



**CTB**

**AGENCE BELGE  
DE DÉVELOPPEMENT**

**ANNUAL REPORT 2010**

**APEL PROGRAM**

**SUPPORT TO SMALL STOCK**

# **Table of content**

<b>1 PROJECT FORM .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2 SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION .....	5
2.2 KEY POINTS .....	5
2.3 LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	5
<b>3 EVOLUTION OF THE CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1 INSTITUTIONAL ANCHORING AND EXECUTION MODALITIES .....	8
4.2.1 Indicators .....	8
4.3 RESULT 1 .....	10
4.3.2 Evaluation of activities .....	10
4.4 RESULT 2 (A GENETIC IMPROVEMENT SYSTEM OF SMALL RUMINANTS, PIGS, RABBITS AND POULTRY IS INITIATED AND APPROPRIATE BREEDING TECHNIQUES ARE EXTENDED.) .....	13
4.4.2 Evaluation of activities .....	13
4.4.3 Analysis of progress made.....	13
4.5 RESULT 3 (THE PRIVATE SECTOR, INCLUDING MICRO FINANCE, HAS DEVELOPED THE SMALL STOCK VALUE CHAIN.).....	15
4.5.2 Evaluation of activities .....	16
4.5.3 Analysis of progress made.....	16
4.6 RESULT 4 (MINAGRI'S CAPACITIES ARE STRENGTHENED AT NATIONAL AND DISTRICT LEVEL.).....	17
4.6.2 Evaluation of activities .....	18
4.6.3 Analysis of progress made.....	18
<b>5 BENEFICIARIES .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>6 FOLLOW-UP OF THE DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE STEERING COMMITTEE.</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>7 ANNEXES.....</b>	<b>22</b>



## 1 Project form

Title	Programme d'Appui au petit élevage (APEL) Support to small stock development program.
Intervention n° DGCD	3006010
Navision code BTC	RWA 08 065 11
Sector	Code CAD 31163
Reference document:	Specific agreement signed on 22/01/2009 between the Republic of Rwanda and the Kingdom of Belgium: length 48 months
National institution in charge of the execution:	MINAGRI (Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'élevage)
Length of the program:	36 months.
Date of effectiveness	01/07/2009
Date of initial closure:	30/06/2012
<b>BUDGET:</b>	
Rwandan contribution:	500 000 € (395 000 000 Rwf)
Belgian contribution:	5 000 000 € (3 950 000 000 Rwf)
General objective	A contribution to poverty reduction is provided by improving the living standard of small stock farmers.
Specific objective	The foundations of a sustainable small stock development system are laid.
Expected outputs	Result 1. Small stock breeding is developed by poor farmers using improved, effective and sustainable production methods. Result 2. A genetic improvement system of small ruminants, pigs, rabbits and poultry is initiated and appropriate breeding techniques are extended. Result 3. The private sector, including micro finance, has developed the small stock value chain. Result 4. MINAGRI's capacities are strengthened at national and district level.
Target group	1. The poor farmer communities: the program will focus on the most vulnerable communities in particular, families owning less than a quarter of a hectare, women and orphans headed families. 2. National institutions (MINAGRI/RARDA, ISAR, ISAE, UNR, ...) involved in developing small stock breeding.
Intervention area	The program will intervene in 5 Districts: Gisagara, Huye, Ngororero, Nyamagabe, Nyaruguru.

## 2 Summary

### 2.1 Analysis of the intervention

Logic of intervention	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Sustainability
Specific objective	X	X	B
Result 1	B	B	B
Result 2	X	C	X
Result 3	X	C	X
Result 4	B	B	B

Scores: A: Very satisfactory (no extra efforts are required)  
B: Satisfactory (efforts have to be reinforced)  
C: Unsatisfactory (measures should be taken)  
D: Very unsatisfactory (measures are indispensable)  
X: criteria has not been assessed

Budget (€)	Expenditure 2009	Expenditure 2010	Balance (31/12/2010)	Disbursement rate (31/12/2010)
5 000 000	190 470	1 598 360	3 211 170	36 %

Budget 2010 (FIT Q1 2010)	Expenditure 2010	Balance	Disbursement rate
1 697 630	1 598 360	94 218	94 %

### 2.2 Key points

- A Memorandum of understanding (MOU) has been signed with each of the 5 Districts of the intervention zone of the program. Four out of five Districts carried out with success their first operation of distribution of animals. Nevertheless, the operation was delayed due to the slowness of administrative procedures.
- MOUs have also been signed with ISAE, ISAR and UPU in the field of sheep, goat and pig genetic improvement. Implementation of technical activities has not started yet.
- The mid term review has been carried out in November 2010.

### 2.3 Lessons learned and recommendations

#### Recommendations:

- Building management capacity of Districts, ISAE (Institut Supérieur d'Agriculture et d'Élevage), ISAR (Institut des Sciences Agronomique du Rwanda) and UPU (Université Polytechnique de Umutara) in the context of the MOUs signed with APEL.
- Support RARDA to ensure the ownership of the technical management of the selection schemes in the context of the MOUs signed with ISAE, ISAR and UPU;
- Put in place a written evaluation system for APEL staff;
- Put in place a monitoring and evaluation system (identification of appropriate indicators, tools for data collecting and processing, risk management). Assessment of the influence of animal distribution on the vulnerability of the target group has to be carried out.
- Respect all recommendations of mid term review report approved by APEL's Steering committee in December 2010.

