

**Republic of Rwanda**



**Ministry of Agriculture and  
Animal Resources**



***CTB***

# **ANNUAL REPORT 2011**

## **APEL PROGRAMME**

### **SUPPORT TO SMALL STOCK**

<b>ACRONYMS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1 PROJECT FORM .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION .....	6
2.2 KEY ELEMENTS .....	6
2.3 KEY RISKS .....	7
2.4 KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	7
<b>3 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 CONTEXT .....	9
3.1.1 <i>Evolution of the context</i> .....	9
3.1.2 <i>Institutional Anchoring</i> .....	9
3.1.3 <i>Execution Modalities</i> .....	9
3.1.4 <i>Harmo-dynamics</i> .....	10
3.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE .....	10
3.2.1 <i>Indicator</i> .....	10
3.2.2 <i>Analysis of progress made</i> .....	11
3.2.3 <i>Risks and Assumptions</i> .....	11
3.2.4 <i>Quality criteria</i> .....	12
3.2.5 <i>Potential Impact</i> .....	12
3.2.6 <i>Recommendations</i> .....	12
3.3 RESULT 1 .....	14
3.3.1 <i>Indicators</i> .....	14
3.3.2 <i>Evaluation of activities</i> .....	15
3.3.3 <i>Analysis of progress made</i> .....	15
3.3.4 <i>Risks and Assumptions</i> .....	17
3.3.5 <i>Quality criteria</i> .....	17
3.3.6 <i>Budget execution</i> .....	17
3.3.7 <i>Recommendations</i> .....	18
<b>M&amp;E CELL .....</b>	<b>18</b>
3.4 RESULT 2 .....	20
3.4.1 <i>Indicators</i> .....	20
3.4.2 <i>Evaluation of activities</i> .....	21
3.4.3 <i>Analysis of progress made</i> .....	21
3.4.4 <i>Risks and Assumptions</i> .....	22
3.4.5 <i>Quality criteria</i> .....	22
3.4.6 <i>Budget execution</i> .....	22
3.4.7 <i>Recommendations</i> .....	23
3.5 RESULT 3 .....	24
3.5.1 <i>Indicators</i> .....	24
RESULT 1: THE PRIVATE SECTOR, INCLUDING MICRO FINANCE, HAS DEVELOPED THE SMALL STOCK VALUE CHAIN.) .....	24
3.5.2 <i>Evaluation of activities</i> .....	24

3.5.3	<i>Analysis of progress made</i> .....	24
3.5.4	<i>Risks and Assumptions</i> .....	24
3.5.5	<i>Quality criteria</i> .....	25
3.5.6	<i>Budget execution</i> .....	25
3.5.7	<i>Recommendations</i> .....	25
3.6	<b>RESULT 4</b> .....	26
3.6.1	<i>Indicators</i> .....	26
3.6.2	<i>Evaluation of activities</i> .....	26
3.6.3	<i>Analysis of progress made</i> .....	26
3.6.4	<i>Risks and Assumptions</i> .....	27
3.6.5	<i>Quality criteria</i> .....	27
3.6.6	<i>Budget execution</i> .....	28
3.6.7	<i>Recommendations</i> .....	28
<b>4</b>	<b>TRANSVERSAL THEMES</b> .....	<b>29</b>
4.1	<b>GENDER</b> .....	29
4.2	<b>ENVIRONMENT</b> .....	29
<b>5</b>	<b>DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE JLCB AND FOLLOW-UP</b> .....	<b>30</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>ANNEXES</b> .....	<b>32</b>
7.1	<b>LOGICAL FRAMEWORK</b> .....	32
7.2	<b>M&amp;E ACTIVITIES</b> .....	33
7.3	<b>“BUDGET VERSUS CURRENT (Y – M)” REPORT</b> .....	34
7.4	<b>BENEFICIARIES</b> .....	38
7.5	<b>OPERATIONAL PLANNING Q1-2012</b> .....	40

## Acronyms

<List all acronyms used in the Annual Report (alphabetically; see examples below)>

BTC	Belgian Technical Cooperation
Delco	Délégué à la Cogestion
FE	Final Evaluation
ISAE	Institut supérieur d' Agronomie et de l'Élevage
ISAR	Institut de Sciences Agronomiques
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Midterm review
PMU	Programme Management Unit
SMCL	Structure Mixte de Concertation Locale
TA	Technical assistant
UPU	Umutara Polytechnic University

## 1 Project form

Title	Programme d'Appui au petit élevage (APEL) /Support to small stock development programme.
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 programme:	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 programme 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 programme will intervene in 5 Districts: Gisagara, Huye, Ngororero, Nyamagabe, Nyaruguru.

## 2 Summary

### 2.1 Analysis of the intervention

Intervention logic	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Sustainability
Specific objective	B	X	B
Result 1	B	B	B
Result 2	D	D	D
Result 3	X	X	X
Result 4	B	B	B

- Scores: A Very satisfactory (no extra effort required)  
 B Satisfactory (effort 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 (€)	Expenditure 2011 (€)	Total expenditure (€) (31/12/2011)	Balance on Budget (€) (01/01/2012)	Execution rate (%)
5 000 000	190 470	1 598 360	1 335 484	3 129 346	1 870 653	63

### 2.2 Key elements

-A Memorandum of Understanding has been signed with each of the 5 Districts of the intervention zone of the programme. The objective of the MoU is to give responsibility to the district to provide identified poor households with small stock and with the necessary basic facilities and training to ensure the sustainability of animal breeding. The Districts are accounting for 55% of the total budget. After a slow start due to administrative procedures the Districts are carrying out with success the distribution of animals, the procurement of feed and veterinary drugs. Construction of animal sheds are still problematic because of a more stringent application of public procurement law.

