		
<b>Improvement of Check Posts</b>	5.999.986					
<b>Milk Quality Control</b>				4.987.660		
<b>Building</b>					330.000.000	400.000.000
<b>TOTAL</b>	63.970.644	74.940.700	65.983.500	114.963.600	409.993.450	500.000.000

### NATIONAL ANIMAL HEALTH CENTRE BUDGET

#### EU Budget (EURO)

	<b>WP01</b> From 01/02/1998 to 31/01/1999	<b>WP02</b> From 01/02/1999 to 31/01/2000	<b>WP03</b> From 01/02/2000 to 31/01/2001	<b>WP04</b> From 01/02/2001 to 31/01/2002
<b>Laboratory Vaccine Unit</b>	2,145.54	29,590.98	76,104.55	12,139.38
<b>Laboratory Diagnostic Unit</b>	989.80	82,853.15	72,356.41	60,381.39
<b>TOTAL</b>	3,135.34	112,444.13	148,460.96	72,520.77



### 10. Project Financial Evolution

COMPONENTS	OWP	AWPI		BALANCE AFTER AWP1	AWP2		BALANCE AFTER AWP2	AWP3		BALANCE AFTER AWP3	AWP4		BALANCE AFTER AWP4
		PMU	EC		PMU	EC		PMU	EC		PMU	EC	
LEGISLATION	79,000	0	0	79,000 0.00 %	1,191	0	77,809 1.51 %	10,102	0	67,707 14.29 %	200	0	67,507 14.55 %
INFORMATION SYSTEMS	133,700	4,219	0	129,481 3.16 %	30,186	0	99,295 25.73 %	30,526	0	68,769 48.56 %	13,025	0	55,744 58.31 %
LABORATORY VACCINE UNIT	545,000	2,146	0	542,854 0.39 %	29,591	0	513,263 6.22 %	76,105	141,958	295,200 45.83 %	12,139	99,125	183,936 66.25 %
DIAGNOSTIC NETWORK	654,000	990	0	653,010 0.15 %	82,853	0	570,157 12.82 %	72,356	245,754	252,047 61.46 %	70,202	0	181,845 72.19 %
EXTENSION	875,800	7,779	0	868,021 0.89 %	71,070	0	796,951 9.00 %	193,866	0	603,085 31.14 %	182,720	0	420,365 52.00 %
REGIONAL COORDINATION	100,000	0	0	100,000 %	5,734	0	94,266 94.27 %	9,746	0	84,520 15.48 %	14,169	0	70,351 29.65 %
INFORMATION/ COMMUNICATION	50,000	1,603	0	48,397 1.60 %	11,567	0	36,830 26.34 %	12,014	0	24,816 50.37 %	2,747	0	22,069 55.86 %
MANAGEMENT M&E	971,500	73,941	0	897,559 7.61 %	95,367	114,692	687,500 29.23 %	133,313	0	554,187 42.96 %	106,169	0	448,018 53.88 %
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,409,000</b>	<b>90,678</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,318,322</b> <b>2.66 %</b>	<b>327,559</b>	<b>114,692</b>	<b>2,876,071</b> <b>15.63 %</b>	<b>538,028</b>	<b>387,712</b>	<b>1,950,331</b> <b>42.79 %</b>	<b>401,371</b>	<b>99,125</b>	<b>1,449,835</b> <b>57.47 %</b>

## 11. DLF Structure in 2001

(Total Number of Staff at the Central Government Level : 60 + 5 abroad = 65)

### **MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY (MAF)**

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LIVESTOCK AND FISHERIES (3)**

##### **PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION DIVISION (5)**

Organisation-Personnel Unit (2)  
Administration –Finance Unit (2)  
Policy Unit (1)

##### **TECHNICAL DIVISION (8)**

Veterinary Unit (1)  
Livestock Unit (5)  
Fisheries Unit (2)

##### **PLANNING AND COOPERATION DIVISION (7)**

Statistics and Technical Information Unit (1)  
Cooperation and Investment Unit (2)  
Planning and Budget Unit (2)  
Aquaculture Improvement Project (0)  
Lao-EU Livestock Project (2)

##### **NATIONAL ANIMAL HEALTH CENTRE (30)**

Director + Administrative Staff (4)  
Vaccine Institute (14)  
Veterinary Supply Unit (2)  
Epidemiology (2)  
Diagnostic Laboratory (7)  
Animal Inspection, Hygiene and  
Quarantine Management (1)

##### **ANIMAL FEED LABORATORY (6)**

#### **PROVINCIAL LIVESTOCK AND FISHERIES OFFICES (252)**

#### **DISTRICT LIVESTOCK AND FISHERIES OFFICES (563)**



## 12. DLF Strucure in 1998

(Total Staff at Central Government Level: 143)