Lessons learned:

- Districts and other state owned partners (ISAE, ISAR and UPU) are not familiar enough with the administrative procedures of the MOUs. Providing the necessary administrative support to District staff to improve the management of the MOUs and action plans is essential to ensure a proper management of these MOUs.
- In the future, formulation of BTC's projects and programs should provide a logical framework with appropriate and precise indicators.

### 3 Evolution of the context

#### External factors

Due to the devision of labour between donors, Belgium will in the future no longer fund activities in the rural development sector. In this context, funding of a second phase of the APEL program will not be possible. For this reason, APEL program has to focus on the ownership of the activities by RARDA and Districts.

#### Internal factors

(i) The project set up was extremely slow:

- Project staff has been recruited in February 2010 (8 months after starting date) except for the T.A. Planning recruited in June 2010 (11 months after the starting date of the program).
- IT material and office furniture has been has been delivered in the course of Q1 2010.
- Appropriate offices for the program staff were at last available in August 2010.
- The first Director of Intervention (DI) was unavailable for the management of APEL activities due to his work load as Director of Animal Production. The second DI who is also in charge of planning, was appointed in April 2010.

(ii) The ITA is still in charge of DELCO responsibilities in addition to technical responsibilities. He spends most of his time on administrative and financial matters and has only little time for technical issues.

(iii) The Slowness of administrative and financial procedures caused delays in activities execution.

## 4 Analysis of the intervention

### 4.1 Institutional anchoring and execution modalities

- (i) The institutional anchoring is appropriate. However, the program management would be more efficient if the new DI, could be more available to work on APEL issues. He has been available about 50 % of his time for APEL matters.
- (ii) The execution modalities are appropriate. Nevertheless, administrative and financial procedures are very slow and caused delays in activities execution.

### 4.2 Specific objective

#### 4.2.1 Indicators

Logical framework counts 19 indicators. The great majority of these indicators are not exploitable because they are not very precise or because they are not fixed (quantity, time limits: these indicators are either “SMART” nor result oriented). Moreover, these indicators are only about quantity. No quality indicators are available. Only 2 indicators were used in monitoring the program implementation (see result 1): the first one deals with the numbers of small animals distributed and the second one deal with the rate of women as beneficiary.

The mid term review carried out in November 2010, and approved by the Steering Committee in December 2010, has analysed the indicators and proposed more appropriate indicators. These new indicators will be monitored in the course of 2011.

<b>Specific objective:</b> The foundations of a sustainable small stock development system are laid.					Progress:
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Progress 2011</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Increase of the number of animals,			-	-	Since the indicators are not exploitable, their progress has not been monitored.
Reduction of illness rate			-	-	
increase of supply in meat to markets			-	-	

#### 4.2.2 Analysis of the progress made

- (i) Relations between the results and the specific objective: effectiveness of the specific objective can not be monitored since on the one hand the program activities have started recently and on the other hand because the indicators are not exploitable.
- (ii) There are neither influencing factors nor unexpected results.
- (iii) Harmo dynamics: APEL is integrated in RARDA and is well aligned with RARDA strategies. There have been no harmonisation initiatives with other actors since APEL is the only program with this specific objective. RARDA’s ownership of the APEL activities was poor in the first months of 2010 but has been improved since a new DI has been appointed. Districts ownership of APEL’s activity is described under result1.



- (iv) Gender aspects are well integration in the program. 60 % of the beneficiaries of the animals distributed are women. Environmental issues are not integrated in the program.

### 4.2.3 Risks and Assumptions

The Logical framework counts 19 assumptions. Most of them can not be taken into account because they are not appropriate, not precise or insufficiently explicit.

A risk analysis has been carried out by the mid term review team and presented in the table below. A risk management, based on this analysis will be carried out in 2011.

Source: MTR

Initial situation (TFF)		Current situation		
risks identified during the formulation	Envisaged mitigation measures	Evolution	Current risk assessment	Measures taken
Agricultural policy is subject to modifications	none	none	medium	none
The sub region is liable to epizooties	none	Concerns especially PPA	medium	none

### 4.2.4 Quality criteria

	Score	Comments
<b>Effectiveness</b>	X	Can not be monitored since activities have started recently and because the indicators can not be used.
<b>Efficiency</b>	X	Can only be monitored on result level (see results 1 to 4)
<b>Sustainability</b>	B	Assessment after only 10 months of operational implementation is difficult. Nevertheless, at beneficiary level, the viability of " technological innovations" seems promising.
<b>Relevance</b>	A	The program is in accordance with the strategic visions of policy makers.

Scores: A: Very satisfactory (no extra efforts are required)

B: Satisfactory (efforts have to be reinforced)

C: Unsatisfactory (measures should be taken)

D: Very unsatisfactory (measures are indispensable)

X: criteria has not been assessed

### 4.2.5 Impact

The impact of APEL program after only ten months of operational implementation (distribution of animals started in February 2010) is obviously still difficult to assess. It will depend largely on tangible effects in improving socioeconomic conditions of target beneficiaries and the willingness and ability of national and decentralized structures to support the development of small stock breeding in rural households.

## 4.2.6 Lessons learned and recommendations

Recommendation	Deadline
Put in place a monitoring and evaluation system (identification of appropriate indicators, tools for data collecting and processing, risk management). Assessment of the influence of animal distribution on the vulnerability of the target group has to be carried out.	Q1 2011

Lesson learned	Public interested	Capitalisation in the project cycle
In the future, formulation of BTC's projects and programs should provide a logical framework with appropriate and precise indicators.	BTC Representation and HQ	Formulation

## 4.3 Result 1

### 4.3.1 Indicators (source: Districts development plan)

Result 1: Small stock breeding is developed by poor farmers using improved, effective and sustainable production methods.					Progress
Indicators 2010	E	3	Baseline	Progress 2010	Comments
3 500 animals distributed			-	<b>B</b> (satisfactory)	2 671 animaux diffuses soit 76 %
≥ 30 % of beneficiaries are women or orphans headed households		<b>X</b>	-	<b>A</b> (very satisfactory)	60 % of beneficiaries are women.