-Weakness at the level of the districts are the monitoring and the follow up of the beneficiaries by the technical staff.

-Training of farmers is still insufficient. Districts are requesting APEL staff to handle the administrative aspects of all issues related to the Programme rather than concentrate on monitoring and training.

-MoU's have also been signed with ISAE, ISAR and UPU in the field of sheep, goat and pig genetic improvement. Those institutes account for 9% of the programme's budget. ISAR started implementation of technical activities in June 2011 while ISAE started only in December 2011. UPU seems not to be able to start implementation of the activities.

- Institutional reforms implemented during the year caused a certain delay in the scheduled support to the partner Institute.

-Key issues of the programme as animal revolving fund and animal genetic selection schemes at the Institutes level and at the farmer level, will not be implemented due to the delay in implementing the activities by the District and the Institutes

## 2.3 Key Risks

	Probability	Incidence	Incidence-descriptive
Public procurement procedures are not adapted	2	3	Sheds will not be constructed
Miss management by farmers	2	1	Small stock breeding will not be developed
The genetic improvement sub-programme will not be implemented	1	1	Beneficiaries will not benefit from the genetic improvement
Epidemics (African Swine Fever)	2	2	High mortality rate

1 : High 2; medium 3; low

## 2.4 Key lessons learned and recommendations

### Lessons learned:

- Districts and state owned partners (ISAE, RAB –research and UPU) need a time to get familiar with the administrative constraints of the MoU.
- In the future, formulation of BTC's projects and programmes should provide a logical framework with appropriate and precise indicators.
- A project dealing with animal breeding has to last longer. A minimum of 5 years of

implementation is required.

- Programme's key services, as M&E and training unit, are not ambitious enough to ensure sustainable and correct implementation of the programme's objectives nor the recommendations of the MTR.
- Attention should be paid that the TA in the districts would not be overloaded with the administrative handling of programme issues.

### Recommendations

- Implementation of animal breeding programmes should last at least for 5 years.
- Extreme poor beneficiaries are not always the best target for animal breeding activities because they have a limited time where animal breeding is a long term investment.
- Distribution of a large number of animals to a large number of beneficiaries scattered over the district area must be accompanied with an huge investment in human resources.
- Building management capacity of Districts, ISAE, ISAR and UPU in the context of the MOUs signed with APEL.
- RAB-research, ISAE and UPU should invest in applied research focusing on the interaction with the rural areas.
- Support RAB 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 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.



## 3 Analysis of the intervention

### 3.1 Context

#### 3.1.1 Evolution of the context

-The Delco who started the programme decided to quit in February 2011 and has been replaced. All has been done to maintain the project's policy and to minimize negative impact.

-RARDA and ISAR were integrated in the larger RAB agency. Within the RAB a department of small ruminant breeding has been created in charge of monitoring all related activities nationwide.

-Election of new authorities at local and at district level. New contacts had to be made with the new elected authorities.

#### 3.1.2 Institutional Anchoring

The institutional anchoring is appropriate.

However, the programme management would be more efficient if the DI, could be more available to work on APEL issues. He has been available about 50 % of his time for APEL matters.

Within the RAB structure the DI has been mandated to oversee nationwide all activities related to small animal breeding. By this way project activities are becoming more integrated in RAB being also more sustainable.

On the District level 3 of the 5 districts are integrating the activities of APEL in their planning. This also increases the sustainability.

#### 3.1.3 Execution Modalities

Co-management of APEL is very appropriate. There are no difficulties in the implementation by this modality.

### 3.1.4 Harmo-dynamics

The programme aligns to the policy of the partner although the policy is not clearly defined. It is part of the tasks of APEL to help the RAB to work out its policy on small stock breeding.

In the intervention area only 2 other projects are operating in the same domain. VSF-Belgium is active in Huye district and in Nyaruguru a project (SAN) funded by the Belgian NGO 'Broederlijk Delen' has a component of small stock distribution. APEL has contacts with both organisations in order to harmonise the activities.

## 3.2 Specific objective

### 3.2.1 Indicator

<b>Specific objective: The foundations of a sustainable small stock development system are laid.</b>						
<b>Indicators global</b>	<b>Baseline value</b>	<b>Progress year N-1</b>	<b>Progress year N</b>	<b>Target year N</b>	<b>End Target</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Increase of the number of animals,	0	2363	14 282		18 000	Target fixed by APEL
Reduction of animal illness rate	X	X	X		X	
Increase of supply of meat to markets	X	X	X		X	Figures on sector level not available
Number of beneficiaries poor households able to support additional medical costs is increased by 50%	X	375	3 948		Increase 50%	Based on reports of health services in activity area
Number of daily meals	X	1	2			
Meal diversity score	X	10%	20%			20% improvement
Children above 12 years old going to school	X	68 789 (district)			Increase 50%	
Families with saving or new income generating activity	X	X	X	X		
Number of activities in small stock at District level	0	5	10	10	Increased 20%	Based on Education services at district level
Number of visits by Sector veterinarian	X	X	1/week		Increase of 20%	Assessment by trainees
At end of programme	X	X	X	X	Increase	

marketing small stock has increased					of 10%	
-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--------	--

### 3.2.2 Analysis of progress made

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.

The midterm 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. It appears that most of those new indicators are very difficult to assess by the M/E cell at management level. The baseline for those new indicators has not been established.

It is obvious that only a few values for the indicators are available. Therefore the analysis of the progress is very difficult. Most of the figures are coming from national statistics and don't give details per district or per sector.

As results 2 and 3 will not be reached it is doubtful that the specific objective will be reached although it makes sense and can contribute to poverty reduction allowing poor families to face some current expenses as basic health care and scholarship.

### 3.2.3 Risks and Assumptions

Risk (describe)	Probability (score)	Potential implications		Risk Level (score)
		Describe	Score	
Miss management (voluntary and involuntary by the beneficiaries)	M	Bad examples for other beneficiaries. Bad example for similar projects	H	C
The sub region is liable to epizooties	M	Endangering results at farmer level	M	B
Public Tendering processes	H	Delaying implementation	H	C

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

A risk analysis has been carried out by the midterm review team. A risk management, based on this analysis is carried out in 2011 and will continue through 2012.

In 2011 a large number of small stock has been provided to a large number of poor households scattered all over the district area. Therefore it became impossible to do an appropriate follow up. The major risk is that poor beneficiaries sell the animals as soon as

they are facing expenditures.

### 3.2.4 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
Efficiency	X	The indicators cannot be used.
Effectiveness	X	Can only be monitored on result level (see results 1 to 4)
Sustainability	B	With the best farmers with a clear vision on the benefits of small stock, sustainability is satisfactory.
Relevance	A	The programme is in accordance with the strategic visions of authorities.

### 3.2.5 Potential Impact

The impact of APEL programme after 2 effective years 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 decentralised structures to support the development of small stock breeding in rural households.

Because of constant pressure to distribute animals district technical services are not able to better organise the beneficiaries in small groups or cooperatives, nor are they able to do the daily follow up of the animals in place. Thorough training of the best farmers has just began at the end of 2011.

### 3.2.6 Recommendations

Recommendations	Source	Actor	Deadline
Implementation of agriculture programmes needs at least 5 years	General	DGC/BTC/Rwanda	-
Extreme poor households are not always the best targeted beneficiaries because they have mostly a very short horizon where animal breeding is a long term investment	R1	Animal husbandry Policy makers	-
Distribution of a large number of animals must be accompanied with a huge investment in human resources	R1	Animal husbandry Policy makers	-
Distribution of large number of animals should be concentrated in a small easily accessible area instead of being scattered through the whole District	R1	Animal husbandry Policy makers	-
Research should focus on applied field research paying attention to the interaction with the rural are.	R2	Higher educational	-

		and research Institutes	
Contracting private organisation and private service providers must be considered carefully	R3	BTC	-

## 3.3 Result 1

### 3.3.1 Indicators

<b>Result 1: Small stock breeding is developed by poor farmers using improved, effective and sustainable production methods</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline value</b>	<b>Progress year 2010</b>	<b>Progress year 2011</b>	<b>Target year N</b>	<b>End Target</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Total number of animals distributed	0	Pigs:1347 Goats:889 Sheep:73 Rabbit:54	Pigs: 4767 Goats:7931 Sheep:730 Rabbit:854		Pigs: 5500 Goats: 8000 Sheep: 900 Rabbit: x	Good progress made
At the end of the project at least 50% of landless beneficiaries continue small stock breeding at	X	X	X		5 000	
Reimbursement through revolving fund 60 %	X	X	4%		60%	Impossible to realise because of delay in distribution
Nb poor families without small stock in the programme area	22 377	X	12 681	7 000	10 000	Difficult to monitor
Widows and orphans participating constitute 50% of benefic	X	X	42 %		More than 30 % of beneficiaries	
Nb of animals given to the revolving fund	X	X	2%	5%	60%	
beneficiaries applying correctly at least 80% of the advises, of which 50%applying integrally	X	X	20%	40%	70%	
Numeric production of small ruminants increases by 50% and of pigs by 40%	X	X	X		-Increase small ruminants by 50% -Increase pigs 40%	

### 3.3.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities (See guidelines for interpretation of scores)	Progress:				Comments (only if the value is C or D)
	A	B	C	D	
1- Identification beneficiaries		B			
2- Construction of housing and purchase of drugs and animal feed.		B			
3- Purchase and distribution of animals		B			
5- Training and monitoring			C		Weak at management unit. Previous bad experience with local service providers. Sector veterinarians are doing the training together with technical assistant

### 3.3.3 Analysis of progress made

Main results of the activities implemented by district level:

Implementation at district level on 31/12/2011	Pigs	Goats	Sheep	Rabbits	Total
<b>SHEDS</b>					
Total scheduled sheds to be built up to end 2011	5 096	4 003	365	171	9 635
Sheds built on 31/12/2011	3756	2 719	330	91	6 896
<b>ANIMALS</b>					
Total small animals to be distributed up to end 2011	5 207	8 052	730	907	14 896
Small animals distributed on 31/12/2011	5 082	8 052	730	907	14 771
<b>BENEFICIARIES</b>					
Total beneficiaries targeted up to end 2011	5 207	4 078	292	169	9 746
Beneficiaries receiving animals on 31/12/2011	5 082	4 078	365	171	9 696

All activities under Result 1 are implemented by the Districts.

The beneficiaries are identified by the districts. They are amongst the poorest and fragile households in the district. A main challenge of the programme is to identify those who just

accept the animals because they are given for free without having the intention to start breeding activities. The identification procedure of the beneficiaries is a gender friendly process.

Good progress has been made in distributing animals, feed and drugs. It has to be highlighted that distribution of animals has been the easiest activity.

Initially the construction of sheds was progressing satisfactorily as BTC accepted to give the non objection after a restricted tendering procedure supported by a positive legal advice of an independent lawyer. At the end of 2011 BTC is asking to handle the construction of sheds in strict accordance with the procurement law. The districts are reluctant and want to allocate the budget for construction to the purchase of small stock.