### 4.3.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities	Progress:				Comments (only if the value is -)
	++	+	+/-	-	
1 Identification bénéficiaires		X			
2 Base line			X		
3 Construction of housing and purchase of drugs and animal feed.			X		
4 Purchase and distribution of animals			X		
5 pay national 5 T.A. program		X			
6 outreach extension service by local service providers		X			

Scores: ++: activity is ahead of schedule

+: activity on schedule

+/-: activity is 3 to 6 months behind schedule

-: activity is more than 6 months behind schedule

### 4.3.3 Analysis of progress made

- (i) Relation between activities and result: There is a good ownership of the breeding techniques by the beneficiaries which helps to achieve result n° 1;
- (ii) Influencing factors: slowness of procedures is responsible for the delay in implementation of housing construction, purchase and distribution of animals.
- (iii) There are no unexpected results.
- (iv) “Harmo dynamics”: the program has harmonised the approaches of animal distribution to vulnerable families with the VSF - Belgium project PROXIVET. These approaches are aligned on the RARDA strategies. In the course of 2011, harmonisation with other partners has to be carried out.  
There is a good ownership of the breeding techniques by the beneficiaries;
- (v) The identification procedure of the beneficiaries is a gender friendly process. Environmental issues are not integrated in result 2 activities.

### 4.3.4 Risks and Assumptions

The assumptions of the logical framework can not be taken into account because they are not appropriate, not precise or insufficiently explicit.

A risk analysis has been carried out by the mid term review team and presented in the table below. A risk management, based on this analysis will be carried out in 2011.

Source: MTR

Initial situation (TFF)		Current situation		
risks identified during the formulation	Envisaged mitigation measures	Evolution	Current risk assessment	Measures taken
The rural zone is not very interested in small scale animal breeding	None	Sometimes, neglect of small species (especially rabbits) by local authorities	Weak	None
Households are not covered by other projects that promote and distribute cattle	None	Within the project context (households with small lands): the risk is limited	Weak	None
Animal breeding activities which are put in place are not adapted to social conditions and are not appreciated	None	None	None	The choice of species is demand driven
Squandering of distributed livestock due to economic difficulties	Implementation of a very close monitoring for supporting and supervising farmers	None	Weak	Close monitoring system
The most vulnerable households are not sensitive to project suggestions and are unable to discuss them with it	None	None	None	Participative approach

### 4.3.5 Quality criteria

	Score	Comments
<b>Effectiveness</b>	B	Effectiveness is good for R1 as expected effects will be likely to be achieved in quantity, quality and time limit.
<b>Efficiency</b>	B	Program resources are used optimally and appropriately to achieve expected outcome.
<b>Sustainability</b>	B	Assessment after only 10 months of operational implementation is difficult. Nevertheless, at beneficiary level, the viability of "technological innovations" seems promising.

Scores: A: Very satisfactory (no extra efforts are required)

B: Satisfactory (efforts have to be reinforced)

C: Unsatisfactory (measures should be taken)

### 4.3.6 Budget execution

The budget execution of 2010 is presented in annex 4.

### 4.3.7 Lessons learned and recommendations

Recommendation ( <i>source: MTR</i> )	Deadline
Carry out a more complete baseline analysis	Q1,Q2
Revising the training program for beneficiaries (Developing complementary topics and refreshing courses)	Q2
Improving housing of animals (standardize the most appropriate models and training of practices of rational use of manure)	Q2
Improving some management aspects of animal breeding such as replacing sterile females and dead animals when beneficiaries are not responsible for the cause of the dead.	Q1,Q2
Reinforcing fodder crops in small scale farms	Q2,Q2,Q3
Improving the feeding status of pigs	Q2,Q3,Q4
Increasing the animal breeding productivity by supporting owners of distributed male animals.	Q2,Q3,Q4
Building management capacity of District: support District staff in administrative management of the MOUs.	Continuous
Capitalize lessons learned in the field of procedures and distribution of animals in the context of the MOU with Districts.	Q4 2011

Lesson learned ( <i>source: MTR</i> )	Public interested	Capitalization in the project cycle
Districts are not familiar enough with the administrative procedures of the MOUs. Providing the necessary administrative support to District staff to improve the management of the MOUs and action plans is essential.	APEL program, RARDA and BTC Representation.	Implementation.

## 4.4 Result 2 (A genetic improvement system of small ruminants, pigs, rabbits and poultry is initiated and appropriate breeding techniques are extended.)

### 4.4.1 Indicators

The indicators of the logical framework are not exploitable either because they are not very precise nor because they are not fixed (quantity, time limits). Moreover, these indicators are only about quantity. No quality indicators are available.

The mid term review carried out in November 2010, and approved by the Steering Committee in December 2010, has analysed the indicators and proposed more appropriate indicators. These new indicators will be monitored in the course of 2011.