Prior to distribution of the animals all beneficiaries are getting training in breeding techniques by the programme and by the district veterinarian and his team.

The programme staff in the districts is progressively training thoroughly the best farmers in order to have a number of pilot breeders. Unfortunately they are asked by the districts to focus on the administrative handling of the cash requests and the public tendering in the framework of the programme.

The monitoring is becoming difficult because of the huge number of beneficiaries who, moreover, are scattered all over the district area. After disappointing experiences with local service providers the sector veterinarians are mobilised to do the monitoring.

Relation between activities and result: Although a large number of beneficiaries are starting to breed small stock, APEL estimates that 15% of beneficiaries are getting rid of their animals at the first opportunity. The local authorities are informed and most of them are imposing measures but they are relatively unarmed against this mismanagement.

It is quite uncertain if the first result “Small stock breeding is developed by poor farmers using improved, effective and sustainable production methods” will be reached at a sustainable level.

This shortcoming is also caused by the overall delay in the implementation of the programme.

Influencing factors: slowness of procedures is responsible for the delay in implementation of the construction, purchase and distribution of animals.

There are no unexpected results.

“Harmo dynamics”: the programme has harmonised his approach of animal distribution to vulnerable families with the VSF - Belgium project PROXIVET in the district of Huye. The programme also harmonised with a rural development programme with an animal distribution component in Nyaruguru (SFA).

There is a good ownership of the breeding techniques by a larger part of beneficiaries. Some districts do appropriate progressively the activities of the programme mainly due to the efforts made by the TA and the District veterinarian.



### 3.3.4 Risks and Assumptions

Risk (describe)	Probability (score)	Potential implications		Risk Level (score)
		Describe	Score	
The rural zone is not very interested in small scale animal breeding	low		low	A
Households are not interested by in small stock due to other projects promoting and distribute cattle	low		low	A
Animal breeding activities which are put in place are not adapted to social conditions and are not appreciated	low		low	A
Mismanaging of distributed livestock due to economic difficulties	medium	If no adequate follow up is done a larger number of poor households in "need of money" could follow the movement	high	C
The most vulnerable households are not sensitive to project suggestions and are unable to discuss them with it	low		low	A

### 3.3.5 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
<b>Efficiency</b>	C	Weak performing M/E cell as well as training cell
<b>Effectiveness</b>	B	Effectiveness is medium for R1 as expected effects will likely be achieved in quantity only
<b>Sustainability</b>	C	As the implementation phase is too short sustainability is doubtful of R1

### 3.3.6 Budget execution

The global budget execution of 2011, on programme level is presented in annexe 7.3. The main expenditures on R1 are transfers to the specific APEL account of the Districts for implementing the activities under R1.

It is expected that most of the Districts will use the allocated budget.

An overview of the specific accounts on district level is given hereunder:

	<b>Gisagara Frw</b>	<b>Ngororer o Frw</b>	<b>Nyamagabe Frw</b>	<b>Huye Frw</b>	<b>Nyaruguru Frw</b>	<b>UPU Euro</b>	<b>RAB-Research Frw</b>	<b>ISAE Frw</b>
Budget MoU	444 660 800	444 660 800	452 816 800	446 700 800	446 700 800	117 934	103 089 600	65 991 200
Transfer	274 382 090	270 999 735	259 327 400	300 789 825	215 591 120	95 078	92 536 614	47 210 402
Bank statement (31/01/2012)	342 482	27 774 005	2 1 648 559	13 995 626	680 854	95 063,58	8 098 118	43 335 936
Total Expenditure	274 139 608	243 225 730	237 678 841	286 794 199	214 910 266	14,42	84 438 496	3 874 466
Expenses (% MoU)	61	54	52	64	48	0	81	5
Financial contractual commitments on 31/01/2012 (contract signed)	14 805 600	170 261 048	193 973 211	50 909 640	21 276 000	0	0	35 100 000
Estimated budget for ongoing public tenders 31/01/2012	125 601 510	25 000 000	17 908 500	56 629 000	170 000 000	0	0	0
Not yet committed (Training, capacity building, organization..)	30 114 082	6 174 022	3 256 248	52 367 961	40 514 534	0	94 991 482	27 016 734
Probability of spending 100% MoU at end of 2012	High	High	High	High/moderate	Moderate/low	APEL will launch tendering	Moderate	High

### 3.3.7 Recommendations

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Actor</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Carry out a more complete retrospective baseline analysis	3 3 1	M&E cell	Q1-Q2
Improving some management aspects of animal breeding such as replacing sterile females and dead animals when beneficiary is not responsible for the cause of the dead.	3 3 2	Field TA	Q1-Q4
Improving the overall training	3 3 3	Training cell	Q1-Q2
Increasing the animal breeding productivity by supporting owners of distributed male animals.	3 3 3	Field TA	Q1-Q3
Building management capacity of Districts technical	3 3 3	TA field and	Q1-Q4

services.		PMU	
Capitalize lessons learned in the field of procedures and distribution of animals in the context of the MOU with Districts.	3 3 3	Direction	Q1-Q3

## 3.4 Result 2

### 3.4.1 Indicators

<b>Result 2: A genetic improvement system of small ruminants, pigs, rabbits and poultry is initiated and appropriate breeding techniques are extended.</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline value</b>	<b>Progress year N-1</b>	<b>Progress year N</b>	<b>Target year N</b>	<b>End Target</b>	<b>Comments</b>
At the end of 2011 the project 3 Research /Education Institutes and X major breeders are involved in the genetic improvement	X	X	-3 Institutes are involved - 3 major goat breeders -1 major pig center			The MoU with UPU will probably be cancelled
At the end of the programme X beneficiaries will have benefit from genetic improved animals provided by the Institutes	X	X	X	X		Delayed
AT the end of the programme implementation of X number of genetic improved animals will be put in place.	X	X	X	X		Delayed
At the end of the project X actors of Research and Extension services will have held a number of consulting meetings.	X	X	X	X		Delayed
At the end of the programme research will have published X supporting documents on small stock breeding for extension purpose.	X	X	X	X		Delayed
At the end of the programme the does, ewes and sows will have a weight X% more than local breed.	X	X	X	X		Delayed