### 4.4.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities	Progress:				Comments (only if the value is -)
	++	+	+/-	-	
1 Sign MOU with ISAE, ISAR and UPU and start activities of genetic improvement on sheep, goat and pigs		X			
2 Selection of cooperative of poultry breeders and prepare MOU			X		
3 Organise platform with small stock breeders and research institutions				X	Breeders were not selected yet, platform schedules for Q1 2011.
4 Prepare extension material (leaflets), radio and television documentaries.			X		

Scores: ++: activity is ahead of schedule

+: activity on schedule

+/-: activity is 3 to 6 months behind schedule

-: activity is more than 6 months behind schedule

### 4.4.3 Analysis of progress made

- (i) Relation between activities and result: It is too early to assess if the MOUs will help to achieve result n° 2 since the implementation of the selection schemes have not yet started.
- (ii) Influencing factors: slowness of procedures is responsible for the delay in signing the MOUs.
- (iii) There are no unexpected results.
- (iv) “Harmo dynamics”: the program has not harmonised the approaches of small stock selection since APEL is the only program involved in this matter. Ownership of the selection schemes stock breeders and state owned institutions (RARDA, ISAE, ISAR and UPU) can not yet be assessed.
- (v) Gender and environmental issues are not integrated in result 2 activities.

#### 4.4.4 Risks and Assumptions

The assumptions of the logical framework can not be taken into account because they are not appropriate, not precise or insufficiently explicit.

A risk analysis has been carried out by the mid term review team and presented in the table below. A risk management, based on this analysis will be carried out in 2011.

Source: MTR

Initial situation (TFF)		Current situation		
risks identified during the formulation	Envisaged mitigation measures	Evolution	Current risk assessment	Measures taken
Confirmed livestock breeders are not interested by the participation in program activities concerning selection and distribution of improved livestock	None	GI program has not yet started; interest of progressive livestock breeders	None	None
The national program of genetic improvement for domestic species with short reproductive cycle is not defined/ or that program is not coherent and applicable	Collaboration and improvement of the existing material	The GI strategy is not yet formalized	Weak	Establishment of platforms intended for getting research and popularization closer
ISAR and/or other institutions identified for monitoring those activities do not have capacity or are not enough Supported	None	Partnership structures have capacity to monitor activities (Criteria specified in MOUs)	None	None
Risk of unnecessary reply or competition with other projects in the implementation of other animal breeding productions	Collaboration and improvement of the existing material	Not very explicit hypothesis	None	None
Operators, research, popularization livestock breeders and others do not have time and concern to share their constraints and skills	None	Rewording: weakness in exchanges and collaboration	Medium	Establishment of platforms intended for getting research and popularization closer

#### 4.4.5 Quality criteria

	Score	Comments
<b>Effectiveness</b>	X	Assessment is not yet possible since implementation of selection schemes has not started yet.
<b>Efficiency</b>	C	Efficiency is not good since procedures prior to the signature of the MOU are far to slow.
<b>Sustainability</b>	X	Assessment is not yet possible since implementation of selection schemes has not started yet.

Scores: C: Unsatisfactory (measures should be taken)

X: criteria has not been assessed

#### 4.4.6 Budget execution

The budget execution of 2010 is presented in annex 4.

#### 4.4.7 Lessons learned and recommendations

Recommendation ( <i>source: MTR</i> )	Deadline
Support RARDA to ensure the ownership of the technical management of the selection schemes in the context of the MOUs signed with ISAE, ISAR et UPU.	Continuous
Building management capacity of ISAE, ISAR et UPU in the context of the MOU.	Continuous

Lesson learned ( <i>source: MTR</i> )	Public interested	Capitalisation in the project cycle
State owned institutions (ISAR, ISAE, UPU) are not familiar enough with the administrative procedures of the MOUs. Providing the necessary administrative support to these institutions to improve the management of the MOUs and action plans is essential.	APEL program, RARDA and BTC Representation.	Implementation.

### 4.5 Result 3 (The private sector, including micro finance, has developed the small stock value chain.)

#### 4.5.1 Indicators

The indicators of the logical framework are not exploitable either because they are not very precise nor because they are not fixed (quantity, time limits). Moreover, these indicators are only about quantity. No quality indicators are available.

The mid term review carried out in November 2010, and approved by the Steering Committee in December 2010, has analysed the indicators and proposed more appropriate indicators.

These new indicators will be monitored in the course of 2011.

## 4.5.2 Evaluation of activities

The steering committee approved the decision not to carry out the most important activity of result 3 which is the start up of a micro credit system. Only the following activities have been maintained:

Activities	Progress:				Comments (only if the value is -)
	++	+	+/-	-	
1 Organise meetings with stakeholders for value chain development (in the context of MOU signed with Districts).			X		
2 Construction of infrastructure (in the context of MOU signed with Districts).			X		
3. Consultancy on micro credit system proposal.			X		

Scores: ++: activity is ahead of schedule

+: activity on schedule

+/-: activity is 3 to 6 months behind schedule

-: activity is more than 6 months behind schedule

## 4.5.3 Analysis of progress made

- (i) Relation between activities and result: It is too early to assess if the activities will help to achieve result n° 3 since the construction of infrastructure has not started yet.
- (ii) Influencing factors: slowness of procurement procedures is responsible for the delay in construction of infrastructure.
- (iii) There are no unexpected results or “Harmo dynamics”.
- (iv) Gender and environmental issues are not integrated in result 3 activities.

## 4.5.4 Risks and Assumptions

The assumptions of the logical framework can not be taken into account because they are not appropriate, not precise or insufficiently explicit.

A risk analysis has been carried out by the mid term review team and presented in the table below. A risk management, based on this analysis will be carried out in 2011.

Source: MTR

Initial situation (TFF)		Current situation		
risks identified during the formulation	Envisaged mitigation measures	Evolution	Current risk assessment	Measures taken
Livestock breeders do not reach a stage of production and technological sophistication that allow them to be interested in marketing and monetary aspect of the sub sector	None	Limited size of livestock breeders' farms	High	Not any specific activity taken ... But cooperative should play a role
Food inputs are not available	None	The problem is linked to the low purchase capacity of beneficiaries +low	High	Not any clear strategy for raising accessibility to food inputs...Possibility



		level of understanding of the importance of complementation + weak accessibility in rural zones		through cooperatives?
Livestock breeders are not interested in the use of food inputs	None	None	High	Establishment of a stock security for 6 months at the level of livestock
The veterinary pharmacy are not enough dynamic	None	No longer relevant	None	
Banks and and/or credit organisms are not sensitive to the principle of giving credits to livestock breeders	None	No longer relevant	None	
Livestock breeders do not have the economic capacity to enter the system of	None	Very low financial capacity in management at the level of the target group	High	Not yet any concrete activity...Cooperatives?

#### 4.5.5 Quality criteria

	Score	Comments
<b>Effectiveness</b>	X	Assessment is not yet possible since construction of infrastructure has not started yet.
<b>Efficiency</b>	C	Efficiency is not good since procedures prior to the construction of infrastructure are far to slow.
<b>Sustainability</b>	X	Assessment is not yet possible since construction of infrastructure has not started yet.

Scores: C: Unsatisfactory (measures should be taken)

X: criteria has not been assessed

#### 4.5.6 Budget execution

The budget execution of 2010 is presented in annex 4.

#### 4.5.7 Lessons learned and recommendations

There are neither lessons learned nor recommendations.

### 4.6 Result 4 (MINAGRI's capacities are strengthened at national and district level.)

#### 4.6.1 Indicators

The indicators of the logical framework are not exploitable either because they are not very precise nor because they are not fixed (quantity, time limits). Moreover, these indicators are only about quantity. No quality indicators are available.

The mid term review carried out in November 2010, and approved by the Steering Committee in December 2010, has analysed the indicators and proposed more appropriate indicators.

These new indicators will be monitored in the course of 2011.

## 4.6.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities	Progress:				Comments (only if the value is -)
	++	+	+/-	-	
1 Pay TA planning and T.A. Monitoring and evaluation		X			
2 Put in place small stock observatory strategy.		X			
3 Training RARDA staff		X			
4 Sign MOU with 5 Districts and monitor the implementation.		X			
5 Support Sectors to prepare small stock action plans			X		
6 support Sector veterinarians (in the context of MOU signed with Districts)			X		
7 training Districts staff		X			

Scores: ++: activity is ahead of schedule

+: activity on schedule

+/-: activity is 3 to 6 months behind schedule

-: activity is more than 6 months behind schedule

## 4.6.3 Analysis of progress made

- (i) Relation between activities and result: ownership of small stock development activities by de Districts and RARDA is improving which helps to achieve result n° 4.
- (ii) There are neither unexpected results nor influencing factors.
- (iii) “Harmo dynamics”: APEL strategy is aligned with the decentralisation policy.
- (iv) Gender and environmental issues are not integrated in result 4 activities.

## 4.6.4 Risks and Assumptions

There are no risks or assumptions in the logical framework.

## 4.6.5 Quality criteria

	Score	Comments
<b>Effectiveness</b>	B	Effectiveness is good for R4 as expected effects will be likely to be achieved in quantity, quality and time limit.
<b>Efficiency</b>	B	Program resources are used optimally and appropriately to achieve expected outcome.
<b>Sustainability</b>	B	Assessment after only 10 months of operational implementation is difficult. Nevertheless, ownership at District and RARDA level of the small stock development activities is improving and seems promising.

Scores: B: Satisfactory (measures should be taken)

## 4.6.6 Budget execution

The budget execution of 2010 is presented in annex 4.

#### 4.6.7 Lessons learned and recommendations

Recommendation	Deadline
Reinforce support to Districts with specific training of District staff (in de context of MOUs signed with Districts)	Q2

Lesson learned	Public interested	Capitalisation in the project cycle
Districts are not familiar enough with the administrative procedures of the MOUs. Providing the necessary administrative support to District staff to improve the management of the MOUs and action plans is essential.	APEL program, RARDA and BTC Representation.	Implementation.

## 5 Beneficiaries

### 5.1. Vulnerable stock breeders

The effects on this target group are still poor. The positive change is the significant improvements at psychosocial level expressed at different levels: opportunity to exercise an activity, recovery of trust (beneficiaries are now better considered because they are no longer very poor), consideration by other villagers thanks to their ability to cope with family needs, neighbors' esteem generated by the good behavior of beneficiaries (compliance with instructions of the program, particularly regarding the revolving credit), better integration into the community by meeting /training participation where they feel confident to express themselves, revolving credit system which allows them to meet other vulnerable breeders.

Economic effects are still very poor since animals have been distributed recently. Manure production increases however the agricultural incomes.

In the course of 2011, an assessment of the influence of animal distribution on the vulnerability of women has to be carried out.

### 5.2. Districts and RARDA.

The authorities of the five Districts of the intervention zone of the program are completely in charge of the planning and the implementation of the small stock development activities.

Since early 2010, at Sector level, RARDA staff is in charge of the follow up of breeding activities of the APEL's beneficiaries of distributed animals. Quality of the follow up has however to be improved in 2011 with help of local service providers.

## **6 Follow-up of the decisions taken by the Steering Committee.**

There is an efficient follow up of every decision taken by the Steering Committee and discussed in the next Committee's meeting. Decisions have been taken in the field of staff management, budget reallocations, management of MOU's and general management issues. These decisions are not listed since the HQ's guidelines of this report do not want the decisions to be listed.