At the end of the programme the offspring of the genetic improved animals at beneficiary level has a weaning weight of X % for goats and pigs.	X	X	X	X		Delayed
AT the end of the project the selling price of improved piglets is 20% higher than local breeds.	X	X				Delayed

### 3.4.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities (See guidelines for interpretation of scores)	Progress:				Comments (only if the value is C or D)
	A	B	C	D	
1 Animal selection of small ruminant programme				C	delayed but ongoing at RAB level
2 Purchase of genetic improved breeds for poultry, rabbits and pigs				D	delayed
3 Organise platform with small stock breeders and research institutions				D	delayed
4 Conduct trials on particular breeds				D	cancelled
5 Strengthening the link between research and extension activities				D	delayed

### 3.4.3 Analysis of progress made

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 midterm review carried out in November 2010, and approved by the Steering Committee in December 2010, has analysed the indicators and proposed more appropriate indicators. However most of the new indicators are not easy to measure by the M&E cell.

APEL has signed a Mou with the 3 main Research and Education Institutes in the animal breeding sector: RAB Research for goat genetic improvement, ISAE in charge of sheep genetic improvement and UPU for pig improvement. Those Institutes are in charge of implementing all activities of the second result.

The programme signed also a contract with a cooperative for poultry breeding (COPIMA).

The design of the MoU is that each of the institutes should purchase pure bred animals,

breed the nucleus in own management and work with major breeders to multiply the number of cross bred animals which would have gone to the mating centers in the programme's intervention area.

Due to slow administrative handling of the public tendering for purchasing animals all activities in de field of genetic improvement were delayed putting at risk the planning of genetic improvement of the animals of the beneficiaries. Only RAB-research imported in June 2011 the pure bred nucleus of Boer goats. 6 Bucks were given to 3 major breeders for animal crossbreeding purposes. A coordination unit has been created with representatives of most important stakeholders.

ISAE and UPU failed to import their nucleus during the year 2011.

APEL has imported poultry parent stock for COPIMA. At the end of the year the cooperative is hardly surviving due to disagreement between members. The incubation of eggs didn't yet start although laying period started in October 2011.

The Steering Committee has canceled activity 4 of this result and has allocated the budget to the activities of research Instiutes.

**Result 2 will obviously not be implemented during this phase.**

### 3.4.4 Risks and Assumptions

Risk (describe)	Probability (score)	Potential implications		Risk Level (score)
		Describe	Score	
The genetic improvement will not be implemented	high	In the present phase the beneficiaries will not benefit from the genetic improvement	high	D

### 3.4.5 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
<b>Efficiency</b>	D	Weak use of the available budget
<b>Effectiveness</b>	D	Genetic improvement will not be implemented
<b>Sustainability</b>	X	Recent implementation of a small part of the programme doesn't allow to appreciate the sustainability

### 3.4.6 Budget execution

The budget execution of 2011 is presented in annex 7.3

The expenditures under this result are transfers from the central account to the budget to the specific APEL account of the Institutes. A part of the transferred amounts is still on the account of the Institutes.

### 3.4.7 Recommendations

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Actor</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Extension of the implementation period of the programme	3 4 3	PMU	Q3

### 3.5 Result 3

This result has largely been set on hold by the Steering Committee and the budget as well as a few infrastructure related to small stock breeding, has been transferred to Result 1 for implementing the MoU.

#### 3.5.1 Indicators

Result 1: The private sector, including micro finance, has developed the small stock value chain.)						
Indicators	Baseline value	Progress year N-1	Progress year N	Target year N	End Target	Comments

#### 3.5.2 Evaluation of activities

Activities (See guidelines for interpretation of scores)	Progress:				Comments (only if the value is C or D)
	A	B	C	D	
1					
2					
3					

#### 3.5.3 Analysis of progress made

#### 3.5.4 Risks and Assumptions

Risk (describe)	Probability (score)	Potential implications		Risk Level (score)
		Describe	Score	




### 3.5.5 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
Efficiency		
Effectiveness		
Sustainability		

### 3.5.6 Budget execution

The budget has been transferred to result 1 by decision of the Steering Committee.

### 3.5.7 Recommendations

Recommendations	Source	Actor	Deadline

## 3.6 Result 4

### 3.6.1 Indicators

<b>Résultat 4: MINAGRI's capacities are strengthened at national and district level.</b>						
<b>Indicateurs</b>	<b>Valeur 'Baseline'</b>	<b>Progrès année N-1</b>	<b>Progrès année N</b>	<b>Valeur Cible année N</b>	<b>Valeur cible</b>	<b>Commentaires</b>
In 2012 Rab-Animal Extension is collecting data on small stock on national level	X	X	X			
An observatory is operational at RAB level analysing every semester the evolution of small stock	X	X	X			
At the end of the project the district development plans on small stock are implemented	X	X	70%		80%	The initial delay in implementation is diminishing

### 3.6.2 Evaluation of activities

<b>Activités</b> <i>(Voir lignes directrices pour l'interprétation des scores)</i>	<b>Déroulement</b>				<b>Commentaires</b> (uniquement si la valeur est C ou D)
	A	B	C	D	
1 Support to RAB		B			Delayed because reorganisation of RAB structure
2 Support to Districts	A				

### 3.6.3 Analysis of progress made

During the year 2011 MINAGRI implemented its execution agency, Rwanda Agriculture Board, charged with the implementation of the policy. Each agricultural zone is headed by a decentralised unit of RAB. APEL is progressively integrating its activities in the Districts in

the zonal structure.