## **7 Annexes**

***Annex 1: Logical framework***

***Annex 2: M&E activities***

***Annex 3: Operational planning 2011***

***Annex 4: Financial report 2010: “Annual planning versus Actuals”***

## Annex 1: Logical framework of APEL program (source:TFF)

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE	INDICATORS	VERIFICATION SOURCES	HYPOTHESES risks and opportunities
<b>The bases of a sustainable development system for small scale animal breeding are laid</b>	Increase of the number of livestock head, reduction of illness rate, increase of supply in meat to markets	Agricultural enquiries: RARDA annual report	1.Continuity in agricultural policy 2. Absence of epizooties in the sub region
RESULTS	INDICATORS	VERIFICATION SOURCES	HYPOTHESES risks and opportunities
<b>(R1)</b> Small scale animal breeding is developed by poor livestock breeders who use improved, efficient and sustainable production methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution of 15 000 animals</li> <li>• At least 50 % of households without land or with less than 0,25 ha go on with small scale animal breeding after the project completion</li> <li>• Reimbursement rate in form of revolving credit &gt;60% one year after livestock delivery</li> <li>• Participation of women and orphans heads of household ≥ 30 %</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sector monitoring report made by MINAGRI/RARDA with support from the program</li> <li>• Project activity reports</li> <li>• Analyses by sector</li> <li>• Statistics report on the progress of households incomes</li> <li>• Report on women participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Interest of rural zones in animal breeding</li> <li>4. Risk of not being concerned with regard to other projects that promote and distribute cattle</li> <li>5. Animal breeding activities adapted to social conditions and appreciated</li> <li>6. Risk of squandering given livestock due to economic difficulties to be minimized by a closest follow-up in order to support and train farmers</li> <li>7. Those most vulnerable households are sensitive to the project suggestions and able to discuss them with it</li> </ul>
<b>(R2)</b> A system of genetic improvement of species with short reproductive cycle is introduced and the most appropriate techniques for their breeding are studies and popularized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 confirmed livestock breeders in production of goats, pigs, rabbits, etc. received livestock head of good quality enabling them selection and multiplication and signed a contract with the program for the distribution of livestock head</li> <li>• A genetic improvement policy is defined and practiced</li> <li>• ISAR and/or public scientific institutions in genetic improvement participate in genetic improvement activities and in technologic research in small scale animal breeding</li> <li>• Research and popularization are provided with documents on small scale animal breeding typology and confirmed improved animal breeding techniques</li> <li>• Research and popularization are regularly combined with field actors as part of consultation platforms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISAR report on breeds improvement, production and mortality rates</li> <li>• District report on improvement and development of small scale animal breeding</li> <li>• Organization of discussion forums, meetings, congresses, publication of reference documents</li> <li>• Production of written documents and multimedia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Confirmed livestock breeders are interested by the participation in program activities concerning selection and distribution of improved livestock head</li> <li>9. A national program of genetic improvement for domestic species with short reproductive cycle is defined ( following planned consultancies beyond or as part of APEL ) and that program is coherent and applicable</li> <li>10. ISAR and/or other identified institutions for monitoring those operations are able to do it or are enough supported</li> <li>11. Other productions performed by other projects: collaboration and improvement of the existing material, no replies or needless competitions</li> <li>12. Operators, research, popularization, livestock breeders and others have time and interest to share their concerns and skills</li> </ul>
<b>(R3)</b> The development of the sub sector is realized by the private sector ( including micro-finance) which organizes and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marketing networks are improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market price list</li> <li>• Monitoring analyses of the sector made by MINAGRI/RARDA with support from the program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13. Livestock breeders reach a production and technological sophistication level that enables them to be interested in commercial and monetary aspect of the sub sector</li> </ul>

organizes and coordinates itself for this purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 20 private farms for livestock reproduction sell small scale animal breeding products for each species</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports (RARDA, Districts...)</li> <li>The number of provided credits in small scale animal breeding sector</li> </ul>	14. Confirmed livestock breeders are interested by participation in project activities concerning selection and distribution of improved livestock head
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The private sector develops and participates in a concerted way in small scale animal breeding sub sector (inputs, marketing, transformation...)</li> </ul>		15. Feeding inputs are available
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial tools adapted to animal breeding are available and used by farmers and livestock breeders</li> </ul>		16. Livestock breeders are interested in their use
(R4) The capacity of MINAGRI and that of actors of the sub sector «small scale animal breeding » is built at national and decentralized level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Ministry has the situation analysis of small scale animal breeding at national level and an observatory of small scale animal breeding situation is operational</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports on observatory data are available and published</li> <li>Performance assessment of training and promotion services</li> </ul>	17. The veterinary pharmacy somehow becomes more liberal and does not enter into exaggerated corporatism
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RARDA implements a strategy and a development plan for small scale animal breeding and mobilizes external financing funds for a common fund for small scale animal breeding development</li> </ul>		18. Banks and/or credits organisms are sensitive to the principle of giving credit to livestock breeders
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development plans for small scale animal breeding at district level are implemented in a reasonable way</li> </ul>		19. Livestock breeders have the economic capacity to enter into the monetary system

## Annex 2: 2010 Monitoring and evaluation activities

Steering Committee meetings	Meeting n° 2: 17 <sup>th</sup> of March 2010 Meeting n° 3: 3 <sup>rd</sup> of June 2010 Meeting n° 4: 4 <sup>th</sup> of December 2010
Baseline survey	February – July 2010
Mid term review	November 2010



### Annex 3: Operational planning 2011

R1 : Small stock breeding is developed by poor farmers using improved, effective and sustainable production methods.

Activities	Sub activities	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	Person in charge
<b>A.1.1 : Identification beneficiaries</b>	Identification beneficiaries 2011 et 2012.													T.A. S/E
	Complementary Base line by APEL staff (cf. MTR)													T.A S/E
<b>A.1.2 : Develop and physical technical environment.</b>	Monitoring private seed suppliers for forage cropping (purchase production – sign new contracts); implement MTR recommendations forage cropping.													A.T Planning
	MTR recommendation : standardizing the most appropriate housing models													DELCO
	Monitoring MOUs Districts: purchase drugs and animal feed.													Districts/ APEL staff
	Monitoring MOUs Districts: housing construction													Districts/ APEL staff
<b>A.1.3 : Purchase and distribution of valuable animals.</b>	Monitoring MOUs Districts: purchase en distribute 15 000 animals													Districts/ APEL staff
<b>A.1.4 : Organize farmer's technical training and advice.</b>	Pay 5 T.A. APEL													Accountant
	Monitoring MOUs Districts: Contrats with local service providers for extension service													Districts/ APEL staff
	MTR recommendations: Revising training program beneficiaries: developing complementary topics such as rational use of manure and refreshing courses.													APEL staff
<b>Implementation other MTR recommandations</b>	replacing sterile females and dead animals.													APEL staff
	supporting owners of distributed male animals													APEL staff
	support District staff in administrative management of the MOUs.													A.T Planning
	Capitalize lessons learned in the in the field of procedures and distribution of animals													DELCO
	Improving the feeding status of pigs													APEL staff

R2 : A genetic improvement system of small ruminants, pigs, rabbits and poultry is initiated and appropriate breeding techniques are extended.

Activities	Sub activities	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	Person in charge
<b>A.2.1 : Genetic improvement of small ruminants</b>	Monitor MOU ISAR													A.T. Planning
	Monitor MOU ISAE													A.T. planning
	Support RARDA to ensure the ownership of the technical management of the selection schemes in the context of the MOUs signed with ISAE, ISAR et UPU													A.T. Planning
<b>A.2.2 : Genetic improvement of pigs, rabbits and poultry</b>	Monitor MOU UPU													A.T. Planning
	Sing and monitor MOU poultly breeders													DI+DELCO
	Purchase parent stock													DI+DELCO
<b>A.2.3 : Organise research in the field of small stock</b>														
<b>A.2.4 : Strengthen de link between research and extension.</b>	Organiser plateforme (RARDA, breeders, ISAR, ISAE, UPU)													DI+DELCO+ A.T. Planning
	Radio and television documentaries													A.T. Planning
	Extension material (leaflets RARDA)													DI+DELCO

**R3** : The private sector, including micro finance, has developed the small stock value chain.

Activities	Sub activities	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	Person in charge
<b>A 3.1 : Install private entrepreneurs at all levels of the value chain</b>	Organise Joint action forum (in context MOU Districts)													Districts/APEL staff
	Construction infrastructure (in context MOU Districts)													Districts/APEL staff
<b>A.3.2 : Support operating private technical adviser</b>														
<b>A.3.3 : Organize the micro-credit system</b>														

**R4** : MINAGRI's capacities are strengthened at national and district level.

Activities	Sub activities	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	Person in charge
<b>A.4.1 : Support to MINAGRI / RARDA</b>	Pay 2 AT S/E et planning													Accountant
	Consultancy Small stock action plan													DI+DELCO
	Support to RARDA laboratories (purchase material – training)													DI+DELCO
	Small stock observatory ( purchase 3 laptops – training Districts veterinarians)													DI+DELCO
<b>A.4.2 : Support on district and sector level</b>	Support to Sector veterinarians (in context MOU Districts)													Districts/APEL staff
	Formation des District (in context MOU Districts)													Districts/APEL staff
	Support planning small stock action plans Sectors (in context MOU Districts)													Districts/APEL staff

## Z. General management

### Staff

Activities	Sub activities	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	Person in charge
<b>Pay APEL staff and guards</b>	Accountant													Accountant
	Secretary													
	Office worker													
	Driver													
	Watchmen Ribirizi office													
<b>Put in place a written evaluation system for APEL staff</b>														

### Investments

Activities	Sub activities	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	Person in charge
<b>Construction</b>	Rehabilitation RARDA fence													DI+DELCO

### Quality (Monitoring Evaluation)

Activities	Sub activities	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	Person in charge
<b>Audit program</b>														DI+DELCO
<b>Audit 5 MOU</b>														DI+DELCO
	- Put in place a monitoring and evaluation system (identification of appropriate indicators, tools for data collecting and processing, risk management). - Carry out assessment of the influence of animal distribution on the vulnerability of the target group. - Monitor all recommendations of MTR													A.T. S/E