At RAB level 2 departments have been created to monitor nationwide the activities on small stock: one for small ruminants and one for pigs and rabbits. In the framework of an exit strategy the collaboration will be intensified during the year 2012.

RAB is collecting data on small stock through its own channels.

The Districts and their technical services are regularly informed about the programme. The technical staff got training in order to be able to continue to monitoring of small stock in the district.

All Districts are charging the TA with the handling of public tendering and the cash requests, making them less available to train and to organise beneficiaries.

The institutional changes of MINAGRI/RAB made the planning unit at programme level superfluous. The TA-planning has been charged with training activities as he had a background of teaching at higher level.

### 3.6.4 Risks and Assumptions

There are no particular risks nor assumptions in the logical framework.

Risk (describe)	Probability (score)	Potential implications		Risk Level (score)
		Describe	Score	
APEL activities will not be integrated in the RAB Zone	medium	Beneficiaries will not be monitored anymore	medium	B

### 3.6.5 Quality criteria

Criteria	Score	Comments
<b>Efficiency</b>	B	Programme resources are used appropriately to achieve expected outcome.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	B	Effectiveness is good for R4 as expected effects will be likely achieved in quantity, quality and time limit.
<b>Sustainability</b>	B	Ownership at District and RAB level of the small stock development activities is improving and seems promising.

### 3.6.6 Budget execution

The budget execution of 2011 is presented in annex 7.3

### 3.6.7 Recommendations

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Actor</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
At least 2 technical assistants per district are necessary one for technical issues and one for the administrative follow up	report	BTC/Minagri	

## **4 Transversal Themes**

### **4.1 Gender**

No specific design was made on gender in the framework of the Programme. Women represent 63% of the beneficiaries where they represent about 55% in the population. As the programme is focussing on the most vulnerable households in rural areas the Districts often identify women and widows but it cannot be said that there is a policy of promoting gender issues.

### **4.2 Environment**

No specific action has been taken to deal with environmental issues.

## 5 Decisions taken by the JLCB and follow-up

Last Steering Committee was held on September 14<sup>th</sup> , 2011

<b>Decisions</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Actor</b>	<b>Time of decision</b>	<b>Status</b>
Close monitoring of the MoU with the Institutes	APEL report	Project management		ongoing

## 6 Lessons Learned

Lessons learned	Target audience
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 programme, RAB and BTC Representation.
Public procurement do not ease the delivery of services and construction works there where a large number of small items have to be provided in the framework of development cooperation	BTC, Authorities
Most agricultural programmes must be conceived to last for at least 5 years	BTC, national policy makers

## 7 Annexes

### 7.1 Logical framework

<b>SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>INDICATORS</b>	<b>VERIFICATION SOURCES</b>	<b>HYPOTHESES risks and opportunities</b>
<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: RAB annual report	1.Continuity in agricultural policy 2. Absence of epizooties in the sub region
<b>RESULTS</b>	<b>INDICATORS</b>	<b>VERIFICATION SOURCES</b>	<b>HYPOTHESES risks and opportunities</b>
<b>(R1)</b> Small scale animal breeding is developed by poor livestock breeders who use improved, efficient and sustainable production methods	• Distribution of 15 000 animals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sector monitoring report made by MINAGRI/RARDA with support from the programme</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>	
	•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		3. Interest of rural zones in animal breeding
	•Reimbursement rate in form of revolving credit >60% one year after livestock delivery		4. Risk of not being concerned with regard to other projects that promote and distribute cattle
	•Participation of women and orphans heads of household≥ 30 %		5. Animal breeding activities adapted to social conditions and appreciated
			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
<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	• 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 programme for the distribution of livestock head	<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>	7. Those most vulnerable households are sensitive to the project suggestions and able to discuss them with it
	• A genetic improvement policy is defined and practiced		8. Confirmed livestock breeders are interested by the participation in programme activities concerning selection and distribution of improved livestock head
	• ISAR and/or public scientific institutions in genetic improvement participate in genetic improvement activities and in technologic research in small scale animal breeding		9. A national programme of genetic improvement for domestic species with short reproductive cycle is defined ( following planned consultancies beyond or as part of APEL ) and that programme is coherent and applicable
	• Research and popularization are provided with documents on small scale animal breeding typology and confirmed improved animal breeding techniques		10. ISAR and/or other identified institutions for monitoring those operations are able to do it or are enough supported
	• Research and popularization are regularly combined with field actors as part of consultation platforms		11. Other productions performed by other projects: collaboration and improvement of the existing material, no replies or needless competitions
<b>(R3)</b> The development of the sub sector is realized by the private	• Marketing networks are improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market price list</li> <li>• Monitoring analyses of the</li> </ul>	12. Operators, research, popularization, livestock breeders and others have time and interest to share their concerns and skills
			13. Livestock breeders reach a production and technological sophistication level that enables



sector ( including micro-finance) which 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>	sector made by MINAGRI/RARDA with support from the programme <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>	them to be interested in commercial and monetary aspect of the sub sector
	<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>		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>Financial tools adapted to animal breeding are available and used by farmers and livestock breeders</li> </ul>		15. Feeding inputs are available
(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>	16. Livestock breeders are interested in their use
	<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>		17.The veterinary pharmacy somehow becomes more liberal and does not enter into exaggerated corporatism
	<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>		18. Banks and/or credits organisms are sensitive to the principle of giving credit to livestock breeders 19. Livestock breeders have the economic capacity to enter into the monetary system