## Annex 4: Financial report 2010: "Annual planning versus Actuals"

### Annual Planning vs Actuals (Year to Month) of RWA0806511

Project Title : **Appui au petit élevage**

Planning Version: **2010Q1**

End date last closing : 31/12/2010

Currency : EUR

	Status	Fin Mode	Forecast 2010 (version 2010Q1)	Actual Expenses YtM	Planning vs actuals	% Exec
<b>A POSER LES BASES D'UN SYSTÈME DE DÉVELOPPEMENT</b>			1.330,49	1.216,29	114,20	91%
<b>01 Les éleveurs pauvres développent le petit élevage et</b>			670,33	766,05	-95,72	114%
01 Identification des bénéficiaires		COGES	30,23	29,32	0,91	97%
02 Aménagement de l'environnement physique et technique		COGES	180,75	297,94	-117,19	165%
03 Obtention et diffusion d'animaux de valeur		COGES	292,00	280,35	11,65	96%
04 Suivi rapproché au niveau local pour la formation et le suivi		COGES	167,35	158,44	8,91	95%
<b>02 Un système d'amélioration génétique des espèces à</b>			290,35	293,51	-3,16	101%
01 Sélection des petits ruminants		COGES	70,35	188,26	-117,91	268%
02 Acquisition et multiplication de races améliorées en		COGES	115,00	96,01	18,99	83%
03 Recherche concernant les techniques liées au petit		COGES	25,00	8,24	16,76	33%
04 Essais et promotion d'élevages particuliers		COGES	30,00	0,43	29,57	1%
05 Renforcement du lien Recherche - Vulgarisation		COGES	50,00	0,57	49,43	1%
<b>03 Le secteur privé s'organise et se coordonne pour le</b>			198,75	18,42	180,33	9%
01 Installation d'entrepreneurs privés à tous les niveaux de la		COGES	20,00	13,62	6,38	68%
02 Appui à l'émergence et au fonctionnement d'encadreurs		COGES	20,00	0,60	19,40	3%
03 Organisation du système de micro-crédit		COGES	158,75	4,20	154,55	3%
		REGIE	189,92	199,32	-9,40	105%
		COGEST	1.507,71	1.399,04	108,67	93%
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1.697,63</b>	<b>1.598,36</b>	<b>99,27</b>	<b>94%</b>



Annual Financial Report - Planning vs Actuals - RWA0806511 - Planning version: 2010Q1

Page 1

## Annual Planning vs Actuals (Year to Month) of RWA0806511

Project Title : **Appui au petit élevage**

Planning Version: **2010Q1**

End date last closing : 31/12/2010

Currency : EUR

	Status	Fin Mode	Forecast 2010 (version 2010Q1)	Actual Expenses YtM	Planning vs actuals	% Exec
<b>04 Les capacités du MINAGRI et des acteurs de la filière</b>			171,06	138,31	<b>32,75</b>	<b>81%</b>
01 Appui au MINAGRI/RARDA		COGES	107,50	31,76	<b>75,74</b>	30%
02 Appui aux niveaux décentralisés		COGES	63,56	106,55	<b>-42,99</b>	168%
<b>Z MOYENS GÉNÉRAUX</b>			<b>367,14</b>	<b>382,07</b>	<b>-14,93</b>	<b>104%</b>
<b>01 Frais de personnel</b>			175,33	185,01	<b>-9,68</b>	<b>106%</b>
01 Assistant technique		REGIE	151,71	157,44	<b>-5,73</b>	104%
02 Staff national		COGES	3,16	7,58	<b>-4,42</b>	240%
03 Equipe finance et administration		COGES	17,86	17,41	<b>0,45</b>	97%
04 Autres frais de personnel		COGES	2,60	2,58	<b>0,02</b>	99%
<b>02 Investissements</b>			51,92	66,55	<b>-14,63</b>	<b>128%</b>
01 Véhicules		REGIE	11,21	12,16	<b>-0,95</b>	108%
02 Véhicules		COGES	0,00	1,10	<b>-1,10</b>	??%
03 Equipement bureau		COGES	5,00	6,93	<b>-1,93</b>	139%
04 Equipement IT		COGES	6,71	8,33	<b>-1,62</b>	124%
05 Aménagements du bureau		COGES	29,00	38,03	<b>-9,03</b>	131%
<b>03 Frais de fonctionnement</b>			98,89	100,79	<b>-1,90</b>	<b>102%</b>
		REGIE	189,92	199,32	<b>-9,40</b>	105%
		COGEST	1.507,71	1.399,04	<b>108,67</b>	93%
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1.697,63</b>	<b>1.598,36</b>	<b>99,27</b>	<b>94%</b>



## Annual Planning vs Actuals (Year to Month) of RWA0806511

Project Title : **Appui au petit elevage**

Planning Version: **2010Q1**

End date last closing : 31/12/2010

Currency : EUR

	Status	Fin Mode	Forecast 2010 (version 2010Q1)	Actual Expenses YTM	Planning vs actuals	% Exec
01 Loyer du bureau		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	??%
02 Services et frais de maintenance		COGES	3,15	0,05	3,10	2%
03 Location de véhicule		COGES	27,50	25,93	1,57	94%
04 Frais de fonctionnement des véhicules		COGES	41,10	42,99	-1,89	105%
05 Télécommunications		COGES	5,67	4,67	1,00	82%
06 Fournitures de bureau		COGES	3,00	8,49	-5,49	283%
07 Frais de mission		COGES	13,75	9,17	4,58	67%
08 Frais de représentation et de communication externe		COGES	0,80	2,21	-1,41	276%
09 Formation		COGES	3,00	6,10	-3,10	203%
10 Frais financiers		COGES	0,92	0,26	0,66	28%
11 Frais TVA		COGES	0,00	0,92	-0,92	??%
<b>04 Audit, evaluation, backstopping</b>			41,00	29,72	11,28	72%
01 Mission d'évaluation		REGIE	20,00	29,72	-9,72	149%
02 Audit semestrielle		COGES	14,00	0,00	14,00	0%
03 Backstopping (appui du siège)		REGIE	7,00	0,00	7,00	0%
		REGIE	189,92	199,32	-9,40	105%
		COGEST	1.507,71	1.399,04	108,67	93%
		<b>TOTAL</b>	1.697,63	1.598,36	99,27	94%