## 7.2 M&E 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 Internal consultation n° 5: Meeting n° 6: 14 <sup>th</sup> September 2011
Baseline survey	February – July 2010
Mid term review	November 2010

### 7.3 “Budget versus current (y – m)” Report

## Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of RWA0806511

Project Title : **Appui au petit elevage**

Budget Version: **F01** Year to month : **31/12/2011**

Currency : **EUR**

YtM : **Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing**

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2010	Expenses 2011	Total	Balance	% Exec
<b>A POSER LES BASES D'UN SYSTÈME DE DÉVELOPPEMENT</b>			<b>3.877.594,89</b>	<b>1.260.144,14</b>	<b>1.066.250,09</b>	<b>2.326.394,23</b>	<b>1.551.200,68</b>	<b>60%</b>
01 Les éleveurs pauvres développent le petit élevage et			3.074.943,00	800.231,13	1.015.347,06	1.815.578,19	1.259.364,81	59%
01 Identification des bénéficiaires		COGES	30.225,00	29.322,48	902,52	30.225,00	0,00	100%
02 Aménagement de l'environnement physique et technique		COGES	1.352.518,00	323.558,35	279.621,62	603.179,97	749.338,03	45%
03 Obtention et diffusion d'animaux de valeur		COGES	1.273.000,00	280.559,96	649.715,27	930.275,23	342.724,77	73%
04 Suivi rapproché au niveau local pour la formation et le suivi		COGES	419.200,00	166.790,34	85.107,65	251.897,99	167.302,01	60%
02 Un système d'amélioration génétique des espèces à			384.667,04	294.368,60	8.964,65	303.333,25	81.333,79	79%
01 Sélection des petits ruminants		COGES	233.348,00	188.841,87	940,71	189.782,58	43.565,42	81%
02 Acquisition et multiplication de races améliorées en		COGES	133.000,00	96.014,93	8.023,94	104.038,87	28.961,13	78%
03 Recherche concernant les techniques liées au petit		COGES	8.514,78	8.514,78	0,00	8.514,78	0,00	100%
04 Essais et promotion d'élevages particuliers		COGES	429,26	429,26	0,00	429,26	0,00	100%
05 Renforcement du lien Recherche - Vulgarisation		COGES	9.375,00	567,76	0,00	567,76	8.807,24	6%
03 Le secteur privé s'organise et se coordonne pour le			85.264,85	18.886,88	6.416,72	25.303,60	59.961,25	30%
01 Installation d'entrepreneurs privés à tous les niveaux de la		COGES	80.000,00	13.622,03	6.416,72	20.038,75	59.961,25	25%
02 Appui à l'émergence et au fonctionnement d'encadreurs		COGES	595,02	595,02	0,00	595,02	0,00	100%
03 Organisation du système de micro-crédit		COGES	4.669,83	4.669,83	0,00	4.669,83	0,00	100%
04 Les capacités du MINAGRI et des acteurs de la filière			332.720,00	146.657,53	35.521,66	182.179,19	150.540,81	55%
01 Appui au MINAGRI/RARDA		COGES	154.300,00	32.726,53	31.011,34	63.737,87	90.562,13	41%
02 Appui aux niveaux décentralisés		COGES	178.420,00	113.931,00	4.510,32	118.441,32	59.978,68	66%
<b>Z MOYENS GÉNÉRAUX</b>			<b>1.122.405,11</b>	<b>533.482,11</b>	<b>269.234,14</b>	<b>802.716,25</b>	<b>319.688,86</b>	<b>72%</b>
01 Frais de personnel			579.178,00	285.810,81	186.329,70	472.140,51	107.037,49	82%
01 Assistant technique		REGIE	500.000,00	256.717,11	158.178,55	414.895,66	85.104,34	83%
		REGIE	637.643,00	326.548,30	172.455,18	499.003,48	138.639,52	78%
		COGEST	4.362.357,00	1.467.077,95	1.163.029,05	2.630.107,00	1.732.250,00	60%
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5.000.000,00</b>	<b>1.793.626,25</b>	<b>1.335.484,23</b>	<b>3.129.110,48</b>	<b>1.870.889,52</b>	<b>63%</b>



	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2010	Expenses 2011	Total	Balance	% Exec
02 Staff national		COGES	24.888,00	8.710,88	7.752,11	16.462,99	8.425,01	66%
03 Equipe finance et administration		COGES	44.660,00	17.775,92	17.539,28	35.315,20	9.344,80	79%
04 Autres frais de personnel		COGES	9.630,00	2.606,90	2.859,76	5.466,66	4.163,34	57%
<b>02 Investissements</b>			<b>111.226,33</b>	<b>103.664,46</b>	<b>5.521,10</b>	<b>109.185,56</b>	<b>2.040,77</b>	<b>98%</b>
01 Véhicules		REGIE	34.951,63	34.951,63	0,00	34.951,63	0,00	100%
02 Véhicules		COGES	1.097,46	1.097,46	0,00	1.097,46	0,00	100%
03 Equipement bureau		COGES	7.083,93	6.929,67	154,26	7.083,93	0,00	100%
04 Equipement IT		COGES	26.800,00	21.821,50	2.976,68	24.798,18	2.001,82	93%
05 Aménagements du bureau		COGES	41.293,31	38.864,20	2.390,16	41.254,36	38,95	100%
<b>03 Frais de fonctionnement</b>			<b>326.309,41</b>	<b>114.165,65</b>	<b>72.939,28</b>	<b>187.104,93</b>	<b>139.204,48</b>	<b>57%</b>
01 Loyer du bureau		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	??%
02 Services et frais de maintenance		COGES	12.600,00	1.296,78	2.833,85	4.130,63	8.469,37	33%
03 Location de véhicule		COGES	68.000,00	27.362,33	21.686,98	49.049,31	18.950,69	72%
04 Frais de fonctionnement des véhicules		COGES	117.724,41	42.987,48	13.311,65	56.299,13	61.425,28	48%
05 Télécommunications		COGES	16.200,00	5.216,57	4.572,01	9.788,58	6.411,42	60%
06 Fournitures de bureau		COGES	21.600,00	10.542,17	5.349,83	15.892,00	5.708,00	74%
07 Frais de mission		COGES	45.000,00	9.521,26	15.719,08	25.240,34	19.759,66	56%
08 Frais de représentation et de communication externe		COGES	12.485,00	3.896,71	2.380,60	6.077,31	6.407,69	49%
09 Formation		COGES	9.000,00	6.103,51	110,44	6.213,95	2.786,05	69%
10 Frais financiers		COGES	2.700,00	1.478,42	103,93	1.582,35	1.117,65	59%
11 Frais TVA		COGES	0,00	922,05	-3.055,72	-2.133,67	2.133,67	??%
12 Frais Financiers		REGIE	0,00	69,21	132,68	201,89	-201,89	??%
		REGIE	637.643,00	326.548,30	172.455,18	499.003,48	138.639,52	78%
		COGEST	4.362.357,00	1.467.077,95	1.163.029,05	2.630.107,00	1.732.250,00	60%
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5.000.000,00</b>	<b>1.793.626,25</b>	<b>1.335.484,23</b>	<b>3.129.110,48</b>	<b>1.870.889,52</b>	<b>63%</b>

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2010	Expenses 2011	Total	Balance	% Exec	
13 Entretien Voiture		REGIE	21.000,00	4.969,16	<b>9.793,95</b>	14.763,11	6.236,89	70%	
<b>04 Audit, evaluation, backstopping</b>			<b>105.691,37</b>	<b>29.841,19</b>	<b>4.444,06</b>	<b>34.285,25</b>	<b>71.406,12</b>	<b>32%</b>	
01 Mission d'évaluation		REGIE	64.192,00	29.841,19	<b>4.350,00</b>	34.191,19	30.000,81	53%	
02 Audit semestrielle		COGES	24.000,00	0,00	<b>94,06</b>	94,06	23.905,94	0%	
03 Backstopping (appui du siège)		REGIE	0,00	0,00	<b>0,00</b>	0,00	0,00	?%	
04 Audit Bureau Regie		REGIE	17.499,37	0,00	<b>0,00</b>	0,00	17.499,37	0%	
<b>99 Conversion rate adjustment</b>			<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>?%</b>	
98 Conversion rate adjustment		REGIE	0,00	0,00	<b>0,00</b>	0,00	0,00	?%	
99 Conversion rate adjustment		COGES	0,00	0,00	<b>0,00</b>	0,00	0,00	?%	
			<b>REGIE</b>	<b>637.643,00</b>	<b>326.548,30</b>	<b>172.455,18</b>	<b>499.003,48</b>	<b>138.639,52</b>	<b>78%</b>
			<b>COGEST</b>	<b>4.362.357,00</b>	<b>1.467.077,95</b>	<b>1.163.029,05</b>	<b>2.630.107,00</b>	<b>1.732.250,00</b>	<b>60%</b>
			<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5.000.000,00</b>	<b>1.793.626,25</b>	<b>1.335.484,23</b>	<b>3.129.110,48</b>	<b>1.870.889,52</b>	<b>63%</b>

## 7.4 Beneficiaries

### 7.1. 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 programme, 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 most animals have been distributed recently. The manure production increases however the agricultural incomes.

In the course of 2012, an assessment of the influence of animal distribution on the vulnerability of women has to be carried out.

### 7.2. Districts and RAB.

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

Since late 2011, at Sector level, RAB 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 with help of the districts.



## 7.5 Operational planning Q1-2012

The Implementation of the programme is, at the moment of reporting, ending on 30<sup>th</sup> of June 2012. Therefore the operational planning is covering only the first semester 2012. The Steering Committee will however be asked to approve an extension of the implementation until the end of the validity of the Specific Agreement in 22th January 2013 without additional budget. If accepted closing procedure will start half of the year.

**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 2012.													T.A. S/E
	Complementary Base line by APEL staff (cf. MTR)													T.A S/E
<b>A.1.2 : Develop physical and 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/Field staff
	Monitoring MOUs Districts: purchase drugs and animal feed.													Districts/ APEL staff
	Monitoring MOUs Districts: housing construction where indicated													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 programme beneficiaries: developing complementary topics such as rational use of manure and refreshing courses.													APEL staff
<b>Implementation</b>	replacing sterile females and dead animals.													APEL staff



<b>other MTR recommendations</b>	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													DI/Delco
	Monitor MOU ISAE													DI/Delco
	Support RAB to ensure the ownership of the technical management of the selection schemes in the context of the MOUs signed with ISAE, ISAR et UPU													Di
<b>A.2.2 : Genetic improvement of pigs, rabbits and poultry</b>	Execute the tenders pig breeding ans AI													DI/Delco
	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 (RAB, 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>	Canceled activity													
<b>A.3.3 : Organize the micro-credit system</b>	Canceled activity													

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													
	Support to RARDA laboratories (purchase material – training)													DI+DELCO
	Small stock observatory ( purchase 3 laptops – training Districts veterinarians)													
<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